

[REDACTED]

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 20 November 2018 08:11
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: P/140/16 OUT and P/25/17 OUT

Importance: High

From: paul collins [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 November 2018 15:53
To: Neil Crowther; David Easton; Karl Roberts
Cc: Planning.Responses
Subject: P/140/16 OUT and P/25/17 OUT
Importance: High

Dear All

As you are aware these two Outline Planning applications were submitted allegedly as part of a master planned approach to the delivery of the SD1 Pagham South Allocation and both sites are in different land ownership.

However I note that it was resolved to grant a conditional OPP for P/140 16 OUT at DCC 24/10/18 without linkage to P/25/17 OUT and subject to a condition relating to the safeguarding and long term management of an 18.5 hectare area of land known as the "Brent Goose mitigation land" which as far as I can tell (there is no clear plan on file defining that area) includes the site of P/25/17 OUT which is land in different ownership.

Further, in terms of P/25/17 OUT I note that the submitted application forms record the description of the development as being: "*Erection of 89 dwellings, access roads, landscaping, open space and associated works*" and the application was originally validated/advertised as such but this seems to have been subsequently changed on your web site so that it now reads: "*Outline application for access only - Erection of up to 65 No. dwellings, access roads, landscaping, open space & associated works*". Please can you advise when this change took place and by what authority because I cannot find any e mail or letter relating to same on your file.

I also note that the "access roads" proposed under P/25/17 OUT are across the site of P/140/16 OUT (in different ownership) and that no access drawings are included within application P/25/17 OUT, no notice has been served on those that own the access road land and there is no record that they have agreed such access rights across their land. As you know layout (which includes access roads) is reserved under P/140/16 OUT and it is only the access points onto the main road which have the benefit of the resolution to grant OPP.

It therefore seems to me that these are yet more material considerations that would justify a reconsideration of P/140/16 OUT alongside P/25/17 OUT but I thought I would give you an opportunity to respond before adding them to my ever growing list of arguable grounds for JR to be discussed with my clients Counsel this week.

Please place this e mail and any response on both files for future reference if required.

Thanks

Paul Collins BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

[REDACTED]

