

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 16 February 2021 09:31
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: P/1/21PL AND P/97/20 PL Summer Lane Pagham,

Amanda Scholes

T: 01903 737453
E: amanda.scholes@arun.gov.uk



To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
www.arun.gov.uk/planning

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 February 2021 12:05
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: P/1/21PL AND P/97/20 PL Summer Lane Pagham,

Please add to P/97/20/PL as an objection.

Please also add to P/1/21/PL as Application Correspondence

From: paul collins [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 February 2021 18:45
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>; Neil Crowther <Neil.Crowther@arun.gov.uk>; Karl Roberts <Karl.Roberts@arun.gov.uk>; Nigel Lynn <Nigel.Lynn@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED] Cllr. James Walsh <[REDACTED]> Cllr. Martin Lury <[REDACTED]>
[REDACTED] Cllr. Jamie Bennett <[REDACTED]> Cllr. David Huntley <[REDACTED]>
[REDACTED] Cllr. June Hamilton <[REDACTED]> 'Nicola Swann' <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: P/1/21PL AND P/97/20 PL Summer Lane Pagham,

Dear Mr Davis

Further to my last below I now write to respond to Paragraph 23 in the Shoosmiths LPP letter dated 12 February 2021 which asserts that :

"Our client's planning permission under reference P/58/15/OUT is set to provide a total area of 2.57 hectares of high quality on-site public open space including play area provision. In addition, the planning permission for residential development on the adjacent land with reference P/140/16/OUT may provide a further 5.35 hectares. This totals 7.92 hectares and is well in excess of the level required by the Council's existing SPG guidelines. In addition, financial

contributions totalling £461,150 are to be paid to mitigate against any adverse impacts on the nearby Pagham Harbour SPA in accordance with policy ENV DM2 and the NPPF. Planning conditions also provide further protection for protected bird species in the area."

And I note that what is said is said to be a material consideration in the determination of P/1/21 PL

P/58/15 OUT was an outline planning permission with all matters except for access reserved for the development of the subject site with 90 No. dwellings with associated access & open space. The quantum of open space to be provided and/or its nature (public or private) was not specified in the application, the planning permission granted and/or its related S106 Agreement and the permission granted under this reference did not grant planning permission for such open space or the necessary change of use of the land from agriculture to open space either. Furthermore it is alleged that development has commenced unlawfully on the site pursuant to this permission without compliance with the conditions on the planning permission and/or the terms of the S1106 Agreement that relates to same. Therefore the only planning permission relating to the Drew Smith Ltd part of the site is not "set to provide 2.57 a total area of 2.57 hectares of high quality on-site public open space" as claimed.

P/140/16 OUT was also an outline planning permission with all matters except for access reserved for the development of the subject site with *a mixed use development comprising of up to 400 dwellings, a care home with up to 70 beds, a Local Centre comprising up to 2000sqm of A1/A2/A3/D1/sui generis floor space, provision of land for a 1FE primary school (with sufficient space to ensure that it is expandable to 2FE), provision of land for a scout hut, safeguarding of land to help link the site to the Pagham Harbour Cycle Route & other community uses including public open space & allotments with some matters reserved.*

The quantum of open space to be provided was not specified in the application, the planning permission granted and/or its related S106 Agreement and the permission granted under this reference did not grant planning permission for such open space or the necessary change of use of the land from agriculture to open space either. Therefore the only planning permission relating to that part of the site owned by the Langmead family site may not provide a further 5.35 hectares even if lawfully implemented as claimed.

There is also an extant Outline planning permission for 65 dwellings under ADC Ref: P/25/17 OUT which is an outline planning permission with all matters (including access) reserved. The quantum of open space to be provided was not specified in the application, the planning permission granted and/or its related S106 Agreement and the permission granted under this reference did not grant planning permission for such open space or the necessary change of use of the land to open space either.

The Councils Public Open Space, Playing Pitches and Built Facilities January 2020 SPD adopted on 15 January 2020 states that residential development comprising 555 dwellings (the combined total) should provide 3.9 hectares of public open space, 0.6 hectares of public play space an off site contribution of £10, 684 towards the provision of allotments and a commuted POS ,maintenance sum of £438,779 and a commuted Play space maintenance sum of £30.000 (per play space)

Furthermore the Councils adopted Health and Fitness calculator states that residential development comprising 555 dwellings would generate an additional on-site requirement for 34 sq metre meeting the specifications and an off-site contribution of £68,400

The areas of open space, public play space and health and fitness areas are in addition to land that is required for all 3 developments to be set aside for SUD Schemes on site and as Alternative natural green space on or off the site in accordance with ALP 2018 Policies GI SP1 Green Infrastructure and development, H SP2a Greater Bognor Regis Urban Area SD1 Pagham South, Policy HWB SP1 Health & Wellbeing, W SP1 Water, W DM3 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and ENV DM 2 Pagham Harbour Policy and the contributions that all 3 must make towards the agreed strategic approach to access management at Pagham Harbour.

Nine of the 3 developments cited as approved under ADC Ref: P/58/15 OUT, P/25/17 OUT, P/140/16 OUT either alone and/or in combination demonstrate that these requirements are, can or will be met as asserted by Shoosmiths LLP.

Finally the application made by Drew Smith limited under ADC Ref: P/97/20 PL seeks a fresh permission for part of the site covered by P/58/15 OUT and it would add 15 dwellings to the total of 90 approved for the same site without demonstrating how these requirements will be met either

Please treat this as a representation with regard to P/97/20 PL and P/1/21 PL and place same on both files.

Thanks

Paul Collins BA (Hons) DipTP

