

Amanda Scholes | Receptionist, Department, Arun District Council | Location: Ground Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37736 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737500 ext 37736 | E-mail: amanda.scholes@arun.gov.uk



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



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Maria Tomalova <Maria.Tomalova@arun.gov.uk>

Sent: 18 February 2020 15:45

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

Subject: FW: Canal Mews Barnham BN/66/19

Please upload the attachment and the below to the above application.

Maria Tomalova | Senior Planning Officer, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37510 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737510 | E-mail: maria.tomalova@arun.gov.uk



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



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Paul White [REDACTED]

Sent: 08 January 2020 13:30

To: Maria Tomalova <Maria.Tomalova@arun.gov.uk>; Mark Warwick <Mark.Warwick@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Canal Mews Barnham BN/66/19

Dear Maria,

We have now seen 2 further comments from your greenspace officer and tree officer on the above application and would make the following comments:

Greenspace Officer

We note the greenspace officer recognises the site does not form part of the required open space calculation for the Croudace development and the 3 additional dwellings being proposed on the site in application BN/66/19 does not trigger the requirement for any additional public open space or play area contributions either. But its loss is still considered to reduce the amenity provision and openness of the public realm within the development and impact on the existing trees retained and planted as part of the original application.

In response we would point out that the current applicant, **Seaward Homes maintains the “greenspace” and not the Management Company looking after the adjoining Croudace development.** The amenity value of the land is not therefore guaranteed should this maintenance activity cease. The TPO tree on the site is retained along with the 4 trees along Nightingale Lane and other existing hedging. The Tree Retention and Protection Plan prepared by Lizard Landscape for the application shows all this with the necessary protective fencing. Since all existing trees are retained on site we do not agree with the greenspace officer that they can be impacted by the proposed development in any way that could be considered harmful. A landscape plan was submitted with the application showing the existing trees protected and new native tree and shrub species planting to enhance biodiversity and mitigate the visual impact of the development as requested by the greenspace officer.

So that just leaves us with the loss of the openness of the public realm as a reason for objecting and this has to be balanced against national policy in the NPPF that both supports the development of underutilised land and requires developments make optimal use of the potential of each site where there is a shortage of land to meet housing needs (paragraphs 118 (d) and 123). As we have previously pointed out to you, the shortage in ADC's case is 3.7 years land supply.

Tree Officer

Thank you for forwarding the comments of the tree officer. Notwithstanding the advice of our arborist, he says that the 3 units will likely put the recently TPO'd tree under excessive pressure and compromise its long-term health and vitality. However he says If the plot layout can be reconfigured or unit quantity reduced so as to leave the nominal root protection area of the tree (T04) inviolate – then he would be able to support the scheme.

We have therefore looked at the hardstanding that was within the RPA of the tree and attach a plan which now excludes it all from the RPA. It has necessitated the slight relocation of plot 1 and the footpath and car park hardstanding have been moved. But if you and the tree officer are content with the changes and the revisions allow him to remove his objection then we would be happy to formally substitute this plan for the submitted original. In this regard we are copying this email to Mark Warwick for his attention.

Please get back to me with your thoughts so we can hopefully submit the plan to you and make the formal change.
Kind regards

Paul D White BA(Hons) Dip MRTPI
Director of Planning



RIBA RTPI

PLANNING

From: Paul White
Sent: 02 January 2020 17:41
To: Maria Tomalova <Maria.Tomalova@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Canal Mews Barnham BN/66/19

Dear Ms Tomalova,

Whilst technically not a planning consideration, we attach a letter from the applicants solicitors confirming the transfer of the application site from Croudace includes 1) the legal right of passage across all private roads within the adjoining development site; 2) connection rights to the main estate road including the right to construct any new section of road; and 3) a full right to connect into existing Service Media. We bring the letter to your attention to show that the application site within an existing settlement policy boundary has no technical or landownership impediment to prevent the immediate delivery of housing assuming planning consent is granted. We have emailed you separately confirming there is no foul water treatment plant on the application site and the layout does not harm the tree on the site recently made the subject of TPO. We will formally respond to the tree officers comments in due course and thank you for agreeing to forward this to me.

Whilst writing we would point out that the delivery of housing sites across Arun District is now even more pressing as your Council confirmed at the December 17th 2019 Policy Committee (report attached) that it can now only show a **3.7 year** housing supply. This is less than the 4.7 year supply that existed at the time we last wrote to you on 11 November. We would repeat therefore that this significant and declining land supply shortfall means that the presumption in favour of sustainable development is engaged even more strongly for the application and following paragraph 11 of the NPPF, in the absence of any other policy conflict, we believe it should be approved without further delay.

We trust this further update is helpful in your ongoing considerations.
Kind regards

Paul D White BA(Hons) Dip MRTPI
Director of Planning



RIBA RTPI

PLANNING