

Longview,
Ham Manor Way,
Angmering,
West Sussex,
BN16 4JQ.

25/07/18.

Arun District Council,
Arun Civic Centre,
Maltravers Road,
Littlehampton,
West Sussex,
BN17 5LF

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to OBJECT to application A/87/18/PL.

A/87/18/PL is simply the Southern of the two plots of A/176/17/PL which was refused permission. No material changes have taken place since that refusal so A/87/18/PL should also be refused.

The newly adopted Arun Local Plan contains the same policies now, albeit renumbered, as when A/176/17/PL was refused due to conflict with those policies. The Angmering Neighbourhood Plan (ANP) remains intact with it's relevant policies. It must in also now be the case that the ANP is not out of date and meets the Ministerial Statement.

The applicant was recently successful in obtaining permission for 2 dwellings through A/212/17/CLP using an ancient extant permission. A/87/18/PL seeks to not only use but also increase this permission while the A/212/17/CLP decision states in the " Extent of Use" that the area only relates to the provision of two dwellings and that a further detailed application will be required to be submitted for the design and layout of each plot identified in the CLP application. The "First Schedule" states the principle of one unit of accommodation on each of the 2 identified plots. A/ 87/18 PL goes beyond the permission of A/212/17/PL. Were Angmering Parish Council correct when in their objection to A/212/17/CLP they referred to the application being made in an attempt to circumvent the refusal of A/176/17/PL and is an abuse of process?

While the 2 plots of A/212/17/CLP do occupy land designated as Local Green Space they do not extend into the Local Green Space as much as A/87/18/PL seeks to do. Any land beyond the A/ 212/17/CLP area must remain protected by Arun and Angmering policies as Local Green Space for the benefit of the public. The refusal A/176/17/PL clearly expressed this opinion.

The CLP plots provide 2 dwellings for Arun but in the refusal of A/176/17/PL it was commented that the 2 plots made no significant contribution to housing stocks to meet needs of present and future generations. As such A/87/18/PL should not be allowed especially as an extension of the 2 A/212/17/CLP plots.

It is also noted that Angmering Parish Council do not have the site in question as a strategic site nor as an identified "small site".

A/87/18/PL asks for a single large dwelling which is out of character for the area, as also stated in the refusal of A/176/17/PL, especially considering the surrounding properties are chalet bungalows. As stated, the applicant has permission for 2 dwellings from A/212/17/CLP but it is also noted that the applicant has an appeal pending on A/176/17/PL which in the "Planning Support Statement" is stated as being a site HMGC is "totally reliant on the sale of"!! Why then is A/87/18/PL applied for?

I have noticed that Angmering Parish Council has given " no objection " to A/87/18/PL which is against the ANP and it's policies as voted on by the vast majority of Angmering residents.

One Angmering councillor was also heard to comment that the Local Green Space which is HMGC may not have been intended to be relevant to all parts of HMGC. Regardless of that statement the ANP is clear as is the Arun Local Policy Map 4 which shows HMGC as Local Green Space up to the edges of Ham Manor Way.

The applicant's lengthy "Planning Support Document" refers to other points which are too many to comment on individually but I would make comment as follows:

- HMGC has other assets available not in Local Green Space so cannot be totally reliant on the sale of the appeal site.
- The Local Green Space in question only includes HMGC and not the existing houses/buildings.
- The surrounding area is actually typified by chalet bungalows.
- The various recent developments referred to to support the application were all processed before the ANP was "made" and other properties were outside the Local Green Space.
- The area of land of the second property of the appeal, next to Badgers, will not become wasteland and if vegetation grows it will enhance the benefit of the space. Indeed as Local Green Space I understand it cannot be cultivated or fenced off, even if sold off as a garden. The benefits of Local Green Space were well described in the refusal of A/176/17/PL.
- A/87/18/PL is totally different to A/182/16/CLP with the latter not being in an area of Local Green Space.
- A/145/17/PL already exists, fronts the road with two storeys and remains 19m wide with no impact on Local green Space. It is noted at this point in the Planning Support Statement there is reference to "2 proposed new properties of 195 sqm each"!! The appeal or a further application to come for the North plot?
- The applicant would support Section 6 of the NPPF by developing plots 8 and 9 he successfully obtained via A/212/17/CLP. I would also suggest in this section that the default position is "yes" and that points 4, 5 and 11 can all be met via the CLP.
- The NPPF quote in 6.16 argues against the application due to the connection between Local Green Space and the people, as too does the extract of the PPSI paragraph due to the Local Green Space and other policies.
- The validity of the ANP supported by over 96% of residents is again questioned whilst this was dealt with in the refusal of A/176/17/PL. Indeed the adoption of the Arun Local plan should remove any doubt.
- The Golden Thread must weigh in favour of the CLP plots while upholding policy. Protecting the benefits of the policy, as a whole and specifically, outweighs the application, especially as the second plot of A/176/17/PL will be pursued.

The limits of any development should be met by the 2 plots from A/212/17/CLP and the remaining green space left as Local Green Space in line with policy.

Yours sincerely,

Brian Beach.