

Michael Eastham
Planning Policy & Conservation
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

Date: 25 January 2018

Our ref: 14677/SSL/SW/15983452v1

Your ref: AL/118/18/OUT

Dear Mr Eastham,

Representations in relation to application for outline planning permission for up to 55 dwellings at East of Orchard Gardens Woodgate (ref. AL/129/18/OUT)

On behalf of The Church Commissioners for England, CEG and Hanbury Properties who own the majority of land in the Barnham Eastergate Westergate (BEW) strategic allocation, we write to object to the above planning application.

As the application site partially lies within the strategic allocation at BEW¹, we are disappointed that neither the landowner or its agent has contacted our clients prior to submission of this planning application to inform us of its intentions or to share its illustrative masterplan. This is particularly against the backdrop of Local Plan Policy H SP2, which requires strategic site allocations to be comprehensively planned. We are also surprised that there has been no pre-application engagement with either the Council or the local community.

We note that this application is a resubmission of an outline planning application with some reserved matters for 57 units with public space and affordable housing (ref. AL/111/16/OUT). This was refused on 29 November 2017 because it was considered to harm the 'Biodiversity Corridor', provide insufficient infrastructure to meet the needs of its occupiers and undermine the delivery of a comprehensively planned settlement at BEW. It is not clear from the applicant's submission how the Council's previous reasons for refusal have been addressed.

In particular, we would like to bring the following matters to the Council's attention:

- 1 Local Plan Policy H SP2 requires strategic site allocations to be comprehensively planned. It is important that every opportunity is taken to ensure that developments within the BEW site successfully integrate with each other, as required by Policy H SP2c SD5. As such, applications within the BEW site should come forward in the context of an updated BEW masterplan.
- 2 Although only shown indicatively, the proposed internal road layout is not suitable for connection to the wider BEW site and appears to create an undesirable cul-de-sac arrangement.

¹ Local Plan (2018) Policy H SP2c SD5

For this site specifically, connectivity with the proposed CALA site (ref. AL/15/17/PL) is important because it forms part of the wider BEW allocation and adjoins the site to the north and east. As a minimum, provision should be made for the internal roads to connect to the CALA site and to facilitate this, internal roads should continue to the site boundaries.

The proposed Site Layout (Site Plan 108/01 Rev D) does not successfully tie into the pedestrian and cycle connections in the wider area. It is important that these matters are considered prior to determination to ensure that the proposed development does not miss an opportunity to integrate with the wider BEW site at the appropriate time.

Furthermore, by coming forward in isolation of the wider BEW site it is divorced from local services and public transport connections.

- 3 Whilst the applicant has included proposed heads of terms within its Planning Statement, these fail to adequately reflect the wider BEW infrastructure requirements as detailed in Local Plan Policy H SP2c SD5. The BEW Consortium expects all developers within the site allocation to contribute proportionately to infrastructure costs associated with the BEW site, including contributions to education provision and highway improvements, namely the delivery of the realigned A29.

We would be grateful if the Council would consider the above matters when determining this application.

Yours sincerely



Stephanie Walker
Senior Planner

Copy: Claire Potts