

Bronte Welham

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 30 November 2017 08:44
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: LU 121 17 RES response to highway conditions

From: Michael Eastham
Sent: 30 November 2017 08:27
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: LU 121 17 RES response to highway conditions

Please upload on Ocella as response from applicant to correspondence from the Local Highway Authority.

Thanks,

Michael

From: Graham, Laura [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 November 2017 16:01
To: Michael Eastham
Subject: RE: LU 121 17 RES response to highway conditions

Hello Michael

My comments are as follows (and they take into consideration of the relevant tests of the NPPG):

1 – This condition can not be accepted. It is overly restrictive and ties the occupation of this site to the completion of the Lyminster Bypass, which goes against all our discussions as we need occupations on this site to help fund the bypass (and other infrastructure requirements). We are currently preparing a build programme which will be circulated shortly, but as a summary the Lyminster Bypass won't be completed until Sept /Oct 2019, whereas we are hoping to get occupations on this phase by August 2018.

Occupations on this phase of development can not be tied to the delivery of the Lyminster Bypass as this will effectively mean we are no further forward and the site remains closed. Importantly the transport statement submitted with the application supports that the 126 dwellings that it provides for can be accommodated via Toddington Lane and the IDR (the improvements to Toddington Lane will be completed long before the occupations start and Bovis will be off site not long after thus reducing some of the current pressures being faced). I am also not clear why further detail on the construction of the Main Spine Road needs to be submitted. All this information has been provided with the RMA submission. As you have agreed by discharging outline condition 26.

Really sorry but I can not agree with this condition and if it is imposed will be forced to appeal which is in neither our interests. It also fails the tests of the NPPG as it represents a standardised condition used to impose broad unnecessary controls.

2 – This condition is overly restricted. It is common for development sites to be occupied as the dwellings are constructed, indeed this is what is happening at A1 and B3/B5. I can appreciate the need for a condition that requires access roads, car parking areas and footpaths required to be in place before dwellings are occupied, but a phase wide restriction is not necessary. Therefore, can this condition be changed to reflect this. Suggested wording below.

No dwelling shall be occupied until the road(s), footways, and casual parking areas serving it have been constructed, surfaced and drained in accordance with the plans and details as approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Again I can not agree the wording as currently drafted as it is overly restrictive and also goes against the NPPG and what we have been trying to achieve in getting this application approved.

3 – I don't think this condition is needed. A surface water strategy has been submitted with the application, which details the surface water strategy proposed for the site, which will ensure that all surface water is dealt with. This infrastructure will have to be installed before the dwellings are erected and occupied. Even if you can not discharge 10, then information submitted to discharge it separately will cover this requirement.

4 – again needs to be changed to relate dwelling occupation rather than the development as a whole.

5 – as with my comments on condition 2 wording this condition as site wide is overly restrictive. The wording needs to reflect dwelling occupation not development occupation, e.g.

No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicle parking and turning spaces have been constructed in accordance with the approved plans. These spaces shall thereafter be retained for their designated use.

I also wonder if this needs to be separate condition? Can the requirements not be wrapped up under condition 2?

6 - as per your comments this requirement is already dealt with by outline conditions.

Kind regards
Laura

Laura Graham
Head of Planning

Land & Technical Department

Persimmon Homes Thames Valley
Persimmon House
Knoll Road
Camberley
Surrey
GU15 3TQ

From: Michael Eastham [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 November 2017 14:24
To: Graham, Laura
Subject: LU 121 17 RES response 3 (2)

Hi Laura,

Tim Townsend has requested that 6 conditions be imposed on the RM approval but proposed Condition 5 (Construction Method Statement) is already covered by Condition 22 imposed on the outline planning permission LU/47/11; and proposed Condition 6 (Landscaping of Main Avenue) is covered by Condition 14 of LU/47/11 and you have submitted the landscaping details with the RM application.

Would you agree?

Kind regards,

Michael

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

NLPG UPRN 100062237016
DX 57406 Littlehampton

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.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient please contact the sender and delete the message.

Persimmon Homes Limited is registered in England number 4108747, Charles Church Developments Limited is registered in England number 1182689 and Space4 Limited is registered in England number 3702606. These companies are wholly owned subsidiaries of Persimmon Plc registered in England number 1818486, the Registered Office of these four companies is Persimmon House, Fulford, York YO19 4FE.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
