

Date: 13 July 2018
Your Ref: A/11/OUT and A/23/15/OUT
Our Ref: 9349



6 New Bridge Street
London EC4V 6AB

Ms. Claire Potts
Strategic Development Team
Arun District Council
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

Dear Claire

OBJECTION TO APPLICATIONS A/11/17/OUT AND A/23/15/OUT RELATING TO LAND SOUTH OF NEW ROAD (A259) AND EAST OF BROOK LANE ANGMERING

We write further to our letter dated 26th June 2018 to provide further representations on both of the above applications. As you know, we agree with your recommendation that the applications should be refused, however, given the clear indication at planning committee that Members wished to approve the schemes in spite of the clear policy conflicts, we are very keen to ensure that the schemes above would not prevent other committed developments coming forward. Notwithstanding this point we continue to believe that both applications should be refused.

As you may be aware from your colleague David Easton, we are keen to progress our application for reserved matters, discharge planning conditions and commence development that would realise a substantial number of homes, which will make a valuable contribution to Arun's housing need. We are very concerned that as currently presented the A/23/15/OUT and A/11/17/OUT schemes would threaten this much needed development. We would urge you to ensure that the necessary controls are in place on both applications to ensure that this does not occur.

Application A/23/15/OUT

We have yet to receive any response in relation to our request to review the proposed planning conditions and legal agreement. We remain of the view that a section 106 agreement relating to this application should only be accepted by ADC if executed by all owners of the application site. Notwithstanding this, we strongly believe that the application needs to be returned to planning committee for a decision. The reason for this is three-fold:

Partners

N M Fennell BSc MRICS
R J Greeves BSc (Hons) MRICS
A R Holden BSc (Hons) FRICS

G Bullock BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI
A Vickery BSc MRICS IRRV (Hons)
G Denning B.Eng (Hons) MSc MRICS
B Murphy BA (Hons) MRUP MRTPI

A Meech BSc MRICS
S Page BA MA (Cantab) MSc MRTPI
S Price BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI
P Roberts FRICS CEnv



1. On 5th July Arun District Council received the Inspector's final report in respect of the Local Plan Examination this should be a material consideration in the determination of the planning application, and was not available to the committee members at the time that the decision was made. The proposed development is contrary to the emerging plan in numerous ways and therefore committee members should be made aware of the conflicts
2. It has become apparent to us from information provided through Freedom of Information requests that Members have not been given robust information regarding the employment and economic benefits of the proposed development. This is a significant concern given that the decision was largely based on economic development as a material consideration. Further detail in this regard is provided below under Application A/11/17/OUT.
3. The proposed layout plan for the scheme is not consistent with the consented residential / care home scheme. The applicant needs to demonstrate to the committee how the proposed development does not prejudice the committed development on the adjacent site (which will deliver much needed housing, affordable housing and care home provision). The current highway design precludes access to the committed residential development and to ensure the relationship between the two developments is compatible a revised plan is required. Should this plan receive committee approval, the only way of ensuring that the revised layout provides access to the consented scheme is through a specific section 106 obligation supported by an appropriately worded condition. The comments from West Sussex to the reserved matters applications for the adjacent site are considered to be relevant to this application:

"The Local Planning Authority should note that dependent on the timing of approval of this application and other applications within the vicinity all applications must take account of any consents to ensure that a scenario does not occur where two access points are approved which could be contradictory and the permission would not be implementable or junctions that are located too close to each other. The Highway Authority would look for the LPA to encourage the applicants to work together to provide a comprehensive development and single access arrangement which delivers both sites.

Depending on the timing of any approvals of other applications this therefore may alter the Highway Authority comments on this and other applications."

Application A/11/17/OUT

As above, subsequent to our previous letter of objection we have received a number of documents pursuant to a submitted Freedom of Information request. Importantly we are aware of a number of letters to Members from James Marshall and Chris Smith which we consider to be misleading members, particularly on the quantum of jobs to be provided.

In addition, it has become apparent that the M&S analysis of the sequentially preferable sites has not been made available to the Arun Planning team, nor to Members and we therefore consider that the foundations upon which Members are basing their judgement could be unsound.

We would be very grateful if this letter could be considered alongside our previous letters of objection to both schemes. Importantly in respect of both applications there does not appear to be any record on the planning file of the document dated 4th May 2018 referred to by James Marshall at the Planning Committee meeting. The committee speech inferred that this letter had been sent from the Marshall Group or Commercial Development Projects to the Council. We would urge the planning team to ensure that correspondence is made available on the planning file as it is relevant to the determination of the planning application.

Yours sincerely



Serena Page

Partner

DWD Property+Planning

