

[REDACTED]

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 06 December 2019 09:10
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: BR/233/19/PL - 77 Aldwick Road

From: James Cross [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 December 2019 15:20
To: Planning.Responses [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: BR/233/19/PL - 77 Aldwick Road

[REDACTED]

James Cross MRTPI
Senior Planning Officer
Arun District Council, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

[REDACTED]

From: James Hutchison <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 05 December 2019 15:07
To: James Cross [REDACTED]
Cc: Simon Davis [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: BR/233/19/PL - 77 Aldwick Road

Dear James,

Thank you for your e-mail.

My answers to your questions are in red.

In view of your e-mail below, I will be recommending that my client instruct us to commence work on preparing an appeal now.

I would like to place on record the following:

- (i) That as the evidence shows below, I have exhausted every effort to engage with the Local Planning Authority in explaining our case, and have even tried to explain such matters that should be common ground including how the BRE test works and should be used, and how the housing land supply position is relevant and its implications; and
- (ii) That I have repeatedly asked for a meeting with officers and that this has not been accepted. I have therefore exhausted every effort to engage with the Local Planning Authority before they make their decision based on the findings outlined in the e-mail below.

Please can you ensure that this e-mail (and the complete chain below) is placed on the public register, and is also passed onto your Head of Planning for their information.

Thank you, and please now proceed to determine the application.

Kind Regards,

James

James Hutchison MRTPI
Planning Director

[REDACTED]
Address: Suite 2, Littlehampton Business Centre, Gratwicke House, 10 East Street, Littlehampton, West
Sussex, BN17 6AW
[REDACTED]

Corbil 
ESTATES & PLANNING LTD

Registered Company No: 09991331

From: James Cross [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 December 2019 14:17
To: James Hutchison [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: BR/233/19/PL - 77 Aldwick Road

Dear James,

Many thanks for your email and I have since caught up with Simon regarding your previous correspondence. I also managed to visit the site yesterday and have had an opportunity to review the submission and planning histories to the site. To be clear the issues outstanding at this stage that will be reflected in any subsequent report/decision comprise: (1) Daylighting, (2) Levels of outlook/overbearing impacts, (3) Impacts upon privacy of properties along Stocker Road; and (4) Planning balance. These matters are addressed in the subsequent response below. I understand your concerns regarding the change of case officer throughout the application period but want to re-assure you that this re-allocation is to ensure your decision is expedited as per your previous requests to provide an effective service.

(1) Daylighting

The correspondence below notes that the application would satisfy BRE Daylight/Sunlight tests. At this stage I have not received any formal BRE Assessment undertaken by a suitably qualified BRE assessor which provides a professional opinion on rights of light matters. BRE assessments are used for assessing whether there would be a material loss of light to existing occupants of buildings; however, to undertake a full BRE assessment an assessor would need access to neighbouring properties, have 3D modelling of the proposed building etc.. Only once this has been undertaken would all parties have a fully evidenced position re sunlight/daylight.

Whilst you have undertaken some of the tests contained within the BRE guidance, a full assessment has not been undertaken. The Council would not be in a justified position to state that impacts upon daylight and sunlight have

been adequately satisfied on the basis of BRE guidelines in the absence of a full BRE daylight and sunlight assessment by a suitably qualified assessor.

I am therefore satisfied that in the absence of a full BRE assessment undertaken by a BRE specialist, the Council would be justified in giving limited weight to this matter.

(2) Levels of Outlook/Overbearing

BRE testing solely stipulates whether an acceptable level of daylight/sunlight would be afforded to existing neighbouring properties on a quantifiable basis. However, perception of overlooking/overbearing impacts cannot be quantified. Whilst BRE tests can indicate the extent/severity of neighbouring impacts, a positive BRE test that concludes no impact on sunlight/daylight does not automatically result in no impacts upon overbearing impacts. The Council acknowledges that BRE testing can be used to inform this judgement; however, any judgement needs to take into account all factors including that of the use of spaces and sense of enclosure.

I noted from my site visit yesterday that the adjacent first floor flat to the west, and first floor flat on the application building both have balconies which appear to be used for outdoor amenity space. This level of usage is evidenced through the presence of paraphernalia. BRE guidance does not take these areas into account, though these areas are used to assess overbearing impacts.

