



From: Steven Shaw [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 April 2018 11:28
To: Claire Potts
Cc: Stephen Gee
Subject: RE: A/23/15/OUT and A/11/17/OUT

Hi Claire,

This does not answer all of my queries that I originally raised at the end of February (email attached).

Access

In terms of the access, the applicant has responded stating that they have reviewed the arrangements with regards to the committed development for 90 homes and a care home on the adjacent site (application A/169/17/OUT) and confirmed that it was an outline permission with approval with all matters reserved. However, planning application A/169/17/OUT is a committed development and therefore must be taken account of and any application coming forward must demonstrate that it does not preclude a committed development from coming forward; irrespective as to whether it only has outline or full permission.

The applicant for planning applications A/11/17/OUT and A/23/15/OUT needs to demonstrate that a safe and suitable access can be provided to both their site and does not preclude access to the committed development site. At the moment they have not done this and the proposed access arrangements from both sites are conflicting. A revised drawing needs to be submitted that demonstrates how access can be provided to their site and the

adjacent. Drawing number REDW-3167-131 (Highway Access Plan) should be updated to include an overlay of the adjacent site and demonstrate how a safe and appropriate access could be provided to the adjacent site.

Access rights are a private matter and not for consideration at planning stage but what we can consider is that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that it does not preclude another committed development coming forward. Essentially, both land owners need to work together. It is also noted that the reserved matters application for A/169/17/OUT has now been submitted and will be a material consideration. Stephen Gee is considering this application and we are obviously both aware of each other's applications.

Committed Development

In terms of the my request to include A/169/17/OUT as a committed development as part of their assessment. The applicant has responded and stated that the Mayer Brown TA has considered applications A/23/15/OUT & A/11/17/OUT. However, I was not requesting this. I was requesting that they consider the impact of application A/169/17/OUT as part of their own assessment. Paragraph 4.5 on page 18 of the Redwood Partnership TA states the committed developments that have been considered and this does not appear to include A/169/17/OUT. At the moment in time I am not requesting further junction modelling but consideration needs to be given as part of the assessment to flows associated with the adjacent site.

Any questions just ask.

Regards

Steven Shaw BA (Hons) MSc MCIHT

County Highways (Development Management) Team Manager

Economy, Planning, and Place Directorate

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

From: Claire Potts [mailto:Claire.Potts@arun.gov.uk]

Sent: 28 March 2018 10:22

To: Steven Shaw

Subject: FW: A/23/15/OUT and A/11/17/OUT

Steve,

Please see below and attached in relation to M&S applications. I would also appreciate a discussion in relation to the Brook Lane suggested condition.

Kind regards

Claire

Claire Potts BSc MSc MRTPI | Strategic Development Team Leader, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council | First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37698 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737698 E-mail: claire.potts@arun.gov.uk

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



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Edward Ledwidge [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 March 2018 16:31
To: Claire Potts
Subject: A/23/15/OUT and A/11/17/OUT

Claire

We have reviewed the access and highway position with Redwood Partnership having regard to permission A/169/17/OUT. This is an outline permission approval with all matters reserved. The access arrangements will therefore only be clarified and considered for approval at the reserved matters stage. Therefore, the is scope for access to development approved under A/169/17/OUT to whatever is approved in detail under A/23/15/OUT and A/11/17/OUT at the reserved matters stage.

Furthermore, the Mayer Brown TA which accompanied planning permission A/169/17/OUT confirmed in Paras 6.10-6.11 (attached) that they have included traffic flows from the A1 retail/Public House development (Applications A/23/15/OUT and A/11/17/OUT). No further traffic impact assessment should therefore be required.


Hope this helps to clarify the position.

Regards

Edward

Edward Ledwidge MRTPI
Partner

Montagu Evans LLP
5 Bolton Street, London W1J 8BA



This e-mail is intended solely for the person to whom it is addressed. It may contain confidential or privileged information. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and destroy the transmission. You must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it.

Montagu Evans LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales. Registered number OC312072. A list of members' names is available for inspection at the registered office 5 Bolton Street, London W1J 8BA.

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

NLPG UPRN 100062237016
DX 57406 Littlehampton

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.



Hi Claire,

Following our telephone conversation I've had a look at this and can offer the following.

There are three relevant applications:

- A/169/17/OUT – Outline all matters reserved for care home and 90 residential units
- A/23/15/OUT – retail and public house
- A/11/17/OUT – retail and public house

The applications A/23/15/OUT and A/11/17/OUT should take account of the committed development site A/169/17/OUT to demonstrate that the proposed application does not preclude the committed development from coming forward. The applicant for A/23/15/OUT and A/11/17/OUT should take account of the trips associated with the committed scheme and demonstrate that their proposed access arrangements do not preclude the committed scheme from coming forward and that an access to this site can be achieved.

Given that the approved application (A/169/17/OUT) all matters were reserved the access is to be agreed as part of a reserved matters application. Access to this site could be achieved via the adjacent site and a right of access agreed between both parties. The agreement of any rights of access is a private matter not a planning matter and should be agreed between the relevant land owners. As stated before the applicant of the pub and retail unit site should however demonstrate that their access arrangements do not preclude the other development coming forward.

Any questions just ask.

Regards


Steven Shaw BA (Hons) MSc MCIHT

County Highways (Development Management) Team Manager

Economy, Planning, and Place Directorate

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



From: Richard Gregory 
Sent: 23 January 2018 09:50
To: claire.potts@arun.gov.uk
Cc: Steven Shaw; Ross Moyler; Sarah Wickens; Vera Lamont
Subject: Planning Application A/11/17/OUT

Dear Ms Potts,

Land South of A259 New Road and East of Brook Lane, Angmering, West Sussex




Please find attached a letter prepared on behalf of our client, Store Property Investments Ltd, to raise concerns regarding the above planning application - A/11/17/OUT.

I trust that these comments are helpful and will be considered in determining the planning application.

Kind regards,

Richard.

Richard Gregory, BSc (Hons) MCIHT
Associate
Mayer Brown Limited
Lion House
Oriental Road
Woking
Surrey
GU22 8AR



Please consider the environment before printing this email. Thank you.

IMPORTANT: This message is private and confidential. If you received this message in error, please notify us and remove it from your system.

Mayer Brown is a limited company registered in England.
Registered number: 3531997. Registered office: Lion House, Oriental Road, Woking Surrey, GU22 8AR

This message (and any associated files) is intended only for the use of the intended recipients and may contain information that is confidential, subject to copyright or constitutes a trade secret. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply to the message and deleting it from your computer. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author (rgregory@mayerbrown.co.uk) and do not necessarily represent those of the company.