

[REDACTED]

From: Michael Eastham
Sent: 07 December 2018 16:00
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: AL/20/18/OUT - Land at Bridge Cottage and The Old Cottage, Lidsey Road, Lidsey

Please upload onto Ocella the email response below from the Local Highway Authority to the revised layout plans for AL/20/18/OUT.

Thanks,

Michael

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 December 2018 14:23
To: Michael Eastham
Cc: SU Local Development; Steven Shaw
Subject: RE: AL/20/18/OUT - Land at Bridge Cottage and The Old Cottage, Lidsey Road, Lidsey

Dear Michael,

Thank you for your email of 4th December 2018 found below.

Please see my replies alongside the text of your email (in *red italic* text below):

One further point to make is that the figure of £7,196 set-out in the CHA response of 15th November 2018 should read £7,130.

Dear Tim,

I have received the following email and attachments from the applicant regarding AL/20/18/OUT. (*Response to highways junction plan*) – Drawing 1749-06 (overlaid with details from Reeves Transport Planning drawing OCL/SR/701 Rev. 'D') shows a revised road alignment and wider lane widths for the A29 where it passes the site. This plan does now show a clearer interpretation of the site access visibility splays which now appear to be achievable in-line with guidance based on the recorded traffic speeds. However, the Stopping Sight Distance(SSD)/forward visibility splays are still not shown properly and as such, it is not clear whether they can be achieved. Part of this is how the applicants/their agents have shown the positioning of the vehicle on the drawing waiting to turn into the site. However, it is also how the applicant/their consultants have plotted the splays (i.e. they appear to be shown taken from vehicle-to-vehicle and not driver-to-vehicle and/or driver-to-driver – the latter being the case for eastbound vehicles coming-across a vehicle turning right into the site). In the case of the eastbound driver - while he or she could possibly see the other vehicle turning-in, the driver of the turning vehicle is unlikely to be able to see the approaching vehicle based on what's shown on the drawing. For drivers travelling north towards the site entrance coming-across a vehicle waiting to turn right into the site, again the SSD is taken from vehicle-to-vehicle, whereas it should be shown taken from the approaching drivers eye-view to the back of the turning car. The correct SSD

distances need to be plotted in both directions too. Therefore, it is not demonstrated that SSDs are achieved in both directions.

With regards to swept-path diagrams for vehicles using the A29 in proximity to the access, the only HGV tracking drawing provided so far is for a fixed-axle vehicle. Nothing has been provided for large articulated lorries nor buses using the road. Therefore, it is still not demonstrated that the proposed changes to the alignment and lane widths would be acceptable.

Are you satisfied that reasons 2 and 3 for refusal, which are set out in my email at the bottom of this email trail are still relevant and defensible? Based on the information submitted so far, the Highway Authority is still of the view that vehicular access and access by sustainable modes are NOT satisfied for this planning application. Therefore, the Highway Authority still considers the two objections made in its response dated 15th November 2018 are both relevant and defensible.

I look forward to receiving your response.

Kind regards,

Michael

Tim Townsend, MCIHT

Principal Planner, Highways -- Planning Services

West Sussex County Council, Ground Floor Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester PO19 1RH



Web: www.westsussex.gov.uk

From: Michael Eastham [mailto:Michael.Eastham@arun.gov.uk]

Sent: 04 December 2018 08:58

To: Tim Townsend

Cc: SU Local Development; Steven Shaw

Subject: FW: AL/20/18/OUT - Land at Bridge Cottage and The Old Cottage, Lidsey Road, Lidsey

Dear Tim,

I have received the following email and attachments from the applicant regarding AL/20/18/OUT.

Are you satisfied that reasons 2 and 3 for refusal, which are set out in my email at the bottom of this email trail are still relevant and defensible?

I look forward to receiving your response.

Kind regards,

Michael

From: [Redacted]

Sent: 03 December 2018 11:15

To: Michael Eastham

Subject: RE: AL/20/18/OUT - Land at Bridge Cottage and The Old Cottage, Lidsey Road, Lidsey

Dear Michael

Thanks for your email which I have now discussed with the applicant.

In relation to the first reason, the NPPF states that ‘arguments that an application is premature are unlikely to justify a refusal of planning permission’ other than in the following circumstances:

- The development is so substantial, or its cumulative effect would be so significant, that to grant permission would undermine the plan-making process by predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to an emerging plan; and
- The emerging plan is at an advanced stage but is not yet formally part of the development plan for the area.

Neither of these circumstances would apply.

As the site lies in the south-western corner of the masterplan area it can readily be brought forward now without prejudicing the remainder of the allocation. As previously said, the NPPF encourages the sub-division of large sites where this could help to speed up the delivery of homes. This is especially important following the introduction of the Housing Delivery Test which requires housing supply to be monitored on the basis of houses being built rather than planning permissions being granted.

In relation to the permeability point, the indicative layout plan shows how pedestrian and vehicular connections can be made to land to the east and to the existing footpath to the north.

The second reason has been addressed in previous emails and we maintain the existing footway connections will enable those residents that wish to access facilities on foot to be able to do so. Prospective purchasers of the houses will be aware of the accessibility options and such considerations will be factored in to their choices.

