

Mr G Richmond
9 Parkfield Av
Rose Green
Bognor Regis
PO21 3BW

Your Ref: OWPC7794
Our Ref: P/97/15/PL 16-09-2015
Please ask for:
Mr S Davis

8th 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 6th January 2016 which has been recorded as '**support**' with the comments as follows:

I write in support of the proposal to undertake a managed breach of the shingle spit at Pagham Harbour.

It is critical that this happens 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. My support is based on the following positive outcomes:

People - local residents and the local community have suffered for several years at the risk of loss of homes and flooding of the village. This cannot go on any longer.

Nature conservation - the opportunity exists to compensate for any harm that might arise by way of creative solutions that could better safeguard the nature conservation interests in the long run and allow the habitat the beach provided to recover.

Health - For some years now the health of numerous residents and businesses has suffered due to delays in key decisions and continual uncertainty about whether a long term solution will ever be found by the authorities.

Recreation - The activities and attractions provided by Pagham Beach have been badly affected by the ongoing 'patch it up' approach to the erosion. There has been a decline in the attractiveness of Pagham Beach for residents, businesses, activity groups and visitors! This needs to be reversed.

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.

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.

Increase flood risk - The loss of beach depth has increased the threat to loss of homes

and increased the flood risk to the wider community by overtopping and potential breaching of this natural seawall that is defending Pagham. Cutting the spit will increase the resilience of the beach naturally by stopping the scour current and allowing the beach to accrete by re-establishing long shore drift.

Other impacts - Without a favourable decision to cut the spit, beautiful and historic Pagham will continue to be blighted and will further decline. A decision in favour of cutting the spit will kick-start a recovery. Notably, today's impacts at Pagham will be tomorrow's at 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, I fully support the proposals and respectfully request Arun District Council and Chichester District Council to do the same.

Cut the spit without delay!

Thank you for taking into account my representations.

Yours faithfully

Mr G Richmond

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