

-----Original Message-----

From: Anita Gardner <Anita.Gardner@arun.gov.uk>

Sent: 14 January 2021 12:26

To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: A/187/20/CLP

Please scan as a rep

Anita Gardner
Principal Planning Officer,
Directorate of Place

T: 01903 737529

E: anita.gardner@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF www.arun.gov.uk

Sign up to our newsletter here

-----Original Message-----

From: Terry Linkhorn [REDACTED]

Sent: 14 January 2021 11:30

To: Anita Gardner <Anita.Gardner@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: A/187/20/CLP

Dear Mrs Gardner, I hope you are safe. Thank you for inviting me to comment on the above A/187/20/CLP. I will comment firstly on the Planning Statement.

1.2. If this strip of land had been included in A/55/19/PL it would have been refused as was in A/31/19/PL. So it should be refused now for A/187/20/CLP.

2.2. Described as grassed area but it is Protected Local Green Space and as such cannot be developed.

2.4. It is not designated as countryside, it is designated as Protected Green Space.

3.0. A/76/60 and A/71/59 are not part of the planning history of the land between Ashurst and Badgers.

The central thrust of Rodway Plannings argument for granting the CLP is in 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4 and seeks to convince you to grant an extant permission on what appears to be part of plot 7.

The plot that in its entirety no longer exists.

The use of the word 'appears' in the Planning Report suggests that Rodway Planning cannot prove that plot 7 does exist.

Ashurst has a recorded frontage of 115' and is registered as plot 6. The original plot 6 in the outline consent was 70' and Ashurst acquired an additional 45'. The acquisition of 45' to built Ashurst superseded the outline consent of plot 7 as it could not be developed in the form anticipated.

We understand there was a plot 7 and the strip remaining is 5.39m wide. This was recorded by the Goring Survey Company and its findings were recorded on the A/55/19/PL application. We know that the outline consent for plot 7 was for the development of a house or a bungalow which is now impossible on a strip of land 5.39m wide, which is why it was never developed.

Plot 7 no longer exists and the strip of land is and has always been GREEN SPACE. It is therefore protected from ANY FORM OF DEVELOPMENT in the local plan of Arun and the Angmering Neighbourhood Plan and A/187/20/CLP must be rejected.

The original consent was for plots 7/8/9. The development of three plots even with the additional strip of land cannot be achieved on the property known as Rond Point. It is impossible to build plot 7 and even plot 8 is uncertain.

A/55/19/PL was approved for one single large dwelling and side garden and it granted a separate form of development to that of the original outline consent. This permission now overrides the outline consent as it cannot be built in the form anticipated.

6.7. The application site projects to the rear as it forms part of the golf course beyond , maintaining its Protected Green Space status. It was originally part of the land at the 9 th Tee. It was only fenced off for the development of Rond Point. This was understandable but when the property is completed it MUST BE RETURNED to its Protected Green Space designation.

Please find a number of further points to be taken into consideration.

Letter to the council 31 March 2011 from R.B. Smith Director of Hesketh Estates Limited which says ; "One other notable fact is that there appears to be 57 applications referencing the A/2/57 consent all are plots identified in the approved A/2/57 site plan of 60 plots (ref 5) this only leaves the plots 40, 44 and 45 as being undeveloped. "

The contents of this letter helped to gain approval for plots 40/44 /45 on A/65/11/CLP land that Mr Smith owns. The contents of the letter were totally relied on by the council especially as it was written by a director of Hesketh Estates who were the original developers of the Ham Manor Estate. The information supplied should have been accurate as the writer would have had access to the original files.

Mail from Richard Smith to Anita Gardner 26 September 2017 states; "The land between Ashurst and Badgers includes plots 7, 8 and 9 of the A/2/57 consent which are also unbuilt. Arun District Council determined in A/65/11/CLP that there is no evidence to suggest severability of these permissions "

In the letter of 2011 there were only plots 40, 44 and 45 available for development and suddenly 7/8/9 were being targeted using exactly the same argument for their approval. You will note that in the A/212/17/CLP that only plots 8 and 9 were applied for and granted.

Plot 7 had been dropped as it no longer existed. A major part of it was plot 6 and the balance was Green Space as Arun Council had decided when they refused A/31/19/PL , and they said; " given the position of the dwelling within the established golf course which is outside the built up area boundary and designated as a Local Green Space in the Angmering Neighbourhood Development Plan the increase in width of the site closer to the neighbouring side boundaries would represent an unacceptable incursion into the area and would constitute a prominent form of development which would adversely effect the character and appearance of the area in conflict with policies C SP1, D DM1 and OSR DM1 of the Arun Local Plan and Policies HD5 and CLW2 of the Angmering Neighbourhood Plan.

Nothing has changed since this decision and on this statement alone A/187/20/CLP should be rejected.

Arun is reminded of the letter from THEIR OWN FILES of the 10 June 1960, which states; " I enclose herewith three prints of the plot plan indicating an amendment to the size of the plot so as to take up the whole of the frontage which is available for development on this section, leaving the remaining portion to the north open as the entrance to Tee no 9 "

As the council is aware with the introduction of this information, Tee no 9 was not available for development as the letter clarified. It remained as Green Space for 60 years. The major part of plot 7 was already part of plot 6 and the remaining part of 7 was part of Tee no 9.

A/55/19/PL was outside Protected Green Space and was inside the southern boundary of the outline consent A/212/17/CLP and was approved.

If the strip of Protected Green Space had been included in the application and had been beyond the boundary of the outline consent, it would have been refused.

There is no new evidence supplied by Rodway Planning in this new application that was not already in your files and so you should refuse A/187/20/CLP.

It is also noted that in the appeal that failed A/176/17/PL the inspector stated that whilst plots 8 and 9 had some form of extant planning permission a green gap is to be retained between Ashurst and plots 8 and 9.

This is a point which the council agree with as they refused A/31/19/PL as it was too close to the Ashurst boundary. "the increase in width of the site closer to the neighbourhood side boundaries would represent an unacceptable incursion into the area and would constitute a prominent form of development "

The retention of strip of land helps at least in part to maintain some of the original character of the area, in enabling the community to have a beautiful uninterrupted view of the golf course and the downs beyond.

One of the charms of Ham Manor Way is that it was unique with its green spaces , which gave the area a distinctive rural quality attractive to residents and the local community alike. This is demonstrated by the many hundreds of people who use the Public Right of Way every week of the year.

It is extremely important that the land is not fenced off or cultivated but retained as Protected Green Space.

If you were to grant A/187/20/CLP and the owner of Rond Point should apply for permission to develop plot 8 the additional strip of land would enable them to apply for a much larger property. This would be harmful to the character of the area , as another large property would overshadow the smaller chalet bungalows opposite, and would be an unacceptable incursion into the area.

The council should not allow any further impact on the existing build form and the landscape setting.

In conclusion this proposal would result in the loss of Green Space / Green Belt and would be contrary to policy OSR DM1 of The Local Plan which protects Green Space. It would also conflict with policy CLW2 of the Angmering Neighbourhood Plan which explains that development that results in the loss of local green space adversely affecting their character, setting, accessibility, appearance or amenity value , will not be supported.

I respectfully ask the Council to reject application A/187/20/CLP.

Thank you Terry Linkhorn.

Sent from my iPad