

# Pagham Parish Council

Minutes of the **Planning Committee** Meeting held on Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> February 2017 at 7.30pm in the Small Hall at Pagham Village Hall

---

Present: Cllrs Mr Hailey, Mrs D Hall, Mr P Higson and Mr R Radmall (Chairman)

In attendance: Nicola Jones [Clerk/RFO]  
1 member of the press  
Cllr Mr Atkins

---

**P16/194 Receive apologies for absence**

Cllrs Mr Huntley and Mr Cole gave their apologies. Cllr Mrs Hall arrived at 7.40pm

**P16/195 To receive declarations of interest by Councillors on any of the agenda items below.**

P16/195.1 Cllr Mrs Hall in her capacity as Vice Chairman of the Arun District Council Development Control Committee gave the following declaration "I will be voting on the matter before me, having regard only to such information as placed before the Parish Council. If I come to consider the matter again at the District Council further information will be available and I will consider all the information available at that time and I may come to a different decision".

**P16/196 Public Session Questions and comments from Members of the Public Present**

P16/196.1 There were 24 members of the public present. The Chairman invited the members of the public to make comments on matters on the agenda. All comments were in relation to agenda item 7.1.

P16/196.2 A comment was made with regard to the quality of the material available on the Arun District Council website. In particular, the larger maps and colour material was being reproduced with indistinguishable grey shades.

P16/196.3 A gentleman asked whether the Council had investigated claims that there was a covenant attaching to the proposed development site which prevented building on land south of the Village Hall. Cllr Radmall agreed to investigate.

P16/196.4 A report from a member of the Pagham and Aldwick Greenfields Action Movement stated there had been 868 letters sent to ADC regarding the application.

P16/196.5 It was noted and welcomed that North Mundham Parish Council had objected to the three applications proposed for Pagham

**P16/197 To receive and approve the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held 31st January 2017 (previously issued)**

P16/197.1 It was RESOLVED to APPROVE the Minutes, and the Chairman was authorised to sign them as an accurate record of that meeting.

**P16/198 Matters arising from the previous Minutes (this is for information sharing purposes only)**

**P/134/16/OUT - Land North of Sefter Road & 80 Rose Green Road Pagham. Outline application with some matters reserved for development of up to 250 dwellings (incl affordable homes), provision of land for a replacement scout hut, land for an Ambulance Community Response Post facility & land for 1FE primary school. Primary vehicular access from Sefter Rd & demolition of 80 Rose Green Road & creation of pedestrian & emergency only access. Provision of public open space including children's play areas, landscaping, drainage & earthworks - Departure from the Development Plan. This application also falls within the parish of Aldwick.**

It was noted that the results of the Parish Council's traffic consultant report were not yet available, and an ecological report had not yet been fully assessed. In light of this, it was RESOLVED that further work was required on the response for this application and this item would be deferred to a future meeting.

## **P16/199 Planning Applications**

To consider responses to Planning Applications which have been submitted to Arun District Council and to delegate to the Parish Clerk to respond to each application in accordance with the Parish Council's resolution;

**NJ**

- P16/199.1 **P/140/16/OUT - Outline application for access only - mixed use development comprising of up to 400 dwellings, a care home with up to 70 beds, a Local Centre comprising up to 2000sqm of A1/A2/A3/D1/sui generis floorspace, provision of land for a 1FE primary school (with sufficient space to ensure that it is expandable to 2FE), provision of land for a scout hut, safeguarding of land to help link the site to the Pagham Harbour Cycle Route & other community uses including public open space & allotments with some matters reserved. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan – Land South of Summer Lane and West of Pagham Road, Pagham**
- P16/199.1.1 The Chairman explained that the Parish Council had been scrutinising the documents presented by the developer in respect of this application individually and the cumulative impact when considered alongside P/134/16/OUT and P/6/17/OUT. He explained that a traffic consultant had been employed by the Parish Council to assess the likely impact of the development, which the traffic consultant felt would be significant and were unlikely to be mitigated successfully due to cost and physical characteristics of the land adjacent to the Pagham Road and beyond. Regarding the ecological studies undertaken on the site, he did not feel these dealt with the cumulative effect of so many properties being developed so near the nature reserve, and confirmed the Council would be escalating matters with Natural England and urging them to consider the cumulative effect of all the proposed developments in and around Pagham. He did not feel that monetary contributions would necessarily be sufficient to mitigate the impacts an additional 1200 homes might bring. He was concerned that the pre-application advice from ADC appeared to suggest the site was suitable for 600 homes rather than the 400 proposed in this application.
- P16/199.1.2 Cllr Mr Hailey had been looking at the situation regarding surface water and flooding issues on the site. He commented that there had been no measurement of groundwater presented by the developer. This should be undertaken during a wet winter to establish conditions. Water courses running across the site had been dismissed as not at risk of flooding but there was no evidence to back up this claim. More assessment was required. He turned his attention to foul water issues. The Parish Council had contacted Southern Water regarding the number of times untreated waste had been discharged into Pagham Rife (and consequently the harbour) since 2011. It was advised there had been 55 occasions. These were notifiable events to the Environment Agency. Cllr Mr Hailey disputed the developer's assertion that there would be no problems arising from the disposal of foul water, and did not feel the matter had been fully considered. The Council had also investigated water pressure issues with Portsmouth Water, who had commented that it was able to supply at its statutory pressure levels for all three developments.
- P16/199.1.3 Cllr Mr Higson had been looking at traffic generation issues arising from this and the other two developments. He was awaiting further information from the traffic consultant before making further comments. He had also been looking at the statements made by the developer regarding community involvement. These were at odds with the research done as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process. The developer had received 80 responses to their exhibition and material. The Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire had generated over 600 responses. 90% of residents had said 400 new homes over 15 years would be an unacceptably high level. One third felt any figure over 100 would be too many. The site which was the subject of this application had been the most objected to site of all those proposed during the Neighbourhood Plan process. The design proposals did not include 2/3 bed bungalows which were the preferred style of property and a local estate agent's anecdotal evidence had suggested that modern 4 bed property plots were smaller and therefore less attractive than plots for older 4 bed properties, meaning they were more difficult to sell. In conclusion, the community involvement documents did not accord with the research the parish had undertaken. In relation to cycle routes, it was noted that there had been an indication that the developer would be prepared to provide land for this, but there was no mention in the documents presented that this would be the case.
- P16/199.1.4 Cllr Mr Radmall mentioned that two local businesses had expressed concerns over traffic generated by the three proposed developments. One also had reservations regarding the capacity of the foul water treatment facility as their pumping station could be switched off remotely by Southern Water in the event of capacity issues. There were also concerns about the attractiveness of Pagham as a tourist destination should development on the proposed scale be permitted.
- P16/199.1.5 Cllr Mr Atkins was asked to explain his findings on the issue of the loss of agricultural land through the proposals. He believed the classification of the land as grade 2 was out of date and did not take account of local growing conditions. Some fields were grade 1, including the ones proposed for development under this application. Given global developments in food production and political changes in the UK, it was important that Grade 1 agricultural

**P16/200** To note any decisions confirmed by Arun DC  
P16/200.1 None

**NJ**

**P16/201** Enforcement & ADC Planning Committee  
P16/201.1 None.

**P16/202** Major Local Development/Local & Neighbourhood Plans.  
P16/202.1 None

**P16/203** To note the date of the next Planning Meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2017.

The meeting closed at 9pm

Signed \_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

Date \_\_\_\_\_