

Simon Evers
52 East Front Road
Pagham
PO21 4ST

Your Ref: OWPC7724
Our Ref: P/97/15/PL 16-09-2015
Please ask for:
Mr S Davis

4th January 2016

Dear Sir/Madam

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

Managed breach of shingle spit & blocking of adjacent tidal inlet channel with shingle barrier. Formation of shingle island within Harbour following excavation of adjacent area of spit. This application is accompanied by an environmental statement

Church Norton Spit Pagham Beach Pagham

Thank you for your internet representation made on 2nd January 2016 which has been recorded as '**support**' with the comments as follows:

I write in support of the above planning application, as a local resident.

1. The erosion of Pagham beach is recent and exactly contemporaneous with the growth of the spit which has grown since the main channel from the harbour was left untended. As a consequence, rapid (10 knots+) fluvial and tidal flow has been shifted from a right angle, evacuating movement, to a parallel, erosive movement along the beach. Strong, frothing current can now be observed to be pressed into the beach by the spit, visibly eroding the shingle with every tide. It is a clear primary cause of the erosion of Pagham beach.

As the spit has grown it has become increasingly clear that if this flow is not redirected it will erode the entire beach to the point where homes are destroyed by a normal storm. If that occurs they it will leave homes and wildlife habitat inland exposed to similar action over time. Piercing the spit is critical to maintaining the human and wildlife habitat on and immediately inland of the beach.

2. The spit in its current form is a recent and impermanent habitat to wildlife: piercing will do no more than returning the shingle environment to where it was 10 years ago, incidentally improving the flow of water in and out of the harbour and with it the briny pre-Roman tidal environment in which the local wildlife has evolved over the centuries and on which migratory wildlife depends. Left alone the harbour will eventually silt up, and one of the last remaining destinations for migratory birds in the South of England will disappear. Piercing will improve the ancient wildlife habitat that all parties are seeking to preserve.

Pagham Harbour serves as a channel for evacuating the Chichester flood plain. Left to silt up, it will no longer do so with the consequence that Chichester itself will be at greater risk of flooding. Piercing will reduce the risk of flooding to Chichester.

3. Local experience points unequivocally to the spit as the cause of the beach erosion, and to the proper response. Many residents have lived on the beach for over 50 years. They note that erosion and/or growth of the beach has correlated with seaward dredging of the harbour mouth channel. In supporting the piercing of the spit residents seek to minimise intervention and the impact of works on the beach over time: as planned, piercing will maximise natural dredging, return to a pattern developed over centuries, and allow the spit to replenish the beach with minimal human intervention.

4. Despite significant effort and resources committed to beach reconstruction, repeated adaptive management by Arun council has had limited impact with only temporary benefits. The rock barrier on the Western end of the beach has protected those homes that were initially at risk but serves no benefit further East as the spit continues its remorseless march towards Bognor.

5. The local community is backing the piercing of the spit with a significant financial contribution of its own. Residents of the beach and the homes behind are not wealthy weekenders - many more grew up locally and a large number have lived in Pagham from childhood through to retirement. The amounts raised and the number of contributors involved underline the extent of local involvement both in analysing the problem and in coming up with a solution.

6. The cost of doing nothing will be far higher than the cost of piercing the spit and subsequent management of the channel. Pagham beach is not suffering because it is close to sea level, in a flood plain or otherwise at risk of flooding. Rather it is suffering the effects of an erosion that could easily be managed at a cost that is a fraction of the value being destroyed. The potential loss is not only to private property - it is to a significant local and regional amenity: a beach and harbour environment that are enjoyed by residents of the whole of West Sussex as well as holiday makers from further afield.

Your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

Please be aware that if the application is to be determined by the Council's Development Control committee and your letter has been received at a late stage after the Agenda has been published you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the Council's website or telephone the Council for further information. Please be advised that any comments you make that are not included within the Committee Agenda will be reported to the Members of the Development Control committee. Please also be aware that only a small number of all planning applications received go the Development Control Committee. Most are determined under delegated powers by Officers in which case your comments will again be considered before the application is determined.

Please be aware that Planning Services operate an 'open file' policy and will publish details of your comments on the internet on the Arun District Council Planning section. Please ensure that you only provide information that you are happy will be made available in this way. If you supply information belonging to a third party, please ensure you have their permission to do so. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the 'open file' please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed although this means that its contents will then be disregarded.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

Yours faithfully

Karl Roberts
Director Planning & Economic Regeneration