To give an illustration of how BRE is not the determining factors in assessing overbearing impacts, you could develop a rear extension to a property and have an overbearing impact on an adjacent property 10m away. A BRE assessment would conclude no impact upon daylight or sunlight, but an overbearing impact would still result. This principle is equally applicable in this instance.

Simon has previously outlined in correspondence his concerns regarding the harm the first floor apartment creates on the amenities of neighbouring properties. I too share his concerns in respect of the perception of overlooking and overbearing impacts, specifically in relation to the impact on the first floor windows of adjacent properties and the outdoor amenity spaces (terraces) on the application building and adjacent first floor properties.

(3) Impact upon Privacy of Properties along Stocker Road

Concern was raised by Bognor Regis Town Council regarding impacts upon privacy of the amenity space of properties along Stocker Road. I also share the Town Council's concerns regarding the proximity of development to the amenity space of the rear of properties along Stocker Road. I note that this formed reason for refusal 2 on application BR/63/18/PL which proposed the same layout and relationship with the properties to the south. However, no amendments have been made to respond to this within the submitted scheme.

In the absence of a site section detailing lines of sight I would be unable to justifiably state that no impacts upon the privacies of neighbouring properties would result.

(4) Planning Balance

I note from your correspondence below that you feel that the tilted balance should be applied, on the basis that paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is triggered. For clarity, so all parties are clear in moving forward, the NPPF states:

Where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless...

The effect of applying paragraph 11(d) in this instance would mean that policies relating to the provision of housing development would also be made out of date. This would include those relating to the delivery of 20,000 dwellings throughout the plan period, delivery housing within built up area boundaries etc... Such policies provide sufficient justification and weight towards the proposed development when applying the subsequent planning balance under S38(6) of the Act. I would raise caution in engaging the tilted planning balance in this application as it would result in the Council being unable to apply policies which provide principle support to the development, as such policies comprise those which are *most important for determining the application*.

Both parties are in agreement that the Council are unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and therefore it is important to agree on the ramifications of this in the subsequent assessment. I am happy to engage para 11(d); however, as a result this would affect the weighting given to certain policies when applying S38(6).

On the basis that paragraph 11(d) is not engaged, I would consider there to be principle support for the development in terms of re-use of a previously developed site, location of housing in a built up area that is sustainably located and would reduce the need and reliance upon private motor vehicles. However, this has to be balanced against the amenities of existing occupants.

The harm in this instance derives from the provision of the first floor studio apartment. The ground floor apartment is considered acceptable. Therefore, the benefits associated with 1 no. unit have to be balanced against the amenities of 3 no. existing apartments and the loss of privacy to properties along Stocker Road. Taking into account the policies in the Development Plan, contents of the NPPF and matters raised within the application period, the Council is unable to state that the benefits associated with 1 no. additional apartment outweigh the cumulative harm caused to 4 no. existing residential properties, which are afforded protection within Development Plan and NPPF policies.

I trust this email makes the position of the Council clear. In moving forward, I would be grateful if you could confirm the following points to me ahead of making a decision:

- 1) Will a full BRE assessment be undertaken and provided to the Council in advance of determination? No
- 2) On the basis of the implications of applying paragraph 11(d), do you wish me to consider the application in the context of the tilted balance, or a general planning balance under S38(6)? You represent the Local Planning Authority so I respectfully suggest that you decide whether you wish to apply paragraph 11(d)(ii)
- 3) Will site sections be provided detailing lines of sight between the first floor studio apartment and rear amenity space of properties along Stocker Road? No

I look forward to hearing from you by way of return of this email before close of this week.

Kindest regards,

James Cross MRTPI

Senior Planning Officer

Arun District Council, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

From: James Hutchison <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 05 December 2019 09:49
To: James Cross [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: BR/233/19/PL - 77 Aldwick Road

Dear James,

Thank you.

I look forward to its receipt this afternoon.

