

Barry Dickinson
58 Harbour Road
Pagham
Bognor Regis
West Sussex
PO21 4TD

Your Ref: OWPC7796
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 7th 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.

Arun District Council Planning Application Ref: P/97/15/PL

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. My support is based on the following positive outcomes:

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.

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.

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 more quickly and receive effective long term protection.

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!

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 and barriers, there has been a decline in the attractiveness of Pagham Beach for residents, businesses, activity groups and visitors. It has become increasingly difficult to launch and recover boats from the yacht club and cutting the spit offers the best available option to reverse this, preserving the beach as a water sport venue. Disabled people and those with limited mobility are currently unable to enjoy the beach. This needs to be reversed.

Cost and local economy - The cost to people's quality of lives, property and businesses has been significant. 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 commend the proposals and respectfully request Arun District Council and Chichester District Council to do the same.

Please Cut the spit without delay!

Thank you for taking into account my representations.

Yours faithfully

Barry Dickinson

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