

From: Juan Baeza
Sent: 31 August 2017 08:31
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: RE: LU/231/17/PL (Castleview Nursery)

It's a rep. Please scan.

Thanks

Juan Baeza Area Team Leader -- Planning Department, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37765 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737765 | E-mail: juan.baeza@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Amanda Scholes **On Behalf Of** Planning.Responses
Sent: 31 August 2017 08:28
To: Juan Baeza
Subject: FW: LU/231/17/PL (Castleview Nursery)

What should I do with this ? Is it a rep letter?
Mandy

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 August 2017 14:30
To: Juan Baeza
Cc: Planning.Responses
Subject: LU/231/17/PL (Castleview Nursery)

Dear Juan,

Having read the comments from Mr Herbert at the Littlehampton Town Council I wanted to respond as follows:

(1) "...with no upper limit in terms of the number of vehicles and/or caravans that could be accommodated at the site".

This is factually incorrect; the application clearly states that the number of storage spaces being applied for is an increase from 60 to 91. A site layout was submitted along with the statement and application papers, which clearly sets this layout on paper and to scale. It is clear from this site layout that it will not be possible to increase the number of spaces any more than what I have applied for, i.e. from 60 to 91, therefore this is the limit of any impact both now, as part of this application, and for the future.

(2) "...committee also had serious concerns about the impact of the intensification of the use of the site on the highways network in the area."

The impact assessment of the increase to 91 spaces already effected has been considered by the Highways Agency and they have confirmed their position as being "no objection" therefore I do not agree with Mr Herbert that there has been an intensification of use such that Mr Herbert would have serious concerns. I've checked my cctv for comings in to site and goings out from site and the volume of traffic is virtually static to what it was before the increase of space for which I'm applying retrospectively. This is logical due to the nature of the use, which is for long term storage and the entirely seasonal nature of this usage for caravans/motorhomes (for circa 8 or 9 months of the year owners just leave them on our site untouched and they do not take their caravans / motorhome out. When we sold bedding plants and horticulture we produced from our site we had a lot more traffic with people coming and going buying our produce. If anything, this usage has significantly cut the volume of traffic down from what it was.

(3) "The application also lacked information on how water run off from the increased hard standing would be handled."

This is already confirmed as not being a problem. All surface water simply drains through the permeable surface and into the ground. None of the water runs off to other properties. This is evidenced by the torrential rain we had a few weeks back; none of the water drained onto my neighbours land and all of it easily drained away into the ground.

(4) "The Committee reiterated its previous comments regarding the status of Old Mead Road. As an unadopted highway, it was considered that the developer should be asked to contribute to the long-term maintenance and upkeep of the Road."

This was not a condition of previous approvals and should not be so here on this application either. As I can already evidence by virtue of the cctv cameras on my site, it's clear traffic volumes I generate with this type of usage is very low; in fact, it is lower than the volume of traffic that used to come to our site when we exclusively used it for horticultural purposes. In fact, the types of heavy agricultural vehicles that used to frequent our site no longer do; instead cars towing a silent caravan now come (infrequently) instead.

(5) "In addition, Members also wished to ensure that effective screening was maintained around the site and considered that proposals to deal with the issues highlighted should be submitted with the application before it is determined."

The entire site is already screened very effectively and therefore this point is moot.

I look forward to receiving your reply to my responses above; please call me anytime to discuss.

Best regards,

Manou Amirpashaie.



Sent from my iPhone