

From: Gardiner Hanson [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 March 2025 17:33
To: David Easton
Cc: John Longhorn; David Dodds; Neil Crowther; Jessica Riches
Subject: Re: F/14/24/RES, F/15/24/RES, and F/16/24/RES - March 2025 Update

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Dear David,

Thank you for your email last week setting out ADC officer's position.

On behalf of Vistry South East, we are happy to agree the proposed extension of time on each RM application through 30th April 2025.

Whilst we await further review/comment from ADC Drainage and WSCC Highways we would hope and expect we can continue to work positively with ADC officers in respect of each RM application to address remaining consultee comments, particularly case officer/design comments and the EHO noise objections.

We remain positive and confident that subject to some further minor amendments and preparation of supplemental information that we will be to resolve outstanding objections allowing officers to support our 3 x RM applications.

Drainage Position

Whilst we understand the ADC drainage team are currently working through the back log in their queue, and it is likely weeks before we can expect the supplemental information to be reviewed, we would reiterate that we consider it critical and expedient to agree and arrange a meeting between ADC Drainage, LLFA and Ardent at the earliest convenience to present and discuss the updated site-wide monitoring and overall drainage strategy. My understanding is there are nuances in the data/soil conditions/interpretation of results, so hence our continued request for a meeting between engineers so this can all be discussed collectively rather than back and forth. ADC planning officer assistance in helping facilitate a meeting would be greatly appreciated.

We understand your position and frustrations with additional supplemental information being issued in a seemingly ad hoc manner, but from our perspective we have also been caught in a scenario where ADC and LLFA drainage officers are issuing contradictory positions. We have simply been seeking to address LLFA and ADC officer comments proactively. We apologise if this has caused internal frustrations with additional re-consultations, but we would also flag our frustrations from a drainage perspective given the uncoordinated ADC/LLFA drainage responses and late-stage ADC objections.

At pre-application stage, we were advised ADC Drainage did not have capacity for formal engagement and irrespectively that the LLFA is the primary consultee for major applications. As you will be aware, when we engaged with the LLFA pre-application, they notably stated as part of pre-application feedback (dated 19th July 2024) that the level of groundwater monitoring, infiltration testing and principles of the overall strategy were acceptable, albeit subject to some further information required related to detailed design, catchments, discharge rates, calculations, etc.

At this stage, we as an applicant team were confident that the level of monitoring required to underpin the RM submissions had been agreed and accepted by the relevant consultee. It is only as part of ADC's most recent formal consultation responses on F/14/24/RES (28th Feb 2025) and F/15/24/RES (10th March 2025)

that there has been a formal position stated by ADC Drainage suggesting insufficient site investigations have been undertaken.

We recognise that ADC officers have informally stated from the outset of the project that additional groundwater/infiltration monitoring would be recommended, which is the reason an additional 11 x ground water monitoring locations were installed during the 2023/24 winter season to supplement the original 21 x ground water monitoring locations at outline approval stage. In terms of the additional 8 x infiltration testing locations that are presented within Ardent's technical note (12th March 2025), this was instructed following a post-submission meeting with the LLFA on 25th Nov. 2024, with LLFA officer, Mat Jackson. The initial IRM (F/14/24/RES) and RM1 (F/15/24/RES) LLFA consultation responses stated that additional infiltration testing should be undertaken in areas with low groundwater in the northern part of the site where infiltration may be feasible. As a precautionary approach Vistry instructed the additional to be undertaken, but the work was not completed until following the resubmission of each RM c. 17th Dec 2024. Notably, the LLFA's second formal consultation response for IRM and RM1 (17th Feb 2025) re-confirmed that sufficient groundwater and infiltration investigations had been undertaken.

Ardent and Vistry's technical teams remain steadfast that sufficient monitoring/investigations has been undertaken, and introducing any localised infiltration on this site would not be appropriate due to high groundwater levels, poor infiltration rates, and varying sub-soil conditions. Clearly given the technical nature of the matters, a direct meeting between engineers to discuss the interpretation and application of the results should be convened which can hopefully allow both parties to reach an agreed position. Given the ongoing contradicting positions between LLFA/ADC Drainage, we would hope a meeting can be convened as soon as possible. .

