

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 31 March 2021 16:31
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: P/97/20PL, P/29/21 DOC - Land north of Summer Lane

P/97/20/PL & P/29/21/DOC - Application Correspondence

From: paul collins [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 March 2021 12:36
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>; Daniel Vick <Daniel.Vick@arun.gov.uk>; Neil Crowther <Neil.Crowther@arun.gov.uk>; Karl Roberts <Karl.Roberts@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Cllr. Hugh Coster [REDACTED] Cllr. David Huntley [REDACTED] Cllr. June Hamilton [REDACTED] Cllr. Tony Dixon [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: P/97/20PL, P/29/21 DOC - Land north of Summer Lane

Simon

Some other points to bear in mind for your review..... Summer Lane is a public footpath and bridleway which is not owned or controlled by Drew Smith Homes Ltd and the development of the western parcel of the site as approved under P/58/15 OUT is entirely reliant on physical changes to that Public right of way so that motorised vehicles may access that part of the site from the adopted highway.

As you are aware my clients application under P/1/21 PL for the Material change of use of land from agricultural use to use for open space included this Public right of way but proposed no changes to it but it was refused under delegated powers for the following reason:

The proposal fails to provide safe and suitable access for all users contrary to policies T SP1 and T D M 1 of the Arun Local Plan 2011 -2031 , paragraph 108 (b) of the National Planning Policy Framework and part F of the Arun Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document January 2021.

Therefore please can you explain why P/97/20 PL did not include this reason for refusal? Also please can you confirm that the WSCC Public Rights of way Section has been consulted on these proposals?

Also I note that WSCC Highways do not object to P/29/21 DOC on technical grounds but I remind you that access does require planning permission in this case and it is the responsibility of the LPA to not only consider technical highway safety matters when considering access proposals but also their likely impact on residential amenity and the wider consideration of protecting public rights of way and bridleways for their intended purpose to provide suitable and safe access to the wider countryside for non-motorised users .

Finally I note from your e mail to 'Daniel' on the file for P/97/20 PL that this application was only refused because (much to your thinly veiled annoyance) you and your immediate Team Leader were 'instructed' to do so by some unnamed higher authority please can you confirm who that was and whether or not they will be conducting the review?

Thanks
Paul Collins BA (Hons) DipTP
[REDACTED]

From: paul collins [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 6:42 PM
To: 'Simon Davis' <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>; 'Daniel Vick' <Daniel.Vick@arun.gov.uk>; 'Neil Crowther' <Neil.Crowther@arun.gov.uk>; 'Karl Roberts' <Karl.Roberts@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: 'Cllr. Hugh Coster' [REDACTED]; 'Cllr. David Huntley' [REDACTED]; 'Cllr. June Hamilton' [REDACTED]; 'Cllr. Tony Dixon' [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: Land north of Summer Lane

Finally but by no means least Simon , as you are aware, the developer is currently undertaking works on site in respect of the Summer Lane Public Footpath and bridleway and several drainage ditches surrounding the site which are not owned by them and over which they have no riparian ownership or control and according to no approved plan or surface water drainage strategy that we are aware of. You will also be aware that the original S106 Agreement relating to P/58/15 OUT has not been complied with either and that since this agreement also related to and was designed to dovetail with a s106 agreement that has also not been complied with in respect of the Spinnaker development to the north it is difficult to know what you intend to do about that but I have done my best to suggest a pragmatic and workable solution despite the fact that I have found this to be an exercise in trying to knit soup.

Can I suggest that in all the circumstances you set aside your normal approach and that you and your colleagues discuss and agree a solution with you then share with me as the representative of those local residents most affected before discussing and agreeing anything with the offending developer?

As I said we are beyond being satisfied by platitudes!

Paul Collins BA (Hons) DipTP
[REDACTED]