

**From:** Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses  
**Sent:** 30 June 2020 09:59  
**To:** Planning Scanning  
**Subject:** FW: P/116/19 OUT - Land adjacent to Sefter School House - OBJECTION

Amanda Scholes | Receptionist, Department, [Arun District Council](#) | Location: Ground Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37736 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737500 ext 37736 | E-mail: [amanda.scholes@arun.gov.uk](mailto:amanda.scholes@arun.gov.uk)



Visit Arun's web site at [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](#)



Save the environment - think before you print.

---

**From:** Amy Myer <[Amy.Myer@arun.gov.uk](mailto:Amy.Myer@arun.gov.uk)>  
**Sent:** 29 June 2020 16:52  
**To:** Planning.Responses <[Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk](mailto:Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** FW: P/116/19 OUT - Land adjacent to Sefter School House - OBJECTION

PLs place below email on the case file and label as an objection

Thanks

Amy

Dear Ms Myer

I appreciate that you have only recently become the case officer on this one. However the application has now been under consideration for 6 months and the last extended statutory determination period expired on 19 June 2020 but the proposal remains undetermined.

The proposal is as a matter of principle in direct conflict with relevant development plan policies ( see attached) and to this long list can now be added for clarity the fact that on further investigation I find that the site lies within ZONE B for the purposes of Policy ENV DM2 Pagham Harbour and involves residential development that is likely to have an impact on Pagham Harbour ( see NE consultation response) but fails to make developer contributions towards the agreed strategic approach to access management at Pagham Harbour or create easily accessible new green spaces for recreation within or adjacent to the development site capable of accommodating the predicted increases in demand for local walking, including dog walking or good pedestrian links between the proposed housing and new and existing green space in order to discourage car use.

I also note and remind you that the applicant has failed to provide the necessary documentation required to demonstrate that the required CIL contribution will be made in accordance with the statutory CIL provisions and that any recommendation of approval would need to be referred to the DCC so that any resolution to grant would

be a departure from the development plan and that the relevant procedures set out at NPPG Paragraph: 013 Reference ID: 21b-013-20150327 and articles 15 and 32 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) before any decision was issued in respect of such signalled intent. Please note these procedures cannot be addressed by advertising the application as a departure from the development plan when it is received as they are in fact and law dependent on the LPA signalling their intention to depart from the development plan and that intention is unknown until such time as the LPA passes a resolution or makes a decision to do so.

In all the circumstances can I suggest that you expedite your obviously appropriate recommendation of refusal and decide this under delegated powers rather than keeping us all in suspense any longer as the applicant has already been given a disproportionate level of opportunity to address these fundamental issues but has patently failed to do so and Pagham Parish Council, ADC officers and the ADC DCC already have a heavy workload and more important matters to spend their time on and certainly does not need to be faced with the prospect of having to waste their time having to deal with an appeal against the council's failure to determine the application.

Please place this e mail on the file.

**Paul Collins BA (Hons) DipTP**

