

Hannah Riddle

From: paul collins [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 July 2022 13:49
To: Karl Roberts; Neil Crowther; 'Michael Eastham'; James Hassett; David Easton; Planning.Responses
Cc: Cllr. Terence Chapman; [REDACTED] Cllr. Jacky Pendleton
Subject: RE: CM/48/21/RES - Land to the West of Church Lane South of Horsemere Green Lane Climping

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Dear All

I note that this application remains undetermined at this date as do the Foreman Homes applications for the site at Pagham to which I refer in my e mail below. I also note that Officers continue to consider and determine reserved matter applications for both Foreman Home sites as though my representation had not been made and without consideration of the matters raised. Therefore I take this opportunity to remind you of my representation and confirm that it remains unchanged despite the latest merry go round of later irrelevant amendments made in both cases.

Thank you for considering my representation and please place this e mail and any response on the file for CM/48/21/RES and those for P/167/21/RES, P/158/21/RES, P/155/21/RES and P/153/21/RES.

Thank you

Paul Collins BA (Hons) DipTP

[REDACTED]

From: paul collins [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, April 8, 2022 2:56 PM
To: 'Karl Roberts' [REDACTED]; 'Neil Crowther' [REDACTED]; 'Michael Eastham' [REDACTED]; 'James Hassett' [REDACTED]
Cc: 'Cllr. Terence Chapman' [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: CM/48/21/RES - Land to the West of Church Lane South of Horsemere Green Lane Climping

Dear Mr Roberts et al

Please treat this e mail as a representation in respect of the above application in accordance with your normal procedures.

If my representations seem familiar this is because they should be as they are consistent with those I have made and will continue to make under separate cover in respect of applications made for Sites in Pagham by Foreman Homes et al under ADC Ref: P/167/21/RES, P/158/21/RES, P/155/21/RES and P/153/21/RES.

I attach for the file and ease of reference a copy of the OPP granted on appeal (CM/1/17 /OUT) and the related S106 Agreement from which it will be noted that the time limit for the submission of reserved matter applications pursuant to condition 1 expired on 28 September 2021.

The subject application was made on 7/9/21 by “Climping Homes” C/O Foreman Homes and it seeks approval for the reserved matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to the OPP granted and is currently undetermined. No applications have been made to vary the OPP granted or discharge any of its conditions and no such applications can be made so as to vary the time limits relating to the OPP.

The application for the reserved matters submitted (even as varied over the last 7 months) describes development that does not accord with the description of the development granted OPP or a form of development that complies with the only plans approved or the conditions imposed on the OPP (most notably the approved Access Plans: GDB 4724/005 & GDB 4724/013 and Illustrative Masterplan: P14 4899 01 Rev F and condition 5) . There is also no evidence provided that the Applicant developer can or will comply with the terms of the related S106 Agreement.

In these circumstances the submitted application should be refused under delegated powers without further delay and the Applicant advised that if they wish to pursue their changed proposals for the site they should make a fresh application for full permission as the OPP has expired and does not in any case grant planning permission for what is now proposed. (See the Planning Portal at <https://www.planningportal.co.uk/planning/planning-applications/consent-types/reserved-matters> and the relevant PPG at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/making-an-application#approval-of-reserved-matters>)

My suggested Reason for refusal is as follows or similar:

The details provided with the application fail to describe development that accords with the development granted under outline planning permission CM/1/17 /OUT and also fails to demonstrate that the approved development under the OPP can or will be satisfactorily undertaken in accordance with the Outline Planning permission granted including its conditions and related S106 Agreement.

Thank you for considering my representation and please place this e mail and any response on the file.

Paul Collins BA (Hons) DipTP

