

[REDACTED]

From: Karl Roberts <Karl.Roberts@arun.gov.uk>

Sent: 11 June 2021 14:26

To: paul collins [REDACTED]

Cc: Cllr. Shaun Gunner [REDACTED]; Cllr. Emily Seex <[REDACTED]> Cllr. James Walsh <[REDACTED]> Cllr. Tony Dixon <[REDACTED]> Cllr. June Hamilton <[REDACTED]> Cllr. David Huntley <[REDACTED]> Cllr. Richard Bower <[REDACTED]> Dawn Hall' <[REDACTED]> Cllr. Martin Lury <[REDACTED]> Cllr. Paul Kelly <[REDACTED]> Cllr. Hugh Coster <[REDACTED]> Cllr. John Charles <[REDACTED]> Cllr. Steve Goodheart <[REDACTED]> Cllr. David Edwards <[REDACTED]> Cllr. Billy Blanchard-Cooper <[REDACTED]> Cllr. Will Tilbrook <[REDACTED]> Neil Crowther <[REDACTED]>

<Neil.Crowther@arun.gov.uk>; Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>; Daniel Vick <Daniel.Vick@arun.gov.uk>; Christopher Best <christopher.best@arun.gov.uk>; Nigel Lynn <Nigel.Lynn@arun.gov.uk>; Raymond Cole <Raymond.Cole@arun.gov.uk>; Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>; Claire Potts <Claire.Potts@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Pagham North

Dear Mr Collins,
Thank you for your email.

As you will be aware from our previous correspondence there are already illustrative masterplans in place as referenced in the original planning permissions for these site. Your 'masterplan' does not relate to the outline permissions granted and until (or if) that position changes there is no reason to depart from the original illustrative masterplans unless the subsequent reserved matter applications demonstrates a need for change without compromising the integrity of the original permission.

Regards
Karl Roberts

From: paul collins [REDACTED]

Sent: 11 June 2021 12:28

To: Karl Roberts <Karl.Roberts@arun.gov.uk>; Neil Crowther <Neil.Crowther@arun.gov.uk>; Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>; Daniel Vick <Daniel.Vick@arun.gov.uk>; Christopher Best <christopher.best@arun.gov.uk>; Nigel Lynn <Nigel.Lynn@arun.gov.uk>; Raymond Cole <Raymond.Cole@arun.gov.uk>; Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>

Cc: Cllr. Shaun Gunner [REDACTED]; Cllr. Emily Seex [REDACTED] Cllr. James Walsh <[REDACTED]> Cllr. Tony Dixon <[REDACTED]> Cllr. June Hamilton <[REDACTED]> Cllr. David Huntley <[REDACTED]> Cllr. Richard Bower <[REDACTED]> Dawn Hall' <[REDACTED]> Cllr. Martin Lury <[REDACTED]> Cllr. Paul Kelly <[REDACTED]>

[REDACTED] Cllr. Hugh Coster [REDACTED] Cllr. Steve Goodheart
[REDACTED] Cllr. Billy Blanchard-Cooper [REDACTED] Cllr.
John Charles [REDACTED] Cllr. David Edwards [REDACTED] Cllr. Will
Tilbrook [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Pagham North

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

Further to my last below I now attach my suggested masterplan for Pagham North which should be read in connection with my e mail and Plan for Pagham South below.

Based on my detailed professional knowledge, experience and the well documented evidence the attached plan shows how Pagham North can and should be developed with 300 houses (150 on site E and 150 on site A) over the next 10 years given all the available evidence, the acknowledged needs to safeguard Pagham Harbour from the impacts of future development both inside and adjoining the Parish , the need for a comprehensive SW and foul drainage solution for Pagham that minimises flood risks, protects the water quality in the Harbour and takes account of climate change issues, improves the level of infrastructure and community facilities that Pagham Residents can access without travelling further abroad and properly addresses the well documented concerns of local residents, Pagham Parish Council and the elected ward members

Indeed I go further in saying that given the fact that all the relevant the Local Plan policies are hopelessly out of date and the presumption in favour of sustainable development that now applies in this district this is what must happen at Pagham North if the Council is truly committed to the principles of delivering sustainable development in Pagham that underpins the purpose of the planning system and should underpin every decision that the Planning Committee makes.

What Officers can and should do in order for what I show on the attached plan to happen is to stop being obstructive and downright obstinate and give members the opportunity to discuss the issues and consider their discretionary powers to resolve those issues in accordance with the wishes of the 3000 + people who have signed the well documented and submitted petition, Pagham Parish Council, the ward members and the residents who I represent and ensure/demonstrate that they are not giving members inept, disingenuous and/or dishonest advice when they do so.

What members can do in order for what I show on the attached plan to happen (recognising that whether or not it does is in the hands of others) is :