In relation to the third reason, the latest comments from the highways authority are based on an Illustrative Site Plan, rather than the detailed access drawings submitted with the application which were previously confirmed to be acceptable. Nevertheless I attach a further plan which shows the latest access information superimposed on to the site layout plan. This also shows a possible arrangement which avoids the now-protected trees and T01 and T02.

The fourth reason can readily be addressed at the reserved matters stage. Landscaping and layout are not matters for consideration as part of the current application, and the development description deliberately refers to ‘up to 27 dwellings’ should constraints require a reduction in the number of houses being provided.

In relation to the fifth reason, it is frustrating that this issue has been raised so late in the process and only after survey season has ended. We did chase up the ecologist’s comments back in April and again in May and in the absence of any response assumed this aspect of the proposals to be acceptable. The submitted ecology report assumes a worst case scenario, that bats are present in the buildings proposed for demolition and sets out mitigation for both bats and reptiles. We do not consider either issue to be show-stopping and the mitigation proposed is commonplace. A Reserved Matters application would not be progressed before Spring 2019 and the requested surveys could be conditioned now and carried out at the RM stage to inform the detailed design.

On the above basis the applicant does wish the application to be considered at next week’s committee meeting. Should you wish to reconsult on the attached plans the applicant would be agreeable to a further extension of time.

Kind regards

Clare Bartlett MRTPI PIEMA

Partner

Please note I will be on leave from 12th December – 2nd January.





[To read a copy of Rural Outlook please use this link](#)

This email is confidential and may contain legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient it may be unlawful for you to read, copy, distribute, disclose, or otherwise make use of the information herein. If you have received this email in error please contact us immediately. Batcheller Monkhouse will accept no liability for the mis-transmission, interference, or interception of any email and you are reminded that Email is not a secure method of communication. Whilst all efforts are made to ensure that inbound and outbound emails are virus free, Batcheller Monkhouse will not accept liability for viruses or computer problems which may occur as a result of this email and/or any attachments thereto.

From: Michael Eastham <Michael.Eastham@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 November 2018 16:08
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: AL/20/18/OUT - Land at Bridge Cottage and The Old Cottage, Lidsey Road, Lidsey

Dear Clare,

I must apologise.

I was convinced that I had sent you an email offering you the chance to withdraw the outline planning application (AL/20/18/OUT) - Land at Bridge Cottage and The Old Cottage, Lidsey Road, Lidsey.

I sent emails to the applicants for "The Boweries" and "Bexstone House" requesting that they withdraw their respective applications. The applications for "The Boweries" and "Bexstone House" have been withdrawn and we have requested that the applicants engage with the Southern Consortium over the submission of a comprehensive application and a detailed masterplan for the development of the Barnham / Eastergate / Westergate (BEW) strategic allocation.

The draft committee report for AL/20/18/OUT includes a recommendation to refuse the outline planning application for the following five reasons:

1. The proposed development is premature in terms of the detailed masterplanning and delivery of the Barnham / Eastergate / Westergate (BEW) strategic allocation (SD5). Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development would contribute to the delivery of a comprehensively planned settlement on the Barnham / Eastergate / Westergate (BEW) strategic allocation (SD5), or provide a high quality development with a sense of place and permeable layout contrary to Policy D DM1, Policy T DM1, Policy H SP2 and Policy H SP2c of the Arun Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development does not provide safe nor convenient infrastructure for non-car access to and from goods, services, local facilities, schools and employment, nor does it encourage or enable an increase in environmentally sustainable means of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport, contrary to Policy H SP2(a) and H SP2(j), Policy T SP1 and Policy T DM1 of the Arun Local Plan, Policy GA1 and Policy GA2 of the Aldingbourne Neighbourhood Plan and Section 9 of the revised NPPF (July 2018), paragraphs 108 (a and b), 109 and 110 (a-c).

3. Adequate information has not been submitted to satisfy the Highway Authority that the proposal is acceptable in terms of road/junction layout carriageway (and lane) width/s and visibility splays (including forward visibility/stopping sight distance splays) and would therefore give rise to increased hazards to highway users contrary to Policy T SP1 of the Arun Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. The proposed development fails to give sufficient regard to the existing trees and hedges of high/moderate quality on the site and very few trees of current and/or long-term value would be retained. The extent of the proposed tree removal at this site is unacceptable in terms of protecting, conserving or enhancing the natural environment and landscapes, and would be contrary to Policy ENV DM4 and Policy H SP2(c) of the Local Plan and Policy EH6 of the Aldingbourne Neighbourhood Plan.
5. The lack of requisite bat and reptile surveys and mitigation strategies submitted with the outline planning application in relation to the impact on protected species and the potential for the proposed development to protect existing habitats where possible and provide enhancements is unacceptable, contrary to Policy ENV DM5 and Policy H SP2 of the Local Plan.

I look forward to receiving your reply.

Kind regards,

Michael

Michael Eastham | Principal Planning Officer, Strategic Development, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor,
Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37772 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737772 | E-mail: Michael.eastham@arun.gov.uk

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



Save the environment - think before you print.

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>

DX 57406 Littlehampton

You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>

DX 57406 Littlehampton

You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please reply to advise us but you should not read it, copy it, show it to anyone else nor make any other use of its content. West Sussex County Council takes steps to ensure emails and attachments are virus-free but you should carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.