

Julie Grieves

From: Lisa Coney on behalf of Planning
Sent: 17 December 2015 09:58
To: Planning.Responses; Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: support of managed breach of shingle spit P/97/PL
Attachments: planning managed breach of shingle spit and blocking of adjacent tidal inlet channel.doc

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 December 2015 09:21
To: Planning; Karl Roberts
Cc: Nicola Jones; Ray Radmall
Subject: support of managed breach of shingle spit P/97/PL

To the case officer Mr Simon Davis ADC

Dear Sir ,

I am David Huntley - Chair of Pagham Beach Residents and I attach a letter of support for the the ABP mer Planning Application ref: – **P/97/15/PL Managed Breach of shingle spit and blocking of adjacent tidal inlet channel with shingle barrier.**
formation of shingle island within harbour following excavation of adjacent area of spit.

Yours sincerely,

David Huntley -Chair PBRA.

14



To Mr Karl Roberts &
Mr Simon Davis Case officer
Planning department
Arun District Council
Maltravers Road
Little Hampton West Sussex BN17 5LS

35 West Front Road
Pagham
Bognor Regis
PO21 4SZ
[REDACTED]

14th December 2015

Ref. Planning Application: - P/97/15/PL Managed breach of shingle spit and blocking of adjacent tidal inlet channel with shingle barrier. Formation of shingle island within harbour following excavation of adjacent area of spit.

Case officer: - Simon Davis

Dear Mr Roberts and Mr Simon Davis,

As Chair of Pagham Beach Residents
I wish to formally support this planning application.

The grounds are as follows: -

- 1 There is an immediate threat to the beach estate and the southern half of Pagham. The sea is only metres away from breaching the shingle crest by the yacht club. The present stop gap measures are not working, the situation is getting rapidly worse.
- 2 Loss of SSSI beach with 150 year old community of rare and endangered plants and animals including Childing Pink -*Petrorhagia nanteulii.*, Horned poppy - *Glaucum flavum*, sea spinach - *Beta maritima* ; sand lizards, horned crickets. This has been damaged by necessary emergency beach engineering but enough pockets on undisturbed beach remain to recolonise when the beach recovers after the managed breach.
- 3 Long term cost saving it has cost well in excess of £3 million to continually repair the beach all to no avail. It will cost £750K to £1 million to implement this planning application which will result in a permanent solution. When the harbour mouth was in the 1961 – 2003 position it only cost £10k a year to manage. In the last two years it cost ADC 200k + each year since 2013 to stop houses falling into the sea. This is unsustainable; restore the harbour mouth – breach the spit.
- 4 Recreation The beach used to be an important source of recreation for bucket and spade holidays, sailing, fishing, and other water sports. The scour current and the spit now make the beach unsafe particularly when the tide is racing out. The life boats can no longer get in to rescue people. Responsible beach management indicates the spit should be breached without delay otherwise the competent authorities could be responsible for loss of life due to beach mismanagement.

- 5 Cost and local economy. The Manhood peninsular of Selsey and Pagham provides 10% of the food needs of the UK. Potential loss of grade 1 agricultural land in event of a breach is unacceptable. It makes no sense not to protect our beach crest in the long term as we need the land behind for building and food production. An accreting shingle beach is the best way to absorb wave energy and will naturally build up in response to sea level rise. Breach the spit, allow onshore drift.
- 6 Health – since 2006 the constant worry and stress of our disappearing beach has caused numerous health problems. The failure to implement the effective solution of breaching the spit is the cause. Breach the spit.
- 7 Little terns will breed far more successfully on the restored tern island free from predation by dogs, badgers, stoats, weasels and foxes. Breach the spit; restore the harbour mouth and tern island.

The people of Pagham and annual visitors from the rest of the UK support the ABP mer managed spit breach proposal as the only effective long term solution. They have backed their views by pledging £250 K for the spit breach. Pagham Parish Council has also spent £250 K on this application, so the community obviously believe and have invested strongly in the managed breach of the spit as recommended by ABP mer.

We respectfully recommend this planning application be approved and implemented without further delay.

Yours sincerely,

David Huntley (Chair PBRA).