

[REDACTED]

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 19 November 2018 09:16
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: P/140/16 OUT and P/25/17 OUT

From: paul collins [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 November 2018 13:19
To: David Easton; Neil Crowther; Karl Roberts; Liz Fitcher
Cc: Planning.Responses
Subject: P/140/16 OUT and P/25/17 OUT

Dear All

For the record I note from the e mail exchange between the case officer and the applicant dated 16/11/18 that it is the case officers intention to issue the decision by the close of business on 20/11/18 and that an EOT to that effect has been agreed between ADC and the agent despite my e mail dated 8/11/18 enclosing the letter from the Agent in respect of P/6/17 out and my e mail dated 15/11/18 which all combine to explain why that would be unlawful. I have had no reply to my e mail dated 15/11/18 and the case officer (Mr Easton) deleted that e mail without reading same on 16/11/18.

As you are also aware the same Case Officer on the same day has also agreed an EOT until 21/12/2018 in respect of the as yet unconsidered application P/25/17 OUT on the basis that this application (which together with P/140/16 OUT forms part of the SD1 Pagham South element of the overall SD1/SD2 Allocation) will be considered at the DCC on 12 December 2018.

In this regard I also wish to record that the Minutes for the DCC Meeting on 24/10/18 that resolved to approve the application subject to the finalisation of a S106 and specified conditions are headed:

"Please note these are draft minutes which will be subject to approval, together with the record of the remainder of the meeting to be held on 13 November 2018, at the Development Control meeting on 12 December 2018"

The minutes of the DCC held on 13 November 2018 are not published on the Council's web site and nor is the agenda for the DCC Meeting on 12/12/18 at the date of this e mail. Frankly issuing a decision on a planning application based on a resolution/draft minutes that have as yet to be approved by the DCC in the circumstances we have here does not seem to me to be a lawful Committee process but as I have said this ultimately would be a matter for the Courts to decide if you do issue the decision as intended by the case officer.

I suggest that the more rational and appropriate approach to ensuring the comprehensive and masterplanned development of this allocation required by adopted Policy would be to return P/140/16 OUT to the DCC on 12/12/2018 for reconsideration of all those matters left unresolved on the 24/10/18 alongside the finalised/agreed minutes and the related P/25/17 OUT.

However, as ever you will no doubt act as you see fit and without consideration of the legitimate matters I raise, so please put this e mail on both files for future reference if required.

Paul Collins BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI



