




**From:** Paul Unsworth [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 26 April 2018 10:00  
**To:** David Easton  
**Subject:** Objection to P/6/17/OUT - Hook Lane and other Pagham developments

Good Morning, please accept the attached objection to the above applications. I understand I have until the end of April to lodge this so I hope I am in time, thanks, Paul Unsworth - 6 Hook Lane PO21 3NY

### **Planning Applications:**

**P/134/16/OUT**

**P/140/16/OUT**

**P/25/17/OUT and particularly**

**P/6/17/OUT (land north of Hook Lane, Pagham))**

These comments are made in respect of the above applications and should be regarded as further objection to them.

### **Sustainability**

Proposals fail to address sustainability and the need to safeguard and improve quality of life of residents and to enhance the area's essential character and environmental assets in that:

- They contributes to the increasing loss of high value, productive farm land and the wildlife that depends upon its existence,
- They reduces the diversity of landscapes in the area,
- They eliminate the ability of the land to perform functions such as carbon storage, flood risk mitigation, food production and wildlife support.
- They result in loss of strategic gap and significant change to community identity and demographics,
- They threaten and add nothing to the rights of way network,
- The proposals present an overdevelopment and will result in an imbalance in the community in economic and social terms rather than supporting a strong, vibrant and healthy community.
- They remove land of amenity value in reducing open space and compromise the open and undeveloped nature of the countryside around the established settlement,
- They reduce the attractiveness of the area to wildlife including birds, bats, reptiles, small mammals and thus compromise important habitats such as the Pagham Harbour area and the internationally recognised vegetated shingle environments around it. They also threaten established populations of bats, dormice, badgers , insects and birds.
- The will increase the loss of dark skies so further disrupting wildlife.
- They impact on and miss the opportunity to enhance local biodiversity. These are inadequately assessed. There will be loss of hedgerows (and the native species they support), hedgerow trees and green corridors so important to the preservation of species will disappear.
- No proposals are given that will enhance local sustainability and/or mitigate climate change e.g. enhanced eco design and energy saving, provision of allotments, demonstrable net gain in biodiversity, enhancement of public transport, walking and cycling.

### **Built up boundary and infrastructure**

The proposed development is outside the historically recognised built up boundaries and destroys the well-established distinction between countryside and residential areas. It also cannot be

accommodated within the existing infrastructure, services and facilities and proffers little real analysis of the impact it will have on this existing community and its cohesion. The impact of a potential 30% increase in population in a short period of time is likely to be dramatic and mitigation/coping measures are not dealt with. The impact on crime and disorder has also not been accounted for.

### **Protection of the countryside**

The development will lead to a failure to protect the countryside which should be protected for its own sake. These developments add nothing and take away countryside that exists now. They will mean further restriction of quiet informal recreation, reduced opportunity for rural diversification and will further clog existing key road networks.

The Planning Authority should not be allowing development on greenfield sites in advance of use of alternative lower value land. These applications are speculative and have not justified the destruction of greenfield sites. They have ignored the impact they will have on existing communities and local infrastructure except in a cursory way.

### **Transport and travel (including air and noise pollution)**

The proposals will lead to increased travel demands on an already full network and one which has glaring inadequacies such as lack of safe cycle and pedestrian routes, an inability to safely accommodate the mix and volume of traffic it is subjected to.

The noise environment caused by traffic levels now will increase further. A small change in community noise levels as assessed in decibels reflects a significant perceptible change in the noise climate due to the logarithmic nature of noise measurement and hearing perception. Thus overall noise levels will rise. This together with the increase in air pollution which will result from these developments have not been accounted for or mitigated and will lead to threats to public health and wellbeing.

The increase in traffic from these developments will cause further congestion as well as increased air pollution and noise. The Highways Authorities have already confirmed the existing local network is overloaded especially at peak times so allowing additional traffic onto it will be reckless. The commentary on the proposals fails to recognise the impact of journeys to the east and on the A259 and seems to ignore existing traffic problems and changes proposed to the A27 access and use. No traffic reduction or solutions to existing problems are offered. Neither has any consideration been given to the integration of transport options and incentivising the least damaging over the most. These omissions cannot be ignored by the Planning Authority.

