

Susan Haley

From: Williams, Suzanna (Capita Public Service) <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 November 2024 13:32
To: Planning.Responses
Cc: David Easton
Subject: FW: AL/89/24/OUT -Land at Woodgate Nurseries
Attachments: P3816 Land at Woodgate Nurseries EclA V3 ISSUED ISSUED[27].pdf; P3816 Land at Woodgate Nurseries. EclA Appendix 6 Badger V2[76].pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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.

Afternoon,

I just want to ensure that the attached ecology information is processed and reconsulted on, as it hasn't appeared online as yet (with the exception of appendix 6 Badger information being sensitive).

Many thanks

Suzanna

From: Williams, Suzanna (Capita Public Service)
Sent: 08 November 2024 13:50
To: planning.responses@arun.gov.uk
Cc: David Easton <David.Easton@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: AL/89/24/OUT -Land at Woodgate Nurseries

Afternoon,

Another email concerning the updated ecology information. I cannot see this online so don't believe it's been consulted on and uploaded to the file. Please note that within the EclA - Appendix 6 - badger findings (second attachment) the agent has requested that this remain confidential as it contains sensitive information.

Kind Regards

Suzanna Williams
Principal Planning Consultant



Capita Business Services Ltd | Registered in England and Wales | Registration no. 2299747
Registered office 65 Gresham St | London | EC2V 7NQ | www.capita.com

From: Nigel Jarvis [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 October 2024 15:05
To: Leanne Richardson <Leanne.Richardson@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: James Fox [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: AL/89/24/OUT Land at Woodgate Nurseries - EHO/Noise

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 Leanne,

Thanks for your email of Weds.

Ecology

I attach the updated ecology information comprising an updated EcIA and the ***confidential*** "Appendix 6 - badger findings" – the latter should not be uploaded to your portal as it is sensitive information. As discussed your Ecology Officer's response wasn't quite accurate in its list of surveys that were not up to date but wherever necessary further surveys carried out this year have now been included. With the benefit of further surveys, the assessment is fully up to date and there is no change to the conclusions reached previously.

It is also perhaps important to clarify the ecology officer's reply on the Singleton and Cocking Tunnels SAC – the site is certainly not within the SAC (as said) but is 12km from it so at the fringes of its screening thresholds. We trust you have all the information you need should an Appropriate Assessment be required in this instance.

Highways

In respect of highways – we have already responded on the majority of WSCC's points but following the 19th September WSCC reply we were asked to have regard to the effect of newer BEW transport modelling (which supports present undetermined applications). This is/was not available on the Council's website and we did not receive a copy of the (highly detailed VISSIM model) from WSCC until sometime after their response. Just to be clear, this is new information, so despite agreement on scoping with them at pre-application stage this is now new work. Given the BEW applications are not commitments and policies do not protect them from other development it is an unusual request but – nonetheless – we are working on this in good faith. I am happy to provide an update on this next week.

Other consultees

In summary on other topics:

Noise: You confirmed you are reconsulting your EHO on our already submitted revised noise assessment. As it has been prepared in consultation with the officer I think it is fair to expect we have resolved their concerns (and holding objection).

Drainage: WSCC (as LLFA) confirmed Wednesday they have now been reconsulted on information we sent on the 13th September. They advise they will begin looking at it next week and we await their comments. Our comprehensive reply mirrors our recent experience with AL/129/21/OUT and AL/70/23/OUT so we expect to have resolved all points but have again offered to meet if not.

Landscape & Trees: You don't mention but I note that there are now quite belated replies from 'Leisure & Greenspace' and 'Tree' officers that have now appeared on the web portal. These are dated from just over a week ago. These will need a review, in fairness, but both make clear they do not object to the proposals while raising minor points. My initial thoughts on those are;

1. On NEAP 'equivalent' provision the DAS does show that even within the indicative layout (mindful this is an outline proposal) the substantial surfeit of open space can accommodate one. The response is slightly different to that given at pre-application stage however again suggests a less formalised approach to delivery, and this suits the arrangements on the site well.
2. On potential impacts on RPA for the existing group (G19) - this was picked up in the AIA at s1.4 on pp3 showing compliance with BS 5837 via mitigation ('no dig'). We welcome and agree with the officer that minor adjustments at RM stage may avoid encroachment into RPA or the need for mitigation.

Network Rail: Per highways and our discussion. We have commissioned and undertake a further detailed survey of the level-crossing. This is complete and will be included in the highways response.

I think it would be really helpful to have a catchup next week. If you could let me know your availability I'd be grateful (I am engaged in an appeal hearing all of Tuesday, and preparing for a committee Thursday PM but am happy otherwise to work around you?).

If any of the above isn't clear please give me a call and if we don't speak please have a good weekend.

Kind regards,
Nigel

Nigel Jarvis MRTPI 
Director



The information contained in this email may either be privileged and/or confidential.
If you are not the intended recipient please delete this message; using (including disclosure, copying or onward distribution) its content may be unlawful.
Our messages are checked for viruses, but we cannot accept liability for any viruses which may be transmitted in or with this message or attachments.
Please be green and save money at the same time by printing double sided.
Company Registration No. 07548635

From: Leanne Richardson <Leanne.Richardson@arun.gov.uk>
Date: Wednesday, 16 October 2024 at 15:09
To: Nigel Jarvis 
Subject: RE: AL/89/24/OUT Land at Woodgate Nurseries - EHO/Noise

Hi Nigel

Thank you for forwarding the updated Noise Assessment. I have requested that Env. Health be reconsulted.

Could you please confirm that you are still on track to submit the updated ecology surveys and the outstanding highway response by this Friday? Failure to respond by Friday could result in the application being recommended for refusal.

Kind regards

Leanne

Leanne Richardson
Principal Planning Officer Consultant
Strategic Development Team, Planning

T: 07936 036082

E: leanne.richardson@arun.gov.uk

Working Pattern: Mondays and Wednesdays

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 <http://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>



From: Nigel Jarvis [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 October 2024 11:43
To: Leanne Richardson <Leanne.Richardson@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: AL/89/24/OUT Land at Woodgate Nurseries - EHO/Noise

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 Leanne,

Further to and reflecting the dialogue and agreement between 24A and your EHO please now find an updated noise assessment report, which picks up the additional calculations (ref Prince of Wales pub).

You can see the revised assessment from para 5.19 that even in the very worst-case assessment now used (noted to be provided for completeness) the risk of disturbance to future residents is considered low. Para. 6.6 in the conclusions reiterates. We trust this is satisfactory and addresses the points raised.

Of course on a planning basis I would put this in context that the assessment is carried out on an indicative layout, forming part of an outline application, for "up to" 95 dwellings. In other words if there were residual concerns, sensibly, the low risk identified could be resolved at the reserved matters stage.

Kind regards,
Nigel

Nigel Jarvis MRTPI 
Director



The information contained in this email may either be privileged and/or confidential.
If you are not the intended recipient please delete this message; using (including disclosure, copying or onward distribution) its content may be unlawful.
Our messages are checked for viruses, but we cannot accept liability for any viruses which may be transmitted in or with this message or attachments.
Please be green and save money at the same time by printing double sided.
Company Registration No. 07540836

<https://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 is security checked and subject to the disclaimer on web-page:
<https://www.capita.com/email-disclaimer.aspx>