

[REDACTED]

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 19 November 2018 09:16
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: P/58/15/OUT, P/125/14/PL and P/140/16 OUT

From: paul collins [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 November 2018 15:01
To: Simon Davis
Cc: Karl Roberts; Neil Crowther; David Easton; Daniel Vick; Planning.Responses
Subject: RE: P/58/15/OUT, P/125/14/PL and P/140/16 OUT

Mr Davis

Can I suggest that you actually read the decision notice for P/125/14 PL, look at those files you list and read the S106 (which I have) and reconsider your response. It seems to me that a number of breaches of the controlling conditions and S106 may have already occurred particularly as the applications you list whilst considering and approving details do not confirm pre commencement actions that were necessary and my client wishes to know what ADC intends to do so as to enforce those conditions/S106 because this is material to the determination of P/140/16 OUT.

Further given the relationship between these two sites (see the footpath clause in the S106) and the fact that the cumulative impacts of these 140 dwellings together with the 400 proposed under P/140 16 OUT on the SPA and traffic in the locality and elsewhere has not been considered or assessed I am surprised to note that Hanbury have not advised when they intend to implement their schemes.

Once again I would suggest that this is yet another reason why P/140/16 OUT should be returned to the DCC for reconsideration before a decision is issued as the point at which Hanburys two sites will actually deliver housing as part of the District wide supply is a material consideration not so far considered.

Thanks

Paul Collins BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI



From: Simon Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2018 10:39 AM
To: 'paul collins' [REDACTED]
Cc: Karl Roberts [REDACTED]; Neil Crowther [REDACTED]; David Easton [REDACTED]; Daniel Vick [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: P/58/15/OUT and P/125/14/PL

Dear Mr Collins,

All of the information that you ask for in respect of P/125/14/PL is available on our website under references:

P/19/18/DOC (Re-discharge of condition 07)
P/1/18/DOC (Conditions 10, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 22, 26, 31)
P/116/17/DOC (Conditions 7, 8, 9, 17)
P/92/17/DOC (Conditions 32 & 37)
P/33/17/DOC (Conditions 34, 35 & 36)

In short, all pre-commencement and pre-occupation conditions have been discharged.

ADC and the developer will also fulfil their duties in respect of the legal Agreement.

As regards P/58/15/OUT, I am not aware of any timescales for a reserved matters submission.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council |
Location: Planning, First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltrovers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Please note that I typically work from home on Thursdays when I am unreachable on my work phone

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



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: paul collins [REDACTED]

Sent: 14 November 2018 14:03

To: Karl Roberts; Neil Crowther; David Easton; Simon Davis; Planning.Responses

Subject: P/58/15/OUT and P/125/14/PL

Mr Davis

I act for Pagham Parish Council in this matter.

I refer to the above outline and detailed planning permissions both of which are subject to S106 Agreements and pre commencement conditions.

It is noted that development pursuant to detailed planning permission P/125/14 PL has now commenced and is nearing completion with first occupation likely to be imminent. Therefore my client requests that ADC confirms whether or not all pre commencement conditions have been complied with and whether or not ADC and the other parties have or will fulfill their obligations under the agreement.

My client also asks that in view of the fact that P/58/15/OUT was granted to Hanbury Properties whether or not ADC is aware or been advised when the reserved matters are likely to be submitted in respect of the OPP granted.

As you know although not referenced in the Officer reports, both these planning permissions and when (and/or whether) they will deliver the 140 houses proposed in accordance with conditions and S106 Agreements are material considerations with regard to applications P/6/17 OUT, P/140/16 OUT and P/134/16 OUT as part of the ongoing debates regarding the cumulative impacts of development in Pagham on the Pagham Harbour SPA and the wider transport network/junctions in Chichester District and the lawfulness and enforceability of S106/Conditions debate but do not seem to have been considered thus far.

Therefore please put this e mail and any response on these files for future reference if required.

Thanks

Paul Collins BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI



RTPI

Chartered Town Planner

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>

DX 57406 Littlehampton

You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.