Kind Regards,

James

James Hutchison MRTPI
Planning Director

[REDACTED]
Address: Suite 2, Littlehampton Business Centre, Gratwicke House, 10 East Street, Littlehampton, West
Sussex, BN17 6AW
[REDACTED]



ESTATES & PLANNING LTD

Registered Company No: 09991331

From: James Cross [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 December 2019 09:15
To: James Hutchison [REDACTED]; Simon Davis [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: BR/233/19/PL - 77 Aldwick Road

Hi James,

I'm currently drafting up a response as we speak and having this reviewed by management ahead of it's issuing, as per your request below. I am to be in contact with you later today via email.

Kindest regards,

James Cross MRTPI
Senior Planning Officer
Arun District Council, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
[REDACTED]

From: James Hutchison <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 04 December 2019 17:07
To: Simon Davis [REDACTED]
Cc: James Cross [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: BR/233/19/PL - 77 Aldwick Road

Dear Simon,

Please can you kindly confirm receipt of my e-mail this morning, and also let me know when you will be in a position to respond?

I do not want this application determined before a clear recommendation is expressed to me in view of the confusion to date, and before I have had the opportunity to discuss the same with my client.

I look forward to hearing from you shortly please.

Kind Regards,

James

James Hutchison MRTPI
Planning Director

[REDACTED]
Address: Suite 2, Littlehampton Business Centre, Gratwicke House, 10 East Street, Littlehampton, West
Sussex, BN17 6AW
[REDACTED] [uk](#)

Corbil 
ESTATES & PLANNING LTD

Registered Company No: 09991331

From: James Hutchison [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 December 2019 09:49
To: 'J' [REDACTED]
Cc: 'Simon Davis' <[REDACTED]>
Subject: FW: BR/233/19/PL - 77 Aldwick Road

Dear James

Thank you for your e-mail.

I understand that the side gate (right-hand side of no.77) is always left open and so please feel free to let yourself into the property to take a look around.

I have sent an e-mail to Simon Davis this morning in reply to questions he asked of me yesterday afternoon. I have included the same below for your information.

Whilst I have no concerns with a change in case officer if this gets us nearer to a decision, as you will note from the e-mail below, I am getting increasingly confused by the Local Planning Authority's case on the application, and exactly what cause and evidence is being cited to object to the proposed development. I am looking for clarity and an opportunity to meet with officers.

I would therefore be extremely grateful if you could please coordinate a collective response to the e-mail below with Simon and your team leader, and that every effort is made through the change in case officer not to cause more confusion in respect of how the application is being handled and your recommendation.

That said, I await a response to the e-mail below, but have no issues with you visiting the site this afternoon.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any queries.

Kind Regards,

James

James Hutchison MRTPI
Planning Director

[REDACTED]
Address: Suite 2, Littlehampton Business Centre, Gratwicke House, 10 East Street, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 6AW
[REDACTED]



ESTATES & PLANNING LTD

Registered Company No: 09991331

From: James Hutchison [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 December 2019 09:15
To: 'Simon Davis' [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: BR/233/19/PL - 77 Aldwick Road

Dear Simon,

I was rather hoping that after our telephone conversation yesterday afternoon, our next correspondence would be to set up a meeting with yourself and your team leader. Instead, I feel that we maybe repeating parts of the conversation yesterday upon which there was quite clearly common ground.

However, as you have asked for my reply, I hereby respond in turn.

Daylighting:

You agreed with me on the telephone yesterday afternoon that the proposed development would comply with the vertical sky component (VSC) test as indicated in the sketch that I sent across on Monday, 02 December (and also, as I understand, on your own calculations subsequently).

Indeed, your e-mail below does not dissent from the fact that the application passed the aforementioned VSC test, and so I would refer you to the following extracts from the BRE guidance document '*Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, A guide to good practice, Second Edition*

2.1.21 When applying the 25 degree test, the following BRE guidance and recommendations apply:

- *less than 25°, conventional window design will usually give reasonable results.*
- *between 25° and 45°, special measures (enlarged windows, changes to room layout) are usually needed to provide adequate daylight.*
- *between 45° and 65°, it is very difficult to provide adequate daylight, unless very large windows are used.*
- *more than 65°, it is often impossible to achieve reasonable daylight, even if the whole window wall is glazed.*

2.2.5 If this angle is less than 25° for the whole of the development then it is unlikely to have a substantial effect on the diffuse skylight enjoyed by the existing building.