EHO Noise Position

Noting the in-principle objection raised by ADC EHO on all 3 x RM applications, Ardent are currently reviewing the EHO comments and preparing a technical note to address all EHO comments. We would expect to be able to share with officers in the coming week or so. Following issue of the technical note, we would similarly like to request a meeting with EHO officers and planning officers to discuss the results and mitigation options. We consider our proposals to be in broad accordance with Section 4 of the Outline Waste Infrastructure Statement (as required via OPP Cond. 25), but we are happy to review options with officers.

The technical note we are expecting to cover the following:

- Cumulative noise baseline modelling
- Assessment of 3m vs. 4m noise attenuating fencing mitigation
- Landscape details proposed to mitigate/screen noise attenuation fencing
- Closed window / GSHP mitigation strategy

Next Steps

As stated above, in the interim as we await ADC Drainage comments, the applicant team would aim to continue working positively with Jessica over the coming weeks to deal with any other unresolved matters that she considers need to be addressed. There's been lots of positive progress made to date, so just hoping we can work through the final unresolved issues to the benefit of all parties.

Subject to a positive outcome of the ADC Drainage review and meeting, we would also like to progress with reinstating the PPA as soon as reasonably possible to:

- 1) enable further minor amends (if needed) to the RM applications;
- 2) progress the S106 Deed of Variation;
- 3) submission/determination of pre-commencement outline conditions/obligations; and
- 4) set a new target Planning Committee date.

Should you have any queries or wish to directly discuss, please don't hesitate to get back in touch.

Kind regards,

Gardiner Hanson



From: David Easton <[REDACTED]>
Date: Thursday, 13 March 2025 at 14:50
To: Gardiner Hanson <[REDACTED]>
Cc: John Longhorn <[REDACTED]>, David Dodds <[REDACTED]> Neil Crowther <[REDACTED]> Jessica Riches <[REDACTED]>
Subject: F/14/24/RES, F/15/24/RES, and F/16/24/RES - March 2025 Update

Dear Gardiner,

I write in relation to reserved matters applications F/14/24/RES, F/15/24/RES, and F/16/24/RES.

Revised planning application documents and plans, in relation to the above applications, were submitted to the council on 19 December 2024. This information was submitted prior to all consultee comments having been received or officer's providing a full summary on the applications. Unfortunately, due to the way in which the revised documents submission was packaged with missing documentation and multiple amendments due to late and additional plans, the documents were fully uploaded and re-consultations on the amended information were sent out on 31 January 2025. Given the statutory advertisement period of 21 days, the re-consultation window for F/14/24/RES and F/16/24/RES ran until 28 February 2025. Due to the further amendment of the description for F/15/24/RES the re-consultation for this application ran until 7 March 2025.

Regarding outstanding consultation responses, comments have been provided by the council's design officer for F/14/24/RES, which was the only application with outstanding design comments. Please find these attached for reference. As you are aware, heritage comments were received and shared with you on 27 February 2025. Please see the Ecologist's comments attached, which required synchronising with the outstanding discharge of condition application F/28/24/DOC. Environmental Health comments have also been shared with you on 10 March 2025, and are also attached for ease. Drainage Engineers have also submitted their comments for IRM and RM1, leaving comments from RM4 only. Therefore, the only outstanding comments are from the councils Tree Officer (ADC) and Highways (WSCC) (RM1 and RM4 only). In relation to the absence of comments from the tree officer it is not anticipated that this will delay determination further as in the absence of any TPO's on-site officers are able to review the impacts of the development on trees without additional input.

As you are also aware, the Environmental Health Officer has objected to all three RM applications. This is on the basis that the noise assessments are inadequate due to the failure to consider all noise sources without mitigation, or adequately consider cumulative noise sources (such as roads, industrial uses, air source heat pumps), and the testing data during the working week was largely omitted due to adverse weather and as such the results cannot be entirely relied upon. Worst case scenarios based on permitted uses have also not been accounted for and the principle of using closed windows as the primary acoustic solution on a greenfield site has been objected to in principle.

In addition, it has been noted that the proposed development incorporates a 4m high acoustic barrier adjacent to Ford Airfield Industrial Estate, and Redstone Tyres. These elements are included within F/14/24/RES, but they appear to only be necessary to mitigate noise impacts upon dwellings which will be delivered through subsequent reserved matters proposals. As identified through the NPPF, noise should be considered as part of the design process, with noise being addressed and designed out in the first instance, rather than relying upon physical mitigation to make noise impacts acceptable. Therefore, justification has not been adequately demonstrated, nor has any information been provided to justify this approach. Despite the absence of this detail, concerns exist as to the visual impact this would have upon the character of this semi-rural development, especially adjacent to Ford Road.

