

Stephen Ormrod
19 The Fairway
Aldwick Bay Estate
Bognor Regis
West Sussex
PO214ES

Your Ref: OWPC7702

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 30th December 2015 which has been recorded as '**support**' with the comments as follows:

I support the proposal to cut through the spit at Pagham Harbour: ADC Planning Application Ref: P/97/15/PL.

I have read the reports and supporting documents and request that ADC support the proposal.

I moved to the Pagham area a year ago and, having been associated with Shoreham Beach for many years, was immediately struck by the similarities. I could not understand why the channel at Pagham Harbour has not been maintained as it has existed for hundreds of years: i.e. with the channel in line with the existing harbour entrance and sea wall. This would be an engineered, permanent solution, stabilise and protect Pagham Harbour and allow the beach and SSI at Pagham to recover and be maintained naturally.

When I arrived in the area the tidal flow at the channel outlet was scouring the beach upstream of Groyne 4. At high tide today the end of the spit is pointing between Groyne 4 and Groyne 3. I can see no reason why the spit will not continue to grow eastwards moving the scour past the groynes and sailing club, removing the beach as it goes.

The shingle from the beach forms various banks and deposits at the exit of the harbour channel but eventually ends up as new beach at the end of the spit. You can see this happening in real time especially kayaking around the area.

Unless something changes, eventually the beach at Aldwick and then Bognor will be lost and there will be a new "Chesil Beach" structure on the south coast. Change could be a random, disruptive event such as a massive storm tide - as used to happen at Shoreham before the permanent channel was managed. Or reverting to a short channel at its past location and maintaining this could give a permanent solution.

One reason for moving to this area was the proximity of Pagham Harbour, wildlife and nature reserve. Cutting the spit as proposed will help to secure this amenity as it is today. "Letting nature take its course" will likely cause permanent, albeit unpredictable, change to the Harbour.

If the spit is left to grow there will be an interesting area of virgin shingle forming new land and attracting nesting terns and colonising plants. However, this special area will not grow - just move slowly along the south coast, until potentially destroyed by a storm. This is all

at the expense of the existing beach SSI, which has been rapidly disappearing over the past few years.

I realise that once the spit is cut there will need to be on-going maintenance of the longshore drift of shingle past the Harbour channel. I'm not sure if this would happen naturally or need active maintenance as is necessary at Shoreham and for most of the beaches along the south coast.

Maintenance of the channel would add some cost but this would be very low compared with the existing costs of trying to slow down beach erosion by adding sea defences around the groyne.

As well as financial costs, there is also the loss of the attractiveness of Pagham Beach (to wildlife as well as people) through the continual damage and disruption caused by the repeated, stop-gap work to try and minimise the scouring using heavy plant and machinery, sand bags and foreign rocks. Such temporary fixes have clearly not worked. Pagham Beach is now an embarrassing eyesore.

The cost of cutting the spit will rise (and has risen) by delaying the decision.

The costs associated with loss of homes, amenities and livelihoods if the beach at Pagham is lost are much higher than cutting the spit and on-going maintenance of a new channel.

The proposal must be implemented as soon as possible. It is also vital that all engaged authorities and organisations demonstrate that they can cooperate and deliver a timely solution (councils, planning authorities, the Environment Agency, Natural England, RSPB) to restore faith in what can appear to be politically motivated organisations.

Thank you for taking my comments into account.

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 to 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