

Chichester District Council  
Development Control  
East Pallant House  
East Pallant  
Chichester  
West Sussex  
PO19 1TY

**Our ref:** HA/2016/118238/01-L01  
**Your ref:** E/16/01465/FULEIA  
**Date:** 01 June 2016

Dear Sir/Madam

**TOE END BEACH STABILIZATION SCHEME EXTENDING THE EXISTING ROCK ARMOUR BY 170M ALONG THE TOE END FRONTAGE, INSTALLATION OF A 180M LONG TIMBER SPLASH WALL TO THE REAR OF THE ROCK ARMOUR, REPLACEMENT OF TWO DILAPIDATED GROYNES WITH NEW TIMBER GROYNES (35M LONG) ON THE SAME LOCATION AND AND SHINGLE REPLENISHMENT TO REPLACE ERODED BEACH MATERIAL.**

**BREAKWATER NORTH WEST OF WEST SANDS CARAVAN PARK, MILL LANE, SELSEY, WEST SUSSEX**

Thank you for your consultation on this proposal. Please quote our reference number in any correspondence.

#### **Environment Agency Position**

The Environment Agency has been in discussion with the applicant prior to the submission of this application.

#### **Flood Risk**

On the basis the proposed works will be within 15metres from the landward toe of an Environment Agency maintained sea defence, and watercourse (Broad Rife) the works will require an Environment Permit (EPR) which has recently replaced the previous Flood Defence consents.

It is noted that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been included and it is recommended that the safety procedures identified during the construction phase are implemented.

Environment Agency  
Guildbourne House Chatsworth Road, Worthing, West Sussex. BN11 1LD.  
Customer services line: 03708 506 506  
[www.gov.uk/environment-agency](http://www.gov.uk/environment-agency)  
Cont/d..

We wish to note that although the works will result in significant flood protection improvements, it is not a guarantee that any future development would be acceptable at this location or beyond.

### **Biodiversity**

There are no objections to this proposal from a Biodiversity perspective, providing the recommendations of the Environmental Statement dated April 2016 are followed. This relates in particular to the requirement to re-survey for the establishment of vegetated shingle prior to works commencing so that any of these areas can be avoided by construction traffic.

### **Water Quality**

Having viewed the application details and supporting documents, we are satisfied that the risk to water quality and WFD compliance is low. As such we have no objection to the proposed works.

We would expect that all works are undertaken following current best practice and with minimum impact on water quality. We would advise the applicant to adhere to the Environment Agency's Pollution Prevention Guidance (PPG) 5 for works in or near watercourses. In the event of a pollution incident, all works should cease immediately and the Environment Agency should be contacted via the incident hotline 0800 807060.

The proposed works are located within the Isle of Wight East Coastal WFD water body. We have assessed this proposal against the "no deterioration" requirements of the WFD, which included an assessment of the works' potential for impacts on the status of WFD quality elements, specific pollutants, priority substances and protected areas (e.g. Bathing Waters). Our conclusion is that the works are unlikely to have a significant impact on the current status of the water body.

Yours faithfully

**Mrs Sophie Brown**  
**Sustainable Places Planning Advisor**

Direct dial 02030 257250  
Direct e-mail [planningSSD@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:planningSSD@environment-agency.gov.uk)

**Louise Chater**

---

**From:** Keith Martin [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 June 2016 09:37  
**To:** 'Mick Broomhead'  
**Cc:** 'Louise Chater'; c.charter@earnleypc.org; s.simpson@earnleypc.org; 'Robert Carey'  
**Subject:** RE: A little moan and a couple of questions  
**Attachments:** EARNLEY PARISH PLAN 2016-2021.docx; 15\_00368\_FUL-DECISION-2109930.pdf

Dear Mr Broomhead,

Thank you for your email (copy attached below) which I have read with interest. Much of the comments you raise relate to planning considerations. I have therefore copied our parish clerk, the chairman of the planning committee and the other members of the parish council. By way of this email I will ask that your email is added to the agenda for the next planning committee meeting to be held on 23<sup>rd</sup> June. This will give all the parish councillors the opportunity to properly consider the points you raise.

In the meantime I am attaching a copy of the recently issued Earnley Parish Plan 2016-2020 which, following a wide consultation with Earnley residents, sets out the key objects for Earnley Parish Council over the next 5 years. From this you will see it includes some of the issues you raise about inappropriate development and traffic issues. I hope you find this of interest.

You also raise the specific issue of a mobile home in the grounds of Earnley Concourse. Earnley Parish Council have already raised this with CDC Planning Enforcement following a report from a resident several weeks ago. We are currently awaiting a response from CDC Planning Enforcement.