If, as I now understand to be the case, you are attempting to retract from your agreement yesterday that there is no sustainable grounds to refuse on the matter of daylight, and in support of your argument you state that the BRE guidance is not referred to in your Local Plan, then I would ask you to consider your position carefully in this regard.

There really should be no contention from the Local Planning Authority to the fact that the aforesaid BRE guidance is a material consideration to the assessment of daylighting and sunlight in new development. It is a widely used

guidance document prepared by the government's research establishment and forms the very basis of the British Standard (EN 17037:2018) *Daylight in Buildings*, as updated in 2018.

The policies of your local plan require that new development safeguards the daylight to neighbouring properties (policies SP1, DM1 and DM4). However, Arun presently has no adopted SPD or design guidance that provides a test by which to quantify the degree of any impact on daylight and sunlight. It is quite proper therefore, that in light of the absence of any detailed policy in the development plan, that the BRE guidance document falls to be a material consideration of some weight. This would certainly take a higher priority in terms of relevance when compared with the alternative that you appear to be promoting which is a subjective view based on no guidance or robust analysis.

As the BRE guidance is routinely used in expert witness evidence at appeals, and will therefore be well-known to a planning inspector who maybe called upon to determine this case, I would respectfully suggest to you that the fact that the proposed development passes the VSC test should be sufficient justification alone for you to be able to conclude that any impact on daylight and sunlight should not be raised again by the Local Planning Authority as a concern against this development.

Levels of Outlook / Overbearing Effect:

Your interpretation of the contents of our telephone conversation are slightly distorted, however in essence you are correct in terms of my strong reliance on the VSC daylight diffuse test for quantifying the impact on outlook. Outlook as a material consideration is not strictly defined in policy or guidance, however this does not give the Local Planning Authority carte blanche to use it freely against any development for which they may have a subjective feeling that there maybe a perceived impact.

A common understanding of the terminology, as quoted in most design guidance documents and appeal decisions, is that outlook relates to the visual amenity of an occupant that maybe affected by any form of obstruction that may, by reason of its height and/or close proximity, cause harm to the visual amenity of the concerned property.

I trust that we can agree as common ground words to the effect of those included within the above paragraph. Indeed, the same can be said to apply to the rather more loose phraseology of an 'overbearing effect', which is largely the same as a loss of outlook (i.e. the loss of visual amenity through an obstruction that is either too high or too close to the affected party).

The reason that I relied heavily on the findings of the VSC daylight diffuse test in respect of the matter of outlook in our telephone conversation yesterday is because the daylight test can equally be applied to give a reasonably accurate proxy as to the effect on outlook. The close proximity and height of the opposing structure is calculated as a quantifiable angle / percentage within the VSC test. For example, a line that intersects the top of an opposing structure at an angle of 50° above the horizontal would clearly be far more deleterious in both daylight and outlook to the affected window than a line intersecting the top of a lower opposing structure at an angle of say 15° above the horizontal plane.

There is a clear and readily identifiable correlation between an impact on daylight levels and an impact on outlook of any affected window. In our case, in view of the extent to which the proposed development passed the VSC test in daylight terms, it is rather incomprehensible that such a limited additional loss of skyline above the horizontal as that proposed here, is going to cause a significant adverse effect on the outlook from the window.

The above is particularly the case having in mind the higher finished floor level in the existing building when compared with the new extension, therefore rendering the extension very much subordinate and lower in profile views from the affected window(s). The effect of the difference in floor levels is clearly shown in the side elevation / section drawing that we have submitted.

Our reliance on the use of the BRE guidance document '*Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight*', *A guide to good practice, Second Edition*, as a useful proxy in order to quantify a potential impact on outlook (if also interpreted as a view) is supported in section 5.2 of the document where it states:

5.2.1 *At the site layout stage in design the needs for view and for daylight rarely conflict; an open, well daylight layout will usually provide reasonable views.*

In summary, if a development passed the VSC test on the basis of an opposing structure being sufficiently low and/or far away as to not compromise a 25' daylight line from the horizontal, then it is highly unlikely that the effect on outlook from that same structure and relationship would be sufficient to justify a refusal of planning permission. It is certainly difficult to see how one could sustain an 'outlook' refusal in such circumstances and separate from any daylight concerns at an appeal.