The Environmental Health comments also highlight odour as part of their objection, and whilst there is a condition requiring odour assessments only within a certain range of the odour source, there remains concern with the proximity of development within this RM to the odour buffer edge. Officers will be reviewing this in further detail to ascertain if the information provided is adequate to meet the requirements of the condition.

Furthermore, the Section 106 Agreement was discussed during scheduled meetings in 2024 where it was highlighted that the current wording would not allow for appropriate management of the play areas. Currently the Section 106 ensures a management company will maintain 3 LEAPs and 6 LAPS. However, as part of the Design Code, this was correctly defined to provide the minimum quantum of play and allowed these LEAP and LAPs to be of a size akin to a playground, which resulted in a higher number of play areas. As discussed, a Deed of Variation is required to ensure that any play area is suitably managed by a responsible body and is consistent with the approvals.

As identified above, comments have now been provided by the council's Drainage Engineers for F/14/24/RES with objections having been raised (28 February 2025). These objections are due to the absence of sufficient ground water monitoring and infiltration testing as the information provided for the northern parcels suggests that there is the potential for some infiltration. The council's Drainage Engineers were also asked to look at the evidence base for F/15/24/RES and have concluded that the ground water monitoring and infiltration testing is inadequate to rule out infiltration (10 March 2025), and as a result, no further comments on the drainage strategy have been undertaken. It must be highlighted that officers have advised that it is imperative that sufficient winter ground water monitoring and infiltration testing was carried out to support the application as far back as September 2023, prior to the first pre-application submission. It was further advised in 2024 that winter monitoring would ensure that if any issues were raised by Engineers the information would be available in early 2025 to address these issues. However, monitoring has not been presented, and we are now in the position whereby the necessary data is insufficient. It is unlikely that additional testing from this point forward will be sufficient to evidence peak groundwater levels, meaning that the next opportunity for this data will be winter 2025/26.

Regarding F/16/24/RES, the Council's Drainage Engineers have advised that the groundwater monitoring and infiltration testing data supplied is sufficient to demonstrate that infiltration will not be possible (given the consistency of results). Engineers are reviewing the additional information provided on this application (submitted 24 February 2025) and this has delayed the submission of their final comments. However, it has been verbally advised that objections will remain regarding the overall drainage strategy for the southern parcel.

Based on the objections received to date from the Council's Drainage Engineers and Environmental Health any recommendation from officers would have to be for refusal.

However, on the 12 March 2025 an email was submitted advising that further infiltration testing across the northern part of the site was undertaken in December 2024 which addresses concerns

from previous consultation responses and meetings. It should be noted that officers have not previously been advised that this monitoring work was being or had been undertaken and it was not contained within the original submission. The piecemeal submission of additional information in this way is very unhelpful and causes additional delays with consultations having already been carried out on the previously submitted information and as such a new consultation will now need to be generated.

The additional information submitted 12 March 2025 is accepted and will be the subject of consultation with both the ADC Drainage Engineers and the LLFA. The consultation process is likely to take several weeks to complete with the application needing to join the queue. To allow consultees and officers adequate time to review this information, an extension of time until 30 April 2025 would be necessary. It should be made clear however that if the consultation response received from Engineers does not result in the support of the testing and subsequent design of the layout, the council will seek to prepare a recommendation for refusal under delegated authority.

I would be grateful if you could please provide written confirmation of your agreement to the extension of time for the determination of this application until 30 April 2025.


It should also be noted that the email of 12 March 2025 from Charlie Cooper requested a meeting to be set up between ADC Engineers and the applicants drainage team to discuss the infiltration approach. However, it was made clear that a clarification meeting on IRM and RM1 was agreeable once consultation responses had been received (of which the latest for IRM and RM1 was received on 10 March 2025). Now that new amended information has been received, a new consultation is required, and therefore a meeting with engineers would be more appropriate once they have had an opportunity to review the additional information.

Kind regards,

David Easton
Strategic Development Team Leader, Planning

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder




<https://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.



tor&co Reg No. 1935454 Registered Office: Everdene House, Deansleigh Road, Bournemouth BH7 7DU