

From: Anita Gardner
Sent: 10 December 2018 09:56
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Renaissance development, Arundel

Please treat as a rep

Anita Gardner | Principal Planner, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37529 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737529 | E-mail: anita.gardner@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 October 2018 19:36
To: Anita Gardner
Cc: Karl Roberts
Subject: Renaissance development, Arundel

Dear Anita,

Re: 14 Fitzalan Road, Arundel.

As you may be aware I am ward member for Arundel and I write in my capacity as their representative.

I have been following both the previous application and the recent application with interests and in particular note that there are over 200 objections online, objections from the church of st Nicholas, the Chamber of Commerce, the Surgery, the Town Council and of course the AhA! campaign group which seems quite legitimately to have over 2000 supporters. I can say with some confidence that I have not encountered anyone who is in favour of any part of this inappropriate application and it is, of course, my job to represent the constituents.

I have recently met with the AHA! campaign group and from what I understand from them and from the others, the great concern at present is fourfold:

first, there seems to be reasonable doubt that the application does not conform with the Local and National Validation Requirements (I understand you have been sent the list of 7 breaches dated 4th Oct breaches);

secondly, there seems to be reasonable doubt that the application drawings are inaccurate (I understand you have been sent the list of 67 errors dated 9th Sept 2018);

Thirdly, there seems to be reasonable doubt that the forms and reports accompanying the application contain material errors. (I understand that the AHA! campaign group have alerted you to some of these including the fact that: the Arboricultural Impact Assessment only applies to the site of Greenhurst not the whole development site; it does not include analysis of trees under TPO's on land adjacent to the site; and, for example, the rights of light report does not include a crucial window in the closest property. Additionally, I understand you have been sent one example of the errors in the forms accompanying the application. The 4 page Application Form apparently contains some 12 errors or omissions).

Fourthly, There seems to be reasonable doubt that the statutory consultees still require further information from the applicants and such information has not been forthcoming. For example, I understand County Highways are yet to understand the visibility splays and the turning areas and have requested more information. Additionally, I understand Southern Water have requested a hydraulic capacity study and I understand this has not been forthcoming. I should point out that these are not NIMBY issues arising due to the proposed development: local people have been suffering flooding by sewerage in their homes and gardens in Fitzalan Rd for years and locals have been asking for a 20MPH speed restriction in Fitzalan rd for years as well due to the 90 degree blind corner just next to the development site.

Based on all of the above, and if the above is correct (at least in part), I am unsure whether this application should indeed be put before the committee in November. It seems to me that all of the above points need to be properly scrutinised by the Councils in house lawyer and the developers should be invited to correct their plans and reports accordingly before you can write your report and before the case goes before committee. If you disagree, and allow this application to go before the committee, I imagine there is a real danger that the committee vote on an application that has not and cannot be correctly scrutinised? Would you or Karl please write to me formally and clarify your position in this regard so I can report the matter to my constituents.

If you are minded to allow the application to proceed to committee in spite of the reasonable doubt over its accuracy, I have been asked to say that the AHA! campaign group will regrettably have no option other than to scrutinise each of the reports as well. These run into hundreds of pages and I understand they are full of errors and omission. The AHA! campaign group is anxious not to waste public money by sending in hundreds of pages of submission in circumstances where you will be adjourning the application in any event and requesting the application is corrected. Please can either you or Karl advise me in this regard so I can update my constituents?

I should say that if the matter goes before the committee next month (which I hope it will not for the reasons stated above), I plan to make a speech alerting the committee to the reasonable doubts listed above and to request that they adjourn the application until such time as all of the omission and errors and reasonable queries are satisfied. If the committee do not agree and proceed to approving the application, I am advised that the committee and the council could be exposed to the costs of handling a judicial review. This is surely something that all parties would wish to avoid. Perhaps you can advise me on your stance in respect of dealing with a review?

Kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

Paul Dendle.

District Councillor for Arundel and Walberton"



2 Old Slipway, River Road, Arundel

BN189EY

