Post 1/6

Mr N Harlow & Miss A Jackson
11 The Poplars
Worthing Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 6GZ

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
TECHNICAL SUPPORT
22 AUG 2012
ACTION.....
(of 5)

The Planning Department
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

Date: 21st August 2012

Dear Sirs,

Re: Planning application LU/182/12 – 7 No Residential Units and Garages – The Poplars, Worthing Road, Littlehampton

We write to you today in order to raise our objection to the above mentioned planning application; we have set out below our concerns regarding this application, and would ask that they are taken into consideration when making a decision.

- Firstly we would point out that this application is almost identical to the previous application LU/306/11 apart from rotating two plots a few degrees which appears to have no real improvement over the previous application, nor does it seek to address any of the other reasons for the previous refusal on the site as might be expected, all it attempts to do is dispute their legality, which should the developer had just concerns on this surely they would have raised an appeal against the decision notice, or even questioned the due process during the judicial review period.

- The land is not "undeveloped land" as described in the design statement and application form submitted, but is an "open space", as defined on the current consent for the site LU/439/03, this "open space" is used on a daily basis by members of the community for children's ball games (not able to be played in the play area) and also for general recreation and exercising pets as well as providing a visual amenity and area for wildlife. This, we believe, was the original intent in requiring the definition as "Open Space" on the implemented consent, and the condition 5 of that consent, in relation to the area "*being in accordance with the West Sussex Structure Plan and Arun District Local Plan*". We believe, therefore, that any subsequent development on this site would not then be in accordance with those documents recommendations.

- We would also note that whether the area is shown on local maps or not it is still protected by the government guidelines for open spaces – extracts of which are below

  PPS8 - "It should also be noted, however, that existing open space, regardless of whether it is identified on plan maps or not, benefits from the protection afforded by Policy OS1"

  PPG17 - "11. *Open space and sports and recreational facilities that are of high quality, or of particular value to a local community, should be recognised and given protection by local authorities through appropriate policies in plans. Areas of particular quality may include:*
  i. small areas of open space in urban areas that provide an important local amenity and offer recreational and play opportunities;
  iii. *areas of open space that particularly benefit wildlife and biodiversity."*

- Due to the daily use by local residents, it is clear that the usage of the area as an important local open amenity space has been established as described above and, as such, should be protected from any development.

- The proposed reduced open space is an area behind 2/3 storey properties bounded by 6 foot timber fencing on two sides and 2.4m high "acoustic" fence on the other, this hardly constitutes a safe and open space for children or pets, with no visual security. Also, additional properties and less open space would appear to be heading the wrong way yet again to the government guidance.

- The site we understand has one of the main infrastructure water pipes between Littlehampton and Arundel running under it and potentially other services, we know of these because twice in the last 12 months there have been two substantial burst pipe episodes which have result in significant flooding to the open space on both occasions, and upon speaking with the people carrying out the repair work.

We still ask why these properties were not included on the original application for the site making it 50 units not 43? We still, despite the developers new consultants view, believe it was because the application required an amount of "open space" and this area was designated as such on the approved plans.

We believe this application to develop the land is in direct opposition to the government and local planning guidance and policy for protection of open spaces and, as such, should be rejected, and the decision should be able to be given to prevent any further applications on this site which will waste officers time in reviewing what will be no doubt a string of numerous applications from the developer with minor amendments but which will still not address the fundamental issue of loss of open space.

Regards

[redacted]

Mr N Harlow & Miss A Jackson