

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

From: RICHARD STUBBS [REDACTED]

Sent: 06 August 2019 12:49

To: Juan Baeza <Juan.Baeza@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: New dwelling at Ham Manor Way, Angmering (Ref A/55/19/PL)

Hi Juan, hope all is well with you.

I have seen the responses to Terry Linkhorn in the light of him seeking responses to my letters to Anita and this raises incredible concerns about where you are going with this application. I feel I must state the fundamental concerns to you now on this current application, which I maintain should be refused. I note your comments to him about Policy and relevant history but as far as Policy is concerned I trust you would concur with me that this application should be refused as it is totally contrary to recently adopted Policy as it lies wholly contrary to the concept of Local Green Space.

I should confirm where we are. The historic position was that an LDC was granted for the site was referred back to permissions in 1949 and 1957, and expressly to those permissions. The evidence submitted submitted has been challenged but leave that for now as the boundary of the site followed on from the rear of Ashhurst. No details were submitted as to the size of the plots created either recently or historically so we can only rely on the death of Ashhurst. In 2016 an application is made to your Council and approved which shows the front to rear garden depth as 24 m. As a matter of judgement and with nothing else to use the depth of this plot cannot exceed 24m. This plot is at or about 30m and exceeds this depth and goes into the LGS by up to 6m for which there is no support. As a matter of interpretation of the Law this application can only be refused.

In terms of applying "Policy" to this site in considering its individual merits we are governed by the views of the Inspector who rejected the scheme for two units. His view in setting the approach to the future was for a softer form of development but this scheme fails the approach he offered particularly whilst there remains the potential for two dwellings as set out in earlier correspondence. In this respect the application should be refused.

You have on the correspondence details regarding a proposed 106 Agreement which I again refer to and would ask you to give this matter expert consideration. This may soften the blow in the light of the comments of the Inspector as too blitz this site with two substantial dwellings wholly contrary to the Inspectors stated views is fundamentally wrong!

I have sent this to you in the hope that you will carefully read these obvious concerns and to focus on the application as placed before your Council. We will await to see the outcome on this application.

Richard Stubbs MRTPI

Sent from my iPad