### **Form and nature of development – adverse effects**

The form and nature of the developments will add nothing to local distinctiveness and will result in unacceptable adverse effects on the settled community and adjoining occupiers. This will take numerous forms but will include:

- Increased overall community noise climate.
- Increased air pollution

- Increased use of local roads with increased noise, pollution and accident potential
- Disruption of community cohesion from a sudden change in community make up; age profile; requirements for access to and use of facilities e.g. medical, educational, shopping, recreational. In addition no reference is made to issues such as crime prevention. Whilst some physical structures are offered for a school or medical centre what is actually required to operate these and make them work is ignored. Local services are already at full stretch and new buildings alone will not improve the availability or sustainability of these services or their effectiveness.
- The existing community profile has been ignored and no account taken of the impacts of change on it from these developments and the residents that will find themselves living on its edge. There is no consideration of how the integration of new and old communities will be achieved.
- The proposed housing character and type are mismatched to the resident community needs, existing development and actual housing needs of the area
- Local shops and facilities are expected to benefit from this development but this will only be so if they can be accessed. Visits to these at many times of the day will show that access to them by car is not possible as car parking is just not sufficient. The reality is that people will not walk or cycle to the shops, due to laziness or perceived hazard, and will use their cars. Therefore what will happen is that people will travel further to major shops etc. as they simply cannot park at local ones. The existing parking arrangements at shops are already over-subscribed and sometimes dangerous. No account has been taken of this and the potential impact on the wider road network. As an example traffic chaos already results from work at the site by the Inglenook and this is just from parking by contractors without a single house being built yet!
- There will be increased parking on street in many areas which cannot be safely accommodated e.g. see ongoing dangerous parking near junction of Hook lane and Pagham Road and around the Coop in Hewetts Lane.
- There will be increased use of “rat runs” through existing housing.
- Overall the commentary with the applications is too quiet about the actual impacts of this large development on a small and well established local community.

### **Implications for local business**

There will be significant adverse impacts for local business. Failure to allow local shops to benefit due to poor access is discussed above. There are no quantifiable long term benefits for local businesses. Impacts for business such as Osbornes, which have been important local employers for many years, cannot be ignored. They have a noise footprint which will impact on new houses despite the sop of a fence which will never be maintained. New residents are unlikely to tolerate noise from industrial operation leading to complaint and costly investigation or action for the Local Authority. Osbornes will inevitably be involved in changing their operations or spending money to reduce their impact which they don't have to now. Similar problems are likely for Barfoots. Local industry cannot be compromised because people are allowed to move in next to them.

### **Flooding and drainage**

Flooding remains a serious concern for all Pagham residents. Pagham has been the saviour of Chichester for many years since the river was designated as the flood relief valve for the city. Changes to the beach and rising sea levels will impact upon the efficiency of this “natural” soakaway system. So will ongoing and planned developments around Chichester which add to the ground and surface water issues that Pagham systems have to cope with being downstream from the city. There is no comprehensive ground and/or surface water study within the application that takes account of and accurately predicts the future pressure on the Pagham drainage system or ground water levels. No approval can be given without complete assurance that waters can be managed and flooding prevented. Anyone that has visited the local fields in the winter or who witnessed the severe flooding from flash storms a few years ago will testify to the fact that the existing ground water levels are always high and ditch etc. systems under high load. Evidence of repeated, severe and prolonged ponding on the surface of many fields locally cannot be ignored or fobbed off by a very simple SUDS proposal.

### **Pagham Neighbourhood Plan**

The proposals run contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan and thus ride roughshod over the community “localism” powers, priorities and expectations. In particular the developments proposed offer nothing to support;

- The special character of Pagham
- Enhancement of its rural context
- Protection and enhancement of habitats and local biodiversity
- The needs of local people
- Reduction of flood risk
- Protection and enhancement of local business and provision of business premises
- Protection of countryside around Pagham
- Protection of strategic gap
- Housing site allocation numbers and locations
- Protection of key sites of nature importance
- Protection of agricultural land
- Improved car parking at local shops
- Road traffic improvements and cycle route development
- Promotion of low carbon and renewable technologies

Please ensure the Planning Committee are made aware of these concerns.

Paul Unsworth

6 Hook Lane

Rose Green

Bognor Regis

PO21 3NY

