

[REDACTED]

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 17 September 2019 09:59
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Planning Consultation on: P/70/19/RES

[REDACTED]

From: Daniel O'Shea ([REDACTED])
Sent: 16 September 2019 12:49
To: Simon Davis ([REDACTED])
Cc: Adrian Barker ([REDACTED])
Subject: RE: Planning Consultation on: P/70/19/RES

Hi Simon,

Yes apologies, I wasn't aware Adrian had already responded. We're just keen to address any issues as they arise. Please see my responses below...

Kind regards,

Daniel O'Shea
Planning Manager

Drew Smith Limited
Drew Smith House, Mill
Court, The Sawmills, Durley
Southampton,
Hampshire SO32 2EJ


GallifordTry
Partnerships

DREW SMITH LIMITED



[REDACTED]

For details of this company's registered number and address please follow this [link >>>](#)

From: Simon Davis ([REDACTED])
Sent: 16 September 2019 11:28
To: Daniel O'Shea ([REDACTED])
Cc: Adrian Barker ([REDACTED])
Subject: RE: Planning Consultation on: P/70/19/RES

CAUTION EXTERNAL EMAIL: This message originated outside the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Daniel,

Thank you for your email and that from Adrian on Friday.

I had separately emailed our Engineers to ask whether they had any controls of their own if we were to decide to overrule them but I had not had a response from them and the first I knew of the Ordinary Watercourse Consent was in your two emails. I am also disappointed since I had obtained verbal agreement to the use of bridges at pre-application stage and you have, as you say, designed the scheme on that basis. I will discuss this matter further with the Engineering Services Manager and will let you know of the outcome, if not at our meeting next week then before. - noted

Separately, I have received the attached comments of Pagham Parish Council. I comment on their advice as follows:

Public Open Space: I am seeking advice from Joe Russell-Wells re the comments about landscaping, also whether lighting & street furniture is reasonable to meet the requirement of laying out the POS. Please note however the point about access. -- noted re awaiting comments. Regarding the point on access, main access is actually via Summer Lane, there was a secondary access shown via the Village Hall car park at outline stage, so we progressed the plan on that basis. We're happy to omit this from the plans.

Footpath connecting this site and P/125/14/PL: Agreed in part. This does not need to be provided at this time. However, you need to show your footpath as being able to meet with the route as agreed on the Crayfern plans. See attached plan. -- we will revise to show connection at the point on Crayfern's plan instead, fortunately our route runs adjacent to the point of connection proposed

Plots 34/35 & 36/37: I agree that this is an unacceptable relationship to these existing houses. -- Plot 35 has a side elevation with no windows facing the rear elevation of plots in Brooks Close, but is 11.5m away from the main house at the closest point and is deliberately offset, so as not to fully obscure all views out from the existing property. It is accepted that there may be some loss of evening sunlight to neighbouring gardens, perhaps we could provide a sun path analysis to gauge the extent of this impact?

Plots 36 & 37 have a side elevation intentionally aligned with the road between existing adjacent properties. The existing properties have side elevations adjacent to the boundary, we are repeating this arrangement, but in the space between so as not to obscure light into existing principal elevations or gardens. It is felt this is an acceptable relationship, as would be found in common arrangements of properties that sit side-by-side.

Junction Pagham Road and Summer Lane: I have asked Highways to respond to me on these points -- regarding the main junction and visibility splays, these were obviously agreed at outline stage and technical approval of the S278 works has since been gained. We are addressing points raised by Highways directly with WSCC, in the hope of agreeing solutions prior to our meeting. However, the width of Summer Lane will be increased in areas directly servicing our site. In relation to the adopted section of Summer Lane's width, the issue in question would remain whether or not we were developing the site. There is only a small section that is as narrow as 4.1m, where double yellow lines are proposed to be introduced to maintain vehicle passageways. The arrangement will be no different to other narrow lanes in existence, whereby a car will wait in a wider section to allow a larger vehicle to pass.

Street Scene L-L: Is this possible to do? - there are two roofs affected, which yes can become hipped

Planting: Noted -- agreed, although early winter is also suitable for planting. We are hoping to achieve planning consent prior to planting, but intend to commence asap after

Attenuation ponds: Agree. Could this be changed? -- our proposal was taken from precedents set on other developments. However, we can look at an alternative solution

Bin Storage: Is this possible? Also I could not find where on the plans front bin storage is shown. -- this has been passed to the Architects for their response. I will update at our meeting

Design: To discuss at our meeting - noted

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council |

Location: Planning - First Floor - Arun Civic Centre - Maltravers Road - Littlehampton - BN17 5LE

Please note that I typically work from home on Thursdays when I am unreachable on my work phone

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.