In our telephone conversation yesterday afternoon, when referring to your concerns regarding a loss of outlook to the rear facing window on no.77, you said that your view on outlook and overbearing impact was subjective, and was based on a feeling that you perceived to have were you to be the person living at the affected property looking onto the proposed development when completed.

I would respectfully suggest that, whilst well intended I am sure, perhaps this form of emotive and subjective approach to the consideration of outlook is less reliable, and certainly less quantifiable, than a rational interpretation of the VSC daylight test as a proxy for ascertaining when a reasonable level of outlook would be lost and the visual amenity harmed by the result of a proposed development.

Procedure:

I am beginning to get very concerned with the way in which our application is being considered. We seemed to be moving forward in the right direction in our telephone conversation yesterday afternoon in which we at least agreed to set aside your initial concern regarding a loss of daylight. I am perturbed by the suggestion in your e-mail below that this issue is creeping back into the Local Planning Authority's case after we agreed that there would be no significant loss of daylight, and that the BRE guidance (VSC test) was relevant. This is even more concerning when, by your own volition, the same means of assessment is included within the Local Planning Authority's draft Design Guide, and is likely to therefore soon be adopted as the Local Planning Authority's own means by which to assess daylighting.

I must admit that I was equally concerned in our telephone conversation when you appeared to move your case against the development onto an alleged adverse impact on the balconies notwithstanding this never having been raised previously as a concern in either this application or in the last refusal. Am I correct in stating that after our conversation yesterday, this no longer forms part of your case?

Rightly or wrongly, the only matter that now sits between us is the synonymous issues of a loss of outlook and overbearing effect on the first floor windows. I have set out a cogent explanation (and the only quantifiable evidence) for an absence of a loss of outlook and overbearing effect. However, this seems to be being ignored by officers in preference for your alternative assessment that is essentially one of a wholly subjective and readily interchangeable emotive judgement.

Moreover, whilst conceding that the Local Planning Authority does not currently have a five year housing land supply, thereby engaging paragraphs 11(d)(ii) and 123(c) of the NPPF (as per your agreement in our telephone conversation yesterday), I find it quite alarming that contrary to numerous appeal decisions, you seem to be giving the benefits of the scheme little weight on account of it only comprising of two units. The tilted planning balance works for all housing applications, and the same test applies in respect of the severity of adverse impacts needed to outweigh the benefits.

It is hard to see how a refusal can be sustained on a *level* planning balance when the only adverse impacts identified by the Local Planning Authority are borne out of a self-acknowledged subjective assessment of the proposed scheme. However, when the planning balance is *tilted* and the adverse impacts need to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, it is simply implausible that a decision to refuse permission on the grounds cited to date can be sustained at appeal.

Again, I make my request for a meeting to discuss these matters with you and your team leader, and I strongly ask that you re-visit your recommendation to refuse planning permission. To not do so, and proceed along the current

path, will lead to many more months of needless protracted correspondence in which my client will re-submit the application, and run a consecutive appeal against the refusal. This would have the effect of running up considerable costs and delays of up to 6 -9 months, and in planning terms would simply prevaricate the ability of our client to provide two much needed small homes within a local community that has an identified and great housing need.

I look forward to hearing from you shortly.

Kind Regards,

James

James Hutchison MRTPI
Planning Director

[REDACTED]
Address: Suite 2, Littlehampton Business Centre, Gratwicke House, 10 East Street, Littlehampton, West
Sussex, BN17 6AW
[REDACTED]


Corbil
ESTATES & PLANNING LTD

Registered Company No: 09991331

From: Simon Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 December 2019 17:14
To: James Hutchison <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: BR/233/19/PL - 77 Aldwick Road

Dear James,

I would be grateful if you could indicate where you believe it is stated in the BRE guidance, that if day/sun light levels are ok then there is no issue of outlook (which is what I think you were saying on the phone)?

It is my view that loss of outlook/overbearing impact is a valid planning objection where it would affect the living conditions of existing occupiers and that such an impact is difficult to quantify/involves a degree of subjective judgement (in my view, there are no tests to quantify this).

I would also question the weight to be given to the BRE standards being as they are guidance, and given that they are not referred to in our Local Plan.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, [Arun District Council](#) |
Location: Planning, First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

[REDACTED]
Please note that I typically work from home on Thursdays when I am unreachable on my work phone

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



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: James Hutchison [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 December 2019 17:32
To: Simon Davis [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: BR/233/19/PL - 77 Aldwick Road

Dear Simon,

Thank you for confirming the windows that you feel would be adversely affected by the proposed development.

Please could you now confirm which of the BRE tests (if any) you have used to ascertain that there would be such an impact?

My reason for asking this question is because on our own assessment (using the appropriate VSC test within the BRE guidance) the proposed scheme complies on all windows and by a substantial margin.

For the purposes of methodology, I trust that you are in agreement that the below quote (i.e. the VSC test) from the BRE guidance is applicable in this context:

"If any part of a new building or extension, measured in a vertical section perpendicular to a main window wall of an existing building, from the centre of the lowest window, subtends an angle of more than 25o to the horizontal, then the diffused daylighting of the existing building may be adversely affected.."

I have attached to this e-mail a quick overlay of the VSC test as applied to the western elevation (i.e. a vertical section showing the 'affected' window) of the proposed development. The VSC test has been carried out using the centre point of the lowest window as per the BRE guidance (and also using the 2m from FFL as is also commonly used). Both VSC lines comfortably sit well above the proposed extension meaning that the diffused daylight is, quite simply, not going to be adversely affected. On this basis, an assessment using universally applied BRE methodology supports our case that there would not be an adverse impact.

I have applied the VSC test to the nearest habitable room window (i.e. the first floor rear facing opening serving a living area of no.77) as this should show the worst-case scenario in terms of any potential loss of daylight or outlook. The kitchen of no.77 has no seating area or means to accommodate a seating area and is not a habitable room. However, evidently, even were you to apply the VSC to the kitchen window, with a higher centre point and by virtue of the fact that the extension is not perpendicular, the test would be easily passed. The further away the openings at nos. 75 and 79 means the less they are to be impacted.

Obviously these are our own calculations, and to come to the conclusion that the windows would be adversely affected as you have stated, I trust that you have carried out a test(s) that show a contrary result and conclusion to the one that I have shown attached/above. Please can you share your methodology and results?

Notwithstanding the above, I trust that we are in agreement that the Local Planning Authority does not currently have a five year housing land supply (please refer to our planning statement for the justification of this statement), and therefore paragraph 11(d)(ii) of the NPPF applies meaning that permission should only be refused if the adverse impacts of approval would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

I trust that you will also be familiar with paragraph 123 (c) of the NPPF (again, please refer to our planning statement) whereby Local Planning Authorities are instructed to take a flexible approach to applying policies or guidance relating to daylight and sunlight in the cases where a Local Planning Authority is unable to demonstrate a sufficient and policy compliant housing land supply, and where applying those daylight and sunlight policies in full would otherwise inhibit making the most efficient use of a site.

My client has already given us the go ahead to appeal any decision to refuse permission on the basis of your points raised today. However, in view of the above, and in the absence of knowing to date the methodology you have applied in deciding that the adverse impacts are significant, we would politely request you to share this information and/or reconsider your opinion and recommendation.

I look forward to hearing from you shortly please.

Kind Regards,

James

James Hutchison MRTPI
Planning Director

[REDACTED]
Address: Suite 2, Littlehampton Business Centre, Gratwicke House, 10 East Street, Littlehampton, West
Sussex, BN17 6AW
[REDACTED]



Registered Company No: 09991331

From: Simon Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 December [REDACTED]
To: James Hutchison [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: BR/233/19/PL - 77 Aldwick Road

Dear James,

The relevant windows would be (1) the existing first floor flat's living/dining room window and the terrace/balcony which it shares with its kitchen; (2) the rear/rear side windows and terrace/balcony of the first floor flat on 79 next door and (3) the rear windows of the first floor on 77 next door.

I will speak to another colleague to see whether he has the capacity to write this one up for me before Christmas. If so then I will confirm who is doing it and a rough timescale.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council |
Location: Planning - First Floor - Arun Civic Centre - Maltravers Road - Littlehampton - BN17 5LE

Please note that I typically work from home on Thursdays when I am unreachable on my work phone

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



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: James Hutchison [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 December 2019 14:23
To: Simon Davis [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: BR/233/19/PL - 77 Aldwick Road

Dear Simon,

Thank you for your e-mail.

I would be grateful if you could please confirm the following:

- (i) The precise windows (and on which properties) you perceive there to be an unacceptable impact on the loss of light and outlook;
- (ii) Your timeframe for issuing a decision.

I intend to visit the site tomorrow morning and would be grateful for your reply this afternoon please.

Kind Regards,

James

James Hutchison MRTPI
Planning Director

[REDACTED]
Address: Suite 2, Littlehampton Business Centre, Gratwicke House, 10 East Street, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 6AW
[REDACTED]

Corbil 
ESTATES & PLANNING LTD

Registered Company No: 09991331

From: Simon Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 December 2019 13:23
To: James Hutchison [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: BR/233/19/PL - 77 Aldwick Road

Dear James,

I have discussed the application with my Team Leader and consider that we will refuse the application on grounds of residential amenity impacts to the existing flats on the building and the next door buildings. The reduction in the scale of the building from last time has improved the potential situation but we consider that there would still be impacts in terms of light loss/loss of outlook which cannot be resolved. You may have noted the local opposition (objections received) to the loss of the existing ancillary space to the dry cleaners. However, we do not have any policies which could be used to defend a refusal on those grounds. Your client may therefore wish to submit an application solely for the ground floor flat.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, [Arun District Council](#) |
Location: Planning, First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Tel: 01323 837115 | Email: s.j.davis@arun.gov.uk | www.arun.gov.uk
Please note that I typically work from home on Thursdays when I am unreachable on my work phone



From: James Hutchison [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 December 2019 09:01
To: Simon Davis [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: BR/233/19/PL - 77 Aldwick Road

Dear Simon,

Thank you for the confirmation.

Have you any updates on the application yet in respect of timescales and/or likely recommendation?

Kind Regards,

James

James Hutchison MRTPI
Planning Director

[REDACTED]
Address: Suite 2, Littlehampton Business Centre, Gratwicke House, 10 East Street, Littlehampton, West
Sussex, BN17 6AW
[REDACTED]



ESTATES & PLANNING LTD

Registered Company No: 09991331

From: Simon Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 November [REDACTED]
To: James Hutchison [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: BR/233/19/PL - 77 Aldwick Road

Dear James,

This has been actioned.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council |
Location: Planning, First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
[REDACTED]

Please note that I typically work from home on Thursdays when I am unreachable on my work phone



From: James Hutchison [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 November 2019 08:40
To: Simon Davis [REDACTED]
Subject: BR/233/19/PL - 77 Aldwick Road

Dear Simon,

I write regarding the above referenced planning application for which I understand that you are the case officer.

I have taken instruction from my client in respect of this application and he would like to add his company name to the applicant's details.

The company name is **Monairit Properties Limited**

Please note that the application will remain in Simon Royall's name as the sole shareholder of the above company.

Please can you confirm receipt and when this has been added?

Thank you

Kind Regards,

James

James Hutchison MRTPI
Planning Director

E-Mail: [REDACTED]
Tel: 07517 980 401
Address: Suite 2, Littlehampton Business Centre, Gratwicke House, 10 East Street, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 6AW
Website: [REDACTED]



ESTATES & PLANNING LTD

Registered Company No: 09991331

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>

DX 57406 Littlehampton

You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any

reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>
DX 57406 Littlehampton
You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>
DX 57406 Littlehampton
You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>
DX 57406 Littlehampton
You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>
DX 57406 Littlehampton
You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>
DX 57406 Littlehampton
You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.