You also raise points about Medmerry Park. I am attaching a copy of the planning permission notice in relation to application 15/00368/FUL. This application did in fact grant an extension for holiday use of Medmerry Park from 1<sup>st</sup> March in any one year to the 6<sup>th</sup> January the following year. A number of conditions were attached by CDC Planning in granting this permission. I would draw your attention to condition 3), which specifies that the chalets are for holiday use only and condition 4), which states that the park shall be closed between 17:00 and 8:00 each day from 6<sup>th</sup> January to 1<sup>st</sup> March each year, with no overnight stays permitted during this closed period.

I hope the above helps to clarify the position on planning matters at Medmerry Park.

Thank you again for your interest in the work of Earnley Parish Council.

Best regards,

Keith Martin  
 Chairman EPC

---

**From:** Mick Broomhead [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 14 June 2016 14:56  
**To:** k.martin@earnleypc.org  
**Subject:** A little moan and a couple of questions

Dear Mr Martin

I do not often put pen to paper (an old expression these days) but feel the time has come to make a comment.

I am appalled at the number of housing developments that have taken place and are being applied for in our area. Not only large developments but individual small applications on spare land that local residents own. I note that more and more applications coming from old, redundant, or nurseries that are no longer



viable who's owners seem to be jumping on the band wagon of development. I noticed a case that an application has been made for a mobile home to house farm workers out of season i.e. December to January. May I beg the question where are they housed for the rest of the year, why not at that location for the 2 months mentioned. A further concern on this point is if granted who would monitor that they are not living there the other 10 months of year, and again if granted not leave the door open to further mobile homes being allowed on this site or else where.

On the point of mobile homes I would like to know why at Earnley Concourse a mobile home has been parked on site and is being used please correct me if I am wrong but I cannot find a planning application for this. It also begs the question how many more of these mobile homes are on farm or nursery land. I return to the amount of development, there are serious overloading of the doctors surgery and schools. The road system is becoming a major concern. One now has problems at a large amount of times trying to enter Bracklesham Lane, the roundabout at Birdham, approach to Siddlesham roundabout, gaining access to A27 and of course the A27 its self. It becomes intolerable at holiday times and summer weekends. Surely the council like its residents must think that a road system HAS to improve before these developments are granted planning permission.

Also on this point more and more traffic is using the lanes through Almodington from the Selsey Road to Clappers Lane as a rat run, this includes large vans and lorries. Most of these have total disregard for the speed limit and I personally have had a number of near misses. The use of the lanes by horse riders leaves them very vulnerable to these inconsiderate drivers and could result in a serious accident. Again I have witnessed a couple of near misses. Never any Police presence in the form of speed cameras. As for Police presence in this area I find leaves a lot to be desired, especially now with the threat of illegal immigrants trying to enter Chichester Marina. In addition an acquaintance reported to 101 that either squatters or illegals could be using the old house on the left as you exit Clappers Lane into Bookers Lane, grounds all over grown, the smell of cannabis and bicycles at side of house. Appears no response.

I have been coming to Bracklesham and Wittering since the age of 3 for holidays and day trips I am now 68. My Uncle had a caravan at what was called The Red Skin Caravan Park where I stayed with my parents as a child. When I retired from the London Fire Brigade 20 years ago my first thought was to move here which I did because of the village, country, and coastal tranquillity. Of course I realise that the population has risen and the roads have more vehicles but this area is now being swamped. The village environment has disappeared. We have the Pub at East Wittering village, I now use the term loosely, falling into disrepair, after yet another super market gets its planning permission, a monstrosity I might add, decides not to continue.

May be I have the next points completely wrong but will stand corrected by yourself if so. Will keep brief. 1/ I understand that Medmerry Chalet Park wanted to extend their season, refused on basis flooding, permanent residents, Medmerry Nature reserve. The way the English climate has changed flooding could occur at any time of year, not just winter months, had more weather warnings for flooding this year at this time of year than I can remember. If it did become a residential site council would receive 12 months council tax and not 10, in addition could stop 308 units being built in or around the area. As for nature reserve being disturbed during winter months walkers, bikers and horse riding continues closer to the wild life than the Chalet Park. Also when the village is devoid of holiday makers the local shops would benefit. I cant see the logic when Caravan Parks have 12 month licence and the occupants dont pay ANY council tax.

2/ Is there not a law that prevents a caravan park owner from selling a unit on a 12 month licence reviewed each calendar year, then the following year states that they can only have use of the unit for 6 months of the year, still charging the 12 month fee. The owner of the unit is then in a position of having to accept the contract or sell the unit back to the owner of the site at a greatly reduced figure to the original purchase price.

Sorry to go on a bit but had to get points off of chest.

Yours

Mr Mick Broomhead

email.... 