

Meadowsweet
Summer Lane
Pagham
Bognor Regis
West Sussex
PO21 4NG

1st November 2020

Dear Mr Davis

Objection to Planning Application P/97/20/PL

My partner and I are strongly opposed to the new planning application P/97/20/PL for the following reasons:

1. In our ongoing consultations with Drew Smith we have always been told that there would be detached bungalows fronting the new development to the west of our property and in particular the property which will be right next door to our home would be a detached bungalow. In this new application they are looking to change this to 3 bedroom semi-detached house and replace all bungalows fronting the estate with 3 bedroom houses the majority of which are semi-detached. This is not acceptable. Also, we do not see why we should have social housing next to our property, yet in the new application they are encroaching on our property. For the last 25 plus years I have enjoyed an undisturbed view of fields and countryside and you are now expecting us to sit on our balcony and look out on social housing. This is not acceptable. I attach a letter from Drew Smith dated 29 July 2019 confirming that a bungalow would be butting our property. This was further confirmed in a text to us by Justin, Drew Smith's Site Manager on the 3rd September 2020.
2. What is being proposed in cramming more 2/3 bedroom semi-detached houses into the development for social housing and private sale replacing spacious bungalows is not in keeping with what exists in the way of housing in Summer Lane. These extra houses with more bedrooms will and not providing enough extra parking spaces which will only mean cars parking in the unadopted part of Summer Lane. Probably right outside our home and there will be nothing we can do about it because there are no plans to adopt the unadopted part of Summer Lane. None of what is being proposed is in keeping with the housing that already exists in Summer Lane which mostly consists of large detached properties not cramped in semi-detached housing. I thought developments were supposed to be reflective of the area they are built in but obviously not. It seems it is all about the greed of the Developers, Arun's need to fulfil their requirement to build more homes in the District and to provide more social housing with no regard for the poor home owners who are adversely affected by these decisions and whose properties lose significant value overnight.
3. The application proposes to increase the number of dwellings by 15 Properties which will increase the number of vehicles using Summer Lane. Summer Lane is a single access road and to have the traffic from the 90 additional houses already having planning permission is already unacceptable and many residents are questioning how the traffic flow will work but to add the traffic from another 15 properties is irresponsible. Vehicles associated with 105 houses using a single access road is far too many. The risk of congestion is already significant and access problems due to the narrow part of Summer Lane have already been identified and confirmed by Ian Gledhill, Principal Planner-County Highways at West Sussex County Council. Also, the potential for accidents in the Lane especially around the junction to Pagham Road will be very high. Not to mention the

pollution the residents in the adopted part of the road will have to suffer as traffic queues outside their homes at certain times of the day.

4. Southern Water has already stated that they will have problems coping with the Fowl Water from the original 90 Properties so how will they cope with 15 more Properties, this increases the risk of flooding and fowl water escaping.

5. The Water table has been shown to be high in the field where the development is planned to be and with an increase in the number of properties being constructed this will only increase the risk of flooding to the immediate area and especially the Mill Farm properties as they are situated at a lower level..

The whole point of consultation is to come to a joint agreement about proposals, and we thought we had come to an agreement with Drew Smith about what was going to be next to us and yet we find Drew Smith going quietly behind the scenes to change things. This is not right and should not be allowed. Why did they not inform us personally of the proposed changes? We came across the application P/97/20/PL by accident, and as we understand things, we thought you had to post yellow planning applications around the area that they apply too, yet there have been none that I have seen, why is this?

To reiterate, we do not want the Development to increase the number of properties by 15 or for the original plan showing 21 properties to change.

Yours faithfully,

Paula Hilton & Brian Biermann

Drew Smith House, 7-9 Mill Court, The Sawmills,
Durley, Southampton SO32 2EJ
Tel: 01489 861400
E-Mail: info@drewsmith.co.uk
Website: www.drewsmith.co.uk

Paula Hilton
Meadowsweet
Summer Lane
Pagham
West Sussex
PO21 3NQ

Copy

Our Ref: DSH0201/DO/051/HC

29th July 2019

Dear Paula,

RE: Land off Summer Lane Pagham – Planning Ref: P/58/15/OUT

Thank you for meeting with Leanne and myself 7th June 2019 - it was helpful to be able to discuss the various points raised in your letter dated 6th June 2019. Further to this, we respond to each of your points using the same numbering for ease of reference.

1. As we discussed, the extent of public open space (POS) to the south of Summer Lane was determined at Outline Planning stage – prior to our involvement. Unfortunately, due to the constraints of land ownership, we are unable to extend the POS beyond that which was permitted.
2. A 3-bedroom bungalow is currently proposed to the west of your property - set forward aligning with your front garden. In terms of the shrubs and small trees, they will be planted beyond the rear line of your property, so will not interrupt the light and enjoyment of your balcony. The submitted application includes a planting schedule which provides details of the proposed planting for this area.
3. We have raised your concern with our arboriculture consultant who has advised:

'In terms of the willow and your proposals' impact upon it, the tree has a stem diameter of about 800mm. This gives a Root Protection Area (RPA), of 9.6m (12x diameter measured at 1.5m above GL). Plotted on a topographical plan it barely encroaches onto your site. In terms of the frontage, the existing driveway already restricts roots to the south, as will the track to the west. In my opinion, there is nothing to worry about. Willow is one of the toughest species of tree and will more than tolerate the proposals.'

4. We are to undertake the road widening and improvement works in this location. It is anticipated that the road will remain in private ownership (by the Langmead family or their successors in title). The owners will be responsible for retaining the road in good repair and condition and DS is to pay a fair and reasonable sum towards this.
5. Widening of the unadopted part of Summer Lane will be carried out to allow for two-way traffic. While there are no plans for the road to become adopted, it will be constructed to an adoptable standard, both to facilitate two-way traffic and to accommodate refuse & emergency vehicles.

P-TO