

Taylor Wimpey (Southern Counties)
Colvedene Court
Wessex Business Park
Colden Common
Winchester
SO21 1WP

Date: 19th December 2025

Please ask for: Hannah Kersley

Tel: 01903 737856

Your Ref:

Our Ref: P/154/25/NMA

Dear Ms Hockin,

**Section 96A of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015
(as amended) - Article 10**

Non material amendment following the grant of P/49/21/RES to amend location of block paving at the southern portion of the site and reduce quantity of elevational materials at plots 146, 154, 163, 174 and 212.

Land North of Sefter Road & 80 Rose Green Road Pagham

DECISION: REFUSED

The main issue for consideration is whether the proposed change is i) 'non-material' and ii) the proposed change is acceptable. There is no statutory definition of 'non-material', this is because it will be dependent on the context of the overall scheme. An amendment that is non-material in one context may well be material in another. Arun District Council must be satisfied that the amendment sought is non-material in order to grant a non-material amendment application.

Non-material amendments are generally considered to be those changes which are insignificant and do not introduce new material considerations. They cannot change the intensity of the original planning permission, result in a change to the description of the application or conflict with any conditions of the original permission.

This application seeks to amend the location of block paving at the southern portion of the site and reduce quantity of elevational materials at plots 146, 154, 163, 174 and 212.

The amended plans have been reviewed and assessed against the previously approved

plans. Whilst the proposed changes to the block paving and elevational materials are considered to be non-material, and are accepted in principle, there are a number of errors and inconsistencies between the Hard Landscaping Plans (CSA/2038/134-8) and the other plans submitted under this NMA showing the full site; primarily the NMA Plot Substitution Planning Layout (CB_84_139_101 Rev G). The following errors have been identified:

Hard Landscape Proposals Sheet 2 of 5 CSA/2035/135 Rev E and Sheet 3 CSA/2035/136 Rev E:

- The landscaping and layout to the south of plots 9, 10, and 11 (comprising a junction, and two access points to the sub station and pumping station) varies quite significantly from the other submitted plans showing the site in full. A layby space has been added; footpath has been moved; substation paving is incorrectly placed and not shaded in colour; and the hatching to denote the material for the access to the substation does not align with the lines for the access. This conflicts with the layout and landscaping as shown under CB_84_139_101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 113, 115 (hereby referred to as CB_84_139_101 and other site plans), which have all been submitted under new revisions under this NMA.
- The hatching to the south of Block F is incorrect. This shows one of the parking spaces to be soft landscaping, and concrete paving slabs to be bituminous surface. The Planning Layout CB_84_139_101 Rev G and other site plans denote the parking space as bituminous surface, and the footpath as paving slabs.
- The landscaping around Plot 240 also does not match CB_84_139_101 and other site plans (103, 104 etc). This shows an additional paving slab path and soft landscaping where the site plans show bituminous surface. The denoted paving slab path to the north of Plot 240 is also incorrectly placed, and does not accord with the paving layout as shown on CB_84_139_101.
- A paving slab footpath is shown to the north of plots 16-18. This paving is not denoted on CB_84_139_101 and other site plans, and is shown as bituminous surface.
- Footpath materiality is shown as vehicular bituminous surface on the footpath between plots 229, 230 and 225. This is shown to be footpath / cycleway bituminous surface on CB_84_139_101 and other site plans.
- Paving slab shown to south of Plot 81, but is block paving on CB_84_139_101.
- Drop kerb access to plot 82 shown as block paving, but should be bituminous as per CB_84_139_101.
- Bituminous hatching missing for parking spaces in parking area to north of Block B. This is shown as soft landscaping.
- Inconsistencies with location of paving slab paths around Block A. One path is in the wrong place, another path is missing hatching; conflicting that shown on CB_84_139_101 and other site plans
- Hatching is incorrect on corner to front of Plot 53. This is shown as vehicular bituminous surface, however the adjacent corner outside Plot 58 is denoted as concrete sett paving. CB_84_139_101 shows these corners to both be bituminous surfacing to match the footpath.

Hard Landscape Proposals Sheet 4 of 5 CSA/2035/137 Rev F:

- A paving slab footpath is shown around the substation to the west of Plot 119; this paving is not shown on CB_84_139_101 and other site plans.
- Road surfacing around Plots 151-154 has incorrect colouring. This is coloured as block paving, but hatched as bituminous surface. It is therefore unclear what materiality this is proposed to be. CB_84_139_101 and other site plans show this to be bituminous surfacing.
- A very small area of paving slab is shown to the north of parking spaces for blocks 180 and 181. It is queried whether this should be paving slab or bituminous, as CB_84_139_101

indicates this is bituminous.

- The drop kerb to front of parking for Plot 220 and 221 is shown as bituminous surface, but is shown to be block paving on CB_84_139_101 and other site plans.

Hard Landscape Proposals Sheet 5 of 5 CSA/2035/138 Rev E:

- Footpath materiality is shown as vehicular bituminous surface on the footpath between plots 219, 220 and 212. This also occurs on the edge of the visitor parking layby to the east. CB_84_139_101 and other site plans show this to be footpath bituminous surface.

There are a substantial number of inconsistencies between the details shown on the Hard Landscaping Plans (CSA/2038/134-8), and wider site plans CB_84_139_101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 113, 115 all submitted with new revisions under this NMA application. This therefore results in an incomplete set of drawings, which do not accord with one another. This results in subsequent uncertainties surrounding the layout, location and materiality of hard landscaping across the site, as the details shown on the hard landscaping plans differ from that provided on the wider site plans. As such, these plans cannot be accepted as they conflict one another, and do not provide a comprehensive and cohesive overview of the landscaping details across the site. This Non-Material Amendment is therefore refused.

I trust this information is of assistance to you.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'NC' followed by a flourish and a period.

Neil Crowther
Group Head of Planning