

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

From: Simon Davis

Sent: 28 November 2018 10:19

To: 'mo cook'

Subject: RE: BR/281/18/PL 99 Victoria Drive Bognor Regis

Dear Mo,

The S.106 Agreement is required to secure a financial contribution of £871 per new dwelling to offset the likely impact of new people / recreation on the Pagham Harbour Special Protection Area. Please note that this agreement is required to be submitted whether or not planning permission is granted or not - i.e. it does not predetermine the decision. I do not see any references within the document to them confirming that no work has or hasn't commenced. Please also note that the work that they may have been carrying out at the property may not be work that requires planning permission e.g. site clearance, internal alterations etc.

I note the two BRTC comments but as both say exactly the same, I consider this to be a duplication error on their part and nothing more.

I will add your comments to our website as a comment on the application.

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
Internal: 37874 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737874 | E-mail: simon.davis@arun.gov.uk 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 P
Save the environment - think before you print.

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

From: mo cook

Sent: 28 November 2018 09:08

To: Simon Davis

Subject: Re: BR/281/18/PL 99 Victoria Drive Bognor Regis

Good morning Simon...

Sorry to be a pest again, but there are a couple of things that seem strange about this Application:

In the S106 Planning agreement there are several references to Pagham Harbour which has confused me:

Once under Background (D)

and twice under Agreement Terms, Definitions 1.1

The Application document is quite fuzzy, therefore difficult to read, but appears to be confirming that no work had commenced at the property. Yet clearance work has been going on for about 6 months and has already caused distress and damage to adjacent properties.

There are two Documents posted by BRTC stating "no objections" OWQ92C20686 and 20692, both dated 22/11/18.

The owner of Messy Lets, who appears to own the building now, originally assured neighbours that he was only adding an extension.

Kind regards,

Mo