

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 14 January 2022 10:39
To: 'Kerry Simmons' [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: AL/126/21/PL Ryefields Farmhouse

Dear Kerry,

Mark's comments were received late yesterday (see attached) but I have included them in the report. In any case, they support my previous observations. See my comments in red below.

Simon

From: Kerry Simmons [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 January 2022 06:35
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: AL/126/21/PL Ryefields Farmhouse

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Hi Simon,

I understand that you hope to be in receipt of Marks comments later today. Please can I request to see a copy of the consultation comments before the application is determined? Happy to agree the extension of time until later next week. Noted. However, I now have to agree all extension of times with the Group Head of Planning and given that this has already past its expiry and the fact that parts of the scheme were the same as the previous refusal, I do not believe there is an exceptional case such that they would agree to a further EoT. I will be putting this decision through to my Team Leader for refusal today at 12 midday and so if you are considering withdrawal, please do so before then.

In addition I just have a couple of final comments for your consideration:

Drainage: the Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) would provide a preliminary review of the potential options for drainage design, and the physical changes that the proposed drainage measures may create. In this case Paul Cann has specifically requested a drainage design, and applicants have duly provided him with what he has requested. Paul Cann has been provided with Microdrainage calculations to prove the potential runoff rates and the principle of the drainage strategy has been accepted with recommended conditions, on that basis we can't see that a DIA is necessary. This is included as it was on the previous refusal (AL/81/21/PL), is required by policy due to location in the Lidsey catchment area and had not been provided with this application.

Location and connection to BEW: Please can I ask you to refer to Point 13 of the attached appeal decision letter where the Inspector states *"Thus, within this context, and taking into account the peripheral location of the site*

within the BEW strategic allocation area, its relative small-scale and proximity to existing residential development, the proposal would not impede any future highway, lead to a further physical coalescence of the aforementioned villages, or affect the ability to deliver green infrastructure in the form of the proposed linear park. Moreover, the proposal would not block any existing pedestrian or vehicular routes or impede the proposed buffer zone and screening planting alongside the railway line. Taking into account the size of the site, which is around 0.33 hectares, and its location some distance from the more central parts of the strategic allocation, in my judgement, the development would neither offer any realistic possibility of accommodating, nor compromising, the delivery of the other infrastructure required by Policy H SP2c of the LP, such as a new local centre, schools and potential employment development". Do you agree that this is a material consideration in this case and that the provision of the footpath will provide a safe pedestrian connection to the existing footpath network which would encourage residents to walk/cycle. Noted but my predecessor James Cross who was dealing with BEW as a whole was well aware of the appeal decision when he refused AL/81/21/PL and we have not been provided with anything new to warrant me taking a different view to James.

Ecological enhancement: The applicant has no objection to replacement planting on a 2:1 ratio to demonstrate BNG, it is our understanding that this could be dealt with a part of the landscaping strategy plan which could be controlled by condition in the usual way. I accept that this would normally be dealt with through a landscaping condition but I am not convinced that there is space within the site to plant 42 trees. Planting in private rear gardens would likely lead to future pressure to prune or fell and thus diminish the BNG. A better solution would be to minimise the amount of tree loss and to provide 'communal' areas within the layout where new planting can occur and where there is space available for trees to grow.

I hope the above is helpful and I look forward to receiving a copy of Mark Warwick's consultation response in due course.

Thank you for your time.

Kind regards,

Kerry

Kerry Simmons MA MRTPI

Partner



**SMITH
SIMMONS
& PARTNERS**

32 North Street, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 1LX [REDACTED]

www.ss-p.co.uk

The information in this e-mail is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee and access to this e-mail by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful.

From: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>

Sent: 11 January 2022 16:34

To: Kerry Simmons [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: AL/126/21/PL Ryefields Farmhouse

Hi Kerry,

Thanks. I have just spoken with Mark and he will comment to me before the end of the week.

Simon J Davis MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer
Directorate of Place

T: 01903 737874
E: simon.davis@arun.gov.uk



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>

Arun is a CIL Charging Authority, for more information go to www.arun.gov.uk/cil
Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: Kerry Simmons [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 January 2022 16:12
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: AL/126/21/PL Ryefields Farmhouse

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Hi Simon,

Thank you for your time on the phone earlier today. I appreciate as discussed the opportunity to set out the issues relating to the trees on the site. For clarification, under the previously refused application we submitted a revised site layout plan in response to the Tree Officer's concerns. The complication arises that James Cross did not process the substitute plans/drawing and as such the Tree Officer was not re-consulted on them. Following the Refusal we took the view to resubmit the planning application with the benefit of the amended site layout to ensure the Tree Officer had the opportunity to comment on the design response to the tree issues. We would therefore be grateful if you could follow up the consultation with Mark Warwick to fully inform the current position and potential reasons for refusal.

For ease of reference I have attached the original and amended site plans along with the respective tree reports

I trust this is clear but should you have any queries or require any information please let me know.

Thanks,
Kerry

Kerry Simmons MA MRTPI
Partner



32 North Street, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 1LX [REDACTED]
www.ss-p.co.uk

The information in this e-mail is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee and access to this e-mail by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful.