

Simon Davis

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 January 2014 14:56
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Nikolas Antoniou; Roger Spencer; Daniel Vick
Subject: RE: BR/272/13 on Wednesday 15th January 2014

Dear Councillor Brooks,

I've been asked to reply to you regarding your email to Karl Roberts. I am the case officer for this application.

I note your concerns regarding the request by Natural England to shorten the ramp. Unfortunately, I am duty bound to follow their advice as they are our statutory consultees and the experts in terms of the potential for impact to the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Hence I requested that Mr Elwin submit an amended plan to shorten the length of the ramp. This he did so in late December 2013.

I have been in contact with Mr Elwin since the receipt of the Natural England comments and I understand his concerns repeated in your email about shortening the ramp. Indeed, I understand that he spoke with Natural England today and that Natural England have agreed to consider a compromise solution of allowing the ramp to extend a metre beyond the outfall pipe. I have advised Mr Elwin by telephone today that an amendment can be made as long as the amended plan is received by end of play tomorrow (the deadline for amendments is 10am on Wednesday) and that I will also require something in writing from Natural England.

As to your last question, this does not seem to be an issue if (as expected) Natural England do agree to the extra 1 metre (as Mr Elwin has also agreed to this). However, the planning committee would be able to agree to the full extra 2m if they so wished although I would recommend not making a decision against the advice of Natural England as should damage to the beach (& SSSI) occur then ultimately the Council could be responsible. The original drawings submitted do show the ramp with the extra 2m so we would not need a new plan submitting to show this – rather we would just need to alter the plans condition to reference the previously superseded drawing.

I trust that this answers your queries.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI, Senior Planning Officer, Development Control
Arun District Council (First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF)

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk
P Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Nikolas Antoniou
Sent: 13 January 2014 10:45
To: Simon Davis
Subject: FW: BR/272/13 on Wednesday 15th January 2014

From: Karl Roberts
Sent: 12 January 2014 19:54
To: Nikolas Antoniou
Subject: FW: BR/272/13 on Wednesday 15th January 2014

Can you look into this and respond please to Cllr Brooks

From: Jim Brooks [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 January 2014 19:57
To: Karl Roberts
Cc: Brenda & Joe Elwin
Subject: BR/272/13 on Wednesday 15th January 2014

Hi Karl

BR/272/13 for consideration on Wednesday 15th January 2014

Sorry to add another request when you're so busy but this probably needs your input.

The planning application is for a beach ramp at Bognor Regis Yacht Club which is well supported with no objections.

Roger Spencer has been most helpful with design and advice on this proposal but the plan going forward makes the ramp approx. 2 metres shorter and with a slightly steeper incline than originally designed.

This is because Natural England (Natural England measures requested item 1.) does not wish the ramp to extend past the nearby outfall pipe.

This is disappointing because much of the support for this ramp is for pedestrian use and prams, wheelchairs, small buggies, children etc. will suffer an increased incline and I believe that that last 2 metres may sometimes be the difference between reaching the sand or not. There is presently no pedestrian access to the sand anywhere along the whole length of Bognor Regis sea front.

I understand the reason given by Natural England is that water from the outfall pipe could 'erode' the area around the end of the ramp. However photographic evidence and years of experience from Mr Elwin and Yacht Club members demonstrate the outfall water follows the side of the adjacent breakwater past the ramp end and straight to the sea. In any case matters like erosion and movement of shingle have all been taken into consideration in the design and I believe Roger Spencer and the Yacht Club feel this is not a problem.

Mr Elwin and myself will be speaking at the meeting requesting the original length be maintained (It might be good if Roger could be there too). However I understand the Committee may have to consider the 'shorter' plan put before them.

No one wants to risk having to re-submit or 'muddying the waters' (sorry) or risk rejection at this stage. However this extra 2 metres is considered important for the successful operation of the ramp which is not going to be inexpensive.

Mr Elwin is seeking a 'change of heart' from Natural England and I understand they are divided on the matter, depending on who you speak to.

So I guess what we need to know is -

If Natural England was to withdraw its 'objection' 1. could the Committee approve the plan before them allowing the extra 2 metres, or would another plan need to be produced, or even a new submission?

If Natural England was to agree to the extra 2 metres before Wednesday's meeting, would a letter/email from them be enough to present to the Committee?

If Natural England does not agree to the extra 2 metres what would be the consequences of the Committee agreeing to the extra 2 metres? Is it beyond the power planning-wise for the committee to override Natural England's view on this given, our officer does not think there is a problem?

Any other helpful advice?

Kind regards

Jim Brooks