

Land West of Church Lane, Clymping, West Sussex

Outline application for the erection of up to 300 dwellings and ancillary development comprising open space, a building within use class D1 of up to 875 square metres net, a building for A1 use having a floor area of up to 530 sq. metres net, together with open space and ancillary works, including car parking and drainage arrangements, with appearance, landscaping, layout; and scale wholly reserved for subsequent approval. The access detail, showing the points of access to the development, and indicated on Bellamy Roberts drawings numbered 4724/013 and 4724/005 Rev A are access proposals to be determined at this stage of the application. For the avoidance of doubt all other access detail within the site is to be determined as a reserved matter at a later stage.

Planning Statement Addendum



On behalf of Mulgrave Properties LLP

April 2018



1. Introduction

1.1. Background

1.1.1. In August 2017 Arun District Council refused to grant planning permission in response to an application for planning permission couched in materially the same terms as are used in the description of the current application. That refusal, of application number CM-1-17-OUT, is the subject of a planning appeal to the Planning Inspectorate due to be heard by way of a Public Inquiry to be held in July 2018.

1.1.2. The refusal reasons were twofold. Firstly a concern regarding prematurity of the proposed development in the context of the emerging Arun Local Plan 2011 – 2031. The second reason for refusal related to concerns about the safety of two junctions on the A259 namely the Oyster Catcher Junction and the Comet Corner Junction.

1.2. Events since Refusal of Planning Permission

1.2.1 Since the determination of the earlier application and the progression of the appeal the Examination hearings for the emerging Arun Local Plan have been completed and the Inspector's report of his findings is anticipated to be made available at about the same time as the Public Inquiry.

1.2.2 As the hearings for the examination into the Local Plan has been completed the Council announced in its statement of case for the appeal that it no longer wished to pursue the refusal reason relating to prematurity which leaves the sole issue between the developer and the Council that of the safety issues relating to the two junctions mentioned above.

1.2.3 At the invitation of the Council a meeting has been held to discuss the merits of holding the appeal in abeyance and determining the application with a focus on examining resolution of the sole remaining issue namely the junction safety issues.

1.2.4 Mulgrave Properties LLP has considered this and agrees with the merit of exploring this through a new application. This statement accompanies that new application.

1.2.5 It is normal procedure for the Planning Inspectorate to only consider holding a scheduled appeal in abeyance when a fresh application seeking resolution of outstanding issues has been lodged. Thus immediately the application is registered a formal request on behalf of the appellant will be despatched to the Planning Inspectorate seeking the deferral of the July Inquiry until November to enable this new application to be determined. It is understood the Council will offer immediate support to this request for the appeal to be held in abeyance.

1.2.6 The application as submitted is accompanied by materially the same documents as submitted with application CM 1-17-OUT. Investigations and activity is in hand on various aspects of the submission, especially the highway safety matters. It is considered prudent to lodge the application as soon as possible given the timetable for

the currently scheduled Inquiry. There are aspects of the application document that need to be updated and the remainder of this statement comprises a description of the aspects and where possible an indication of the timescale.

2. Proposed Revisions to the Planning Statement December 2016

2.1. Highway Matters

2.1.1 The company's Highway Consultants have opened a dialogue with the Highway Authority which is aimed at dimensioning the appropriate action to address the question of safety at the two relevant junctions within the limits imposed by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

2.1.2 This work is involving studies already commissioned by the Highway Authority and the timing is geared to that work.

2.2. Ecology

2.2.1 The original survey work in connection with ecology issues which was undertaken previously is considered to be sufficiently recent for it to remain valid. However it is considered appropriate to update this and the opportunity is being taken of seasonal prospects to update the ecology database. This is being programmed as follows:-

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA)

- Survey - Middle April
- Report will be issued by mid-May

Great Crested Newt surveys

- 6 surveys between Mid-April and Mid-June
- Report will be issued by the end of June.

Badger (If required)

- Survey – Late April
- Report will be issued by late May

Bat Tree Assessment

- Survey – Early May

Bat activity surveys

- Survey 1 – Early May
- Surveys 2 and 3 – Middle May to beginning June (If required)
- Report will be issued by the end of June

Arboricultural Tree Assessment

- Survey – May
- Report will be issued by the end of June

2.3. Drainage

2.3.1 At the time of the previous application there was significant public concern regarding ground water and surface water flooding. This was not a concern either of the applicants own consultants following their investigations nor was it significant to the Council's advisers.

2.3.2 However it is considered appropriate for further work on this aspect to be commissioned in order to deliver a fuller picture for members of the public who simply respond to the fact that the fields are immersed in large puddles from time to time. This new work will seek to show why this will not happen when the site is developed, and make it more clear what changes takes place in the water run-off regime. This will take into account percolation rates, and show more clearly how these will be changed through Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)

2.4. Heritage Matters

2.4.1 Historic England was in principle content with the impact of the proposed development on the heritage assets. They did seek some further information regarding the possible impact of the new drainage regime and marshalling this information will be harnessed with the drainage refinement described above.

2.5. Section 106 Agreement

2.5.1 The previous application was accompanied by a draft Section 106 Agreement. Much of the earlier agreement will not require changing, but some changes are necessary to address changes in emerging Local Plan policy and the highway discussions referred to above.

2.6. Housing Land Supply

2.6.1 The latest housing land supply figures available in the Council's Authority Monitoring Report indicate a land supply of deliverable housing sites amounting to about 2.2 years supply. This is marginally better than that which existed at the time the previous application was determined. However it is still far short of the 5+ years supply required to meet national policy.

3. Concluding Remarks

3.1.1. Whilst it would have been preferred to have addressed and resolved all the above matters before submitting the new planning application this would not have been able to be undertaken in time to secure the postponement of the Inquiry fixed for July as the

practice of the Planning Inspectorate is not to permit postponement unless a further application is already in place.

- 3.1.2. Documentation covering the updated material will be submitted as early as possible, and in the meantime the application can be registered and work on processing begun.