

Planning Services,
Arun District Council
Civic Centre
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

12th December 2025

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Application for Non-Material Amendment to Planning Approval: LU/369/21/RES
Phase 5 Hampton Park, Littlehampton, BN17 7PP/RES

Dear Sir or Madam,

This letter is submitted to accompany an application which seeks permission for Non-Material Amendments to Planning Approval LU/369/21/RES, which consented the Central Wetland Area at our Hampton Park development site.

The changes sought relate to landscape changes, in particular tree and reedbed planting that have resulted following the discharge of conditions and technical approval processes in relation to drainage and highway matters. The changes that have resulted primarily relate to planting along the bridge / road cross over where trees needed to be removed from the bridge embankments due to structural concerns / engineering requirements. The result of which is that 15 individual trees were omitted from the bridge embankments and a reed bed was made a little smaller.

This NMA seeks to propose alternative planting to mitigate against this loss that has resulted on site.

We are also providing clarification of the size of the mammal tunnels installed and the water levels in the swale features.

The following information is submitted with this application:

- Completed application forms.
- This covering letter.
- A planning application fee of £383 inc VAT paid via the planning portal.

- Amended plans as listed in the table below.

The plans being replaced are as follows:

Previously Approved Drawings	Proposed Replacement Drawings and Documents
TC2209_LA1 (C) Landscape Strategy	TC22029-LA1 (G) Landscape Strategy
TC2209_LA2 (C) Planting and Features	TC22029-LA2 (G) Planting and Features
TC2209_LA3 (C) Vegetation Lost and Retained	TC22029-LA3 (G) Vegetation Lost and Retained
TC2209_LA4 (C) Landform	TC22029-LA4 (G) Landform
TC2209_LA5 (C) Planting Plan	TC22029-LA5 (G) Planting Plan
	Planting Schedule Comparison
Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan dated January 2022 (v2)	Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan dated December 2026 (v

The total number of trees within the Central Wetland Area will remain the same as a result of the amended planting proposals. There is a decrease in some of the woodier/ wetland edge species due to the need to remove vegetation from the banks, however, this has been balanced out with an increase of structural *Tilia cordata* at the west site boundary. This is actually a betterment as the *Tilia cordata* are larger in specification size.

The overall amount of native mix planting is the same, however we have used Native Mix 2 instead of Native Mix, for design continuity. The species mix is slightly different between the two mixes but the specification sizes etc are broadly the same.

Shrubs, marginal and reedbed planting numbers have all stayed the same. A planting schedule comparison is provided as part of the NMA which illustrates what is being proposed over what was previously consented clearly.

Turning to ecology matters, the ecology scheme for the Central Wetland Area was submitted under LU/279/24/A00, however this was unfortunately refused, with two issues being raised – (1) the wetness of the swale features and (2) the width of the mammal tunnel installed.

To clarify matters an updated version of the Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (EMMP) is submitted with this NMA. This clarifies that the swale beds have been set 1m below the constant ground level of the wider Central Wetland Area which means that the upstream and downstream swales will have a level of “permanent water” throughout the year. The depth of

water will likely fluctuate seasonally, as is the situation with all natural wetland features. Indeed, this seasonal fluctuation plays an important role in supporting biodiversity of these features.

Regarding the mammal tunnel, a 450mm diameter tunnel has been installed rather than the 600mm cited with the original RMA documentation. The reason for this is that a 600mm diameter tunnel raised health and safety issues as it presented a risk of unauthorised access. Therefore, if we proceeded to install a 600mm tunnel we would also have had to install a grill over the entrance, thus negating any use by mammals. We do have duties under the H&S regulations and as such during the detailed design process we had to reduce its size to 450mm. We have asked the ecologist at WSCC for their view on the size and functionality of the mammal tunnel (as they are the adopting authority) and they consider 450mm to be acceptable – badgers (and other mammals) use this width and narrower in their natural tunnel systems – this is also documented in the revised EMMP.

I trust that the information provided with this submission is sufficient to allow the NMA to the existing approval (LU/206/21/RES) and I look forward to receiving notification that the application has been validated. If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely

[Redacted Signature]

Laura Jackson
Head of Planning
Persimmon Homes Thames Valley

[Redacted Contact Information]