




---

**From:** Roger Cooper [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 December 2015 15:47  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** pagham beach spit

Ref :  
P/97/15/PL  
16 Dec 2015  
FAO : Simon Davis

Having known Pagham since the early 60's and then living here since 2000 we have seen numerous changes in the area some good, the creation of a friendly and supportive community and in the last five years - bad. The continuing growth of the spit and the subsequence of "maintaining" the beach has turned the beach into a building site. We live one row back from the front but are still effected by the noise and general disruption as an attempt is made to stop the erosion. We can only imagine what it might be like for those on the beach itself. As a community we have pulled together to rectify the situation and thought that other parties were too.

Therefore we write in **support** of the planning application for a managed breach of the shingle spit at Pagham Harbour. We feel that it is vital that this outcome is moved forward as soon as possible. It is also vital that the two relevant Local Planning Authorities, together with the Environment Agency, Natural England and RSPB, should all work together in a positive manner. Our support is based on the following positive outcomes:

1. **People** - Whilst there are known ecological interests that will need to be safeguarded, these should not be at the expense of people, their homes and livelihoods.

2. **Mitigation** - Whilst nature conservation interests have a degree of protection, the opportunity exists to mitigate any harm that might arise by way of creative solutions that could better safeguard the nature conservation interests in the long run. Cut the spit without delay!
3. **SSSI** - Arising from the need to safeguard homes, much engineering work has been carried out to the beach, to the detriment of the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). These too are nature conservation interests. A quick solution will allow the SSSI to recover.
4. **Health** – For some years now the health of numerous residents’ and businesses has suffered due to delays in key decisions. They need a solution now.
5. **Recreation** – The activities and attractions provided by Pagham Beach and its facilities are both varied and significant. Through the period of coast erosion, which has brought with it damage, heavy machinery, barriers, and dangerous currents, there has been a decline in the attractiveness of Pagham Beach for residents’, businesses, activity groups and visitors. This needs to be reversed.
6. **Cost and local economy** – The cost to people’s lives, property and businesses has been significant. In fact, the ultimate cost will never be known, nor could it be calculated. To those that live with this reality, it is vast. The funds already raised by local residents’, businesses and visitors to Pagham are testament to the significant interest and support that exists for the proposal to cut the spit. However, it is time to address the decline in property values, harm to businesses and activity groups, to help them address their financial losses and to help repair the harm to the local economy.
7. **Expenditure** – The cost of ‘temporary fixes’ is vast and their success mediocre. Cutting the spit will provide a longer term solution and be more cost effective.
8. **Other impacts** – Without a favourable decision to cut the spit, beautiful and historic Pagham will continue to be blighted and will further decline. Whereas, a decision in favour of cutting the spit will kick-start a recovery. Notably, today’s impacts at Pagham, will be tomorrow’s Aldwick and Bognor Regis.

The people of Pagham, and further afield, both local and visitors, acknowledge that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the managed breach of Pagham Harbour, is a stage leading to an engineered solution.

Having considered the report and supporting documents submitted by ABPmer we commend the proposals and request Arun DC & Chichester DC to do the same.

Roger & Jeannette Cooper  
46, Harbour Road  
Pagham