




Sent: 26 April 2017 22:22

To: Planning

Cc: GIBB, Nicolas

Subject: Planning application P/25/17 OUT, P/134/16 OUT, P/140/16 OUT, P/6/17 OUT

26 April 2017

42 Hook Lane

Rose Green

Bognor Regis

West Sussex

PO21 3PB

Dear Sirs

Re: Planning application P/25/17 OUT Church Barton House

together with P/134/16 OUT Sefter Road, P/140/16 OUT Pagham Road

and P/6/17 OUT Hook Lane - OBJECTION

If this issue wasn't as serious as it is, it would be laughable.

Yet another proposal to develop on prime agricultural land, in a village already at capacity with regards to school places, doctor's appointments, parking at local shops and this one pretty much bordering the Pagham Nature Reserve.

I **OBJECT** to this planning application as I believe that this, along with the applications for Summer Lane, Hook Lane and Sefton Road is just too much. We simply don't have the infrastructure in place to support these proposals nor the capacity on our local roads.

My concern is that greed is the overriding factor in determining the future of Pagham.

As is the norm, the developers are required to make financial contributions towards such things as policing, schools, libraries, play equipment etc.

It can be noted from the various consultation letters that in many cases their likely objections to the developments are countered by suggestions that should they receive adequate 'financial contributions' their objections would no longer stand.

The Police have suggested that they would be 'unable to retain the high level of policing that is currently delivered' with such large numbers of people moving into the area, unless they receive more funding.

It seems however that these contributions aren't necessarily going to be spent on the areas being developed.

I note that the contributions generated for WSCC for schools and libraries do not appear to be destined for Rose Green School, nor Willowhale Library but Felpham Community College and Bognor Library?

I find it quite incredible that these developments appear to be provisionally given the 'OK' by the likes of, for example CDC Ecology, provided they receive a financial contribution for a 'strategic scheme of avoidance/mitigation'.

Are they seriously prepared to allow the devastation of habitats in return for money? How is this protecting the wildlife? Collecting it up and finding a 'suitable alternative place' to put it can't work forever. The 'suitable places' will run out as development spreads leaving various species to eventually die out. This is increasingly the case with the destruction of rain forests etc. What is the difference in what is happening here?

I sincerely hope that in voicing our concerns to Arun District Council, they are not falling upon deaf ears. It's high time someone started standing up for what is right for this beautiful area and future generations.

Yours faithfully

Sarah Freeman Smith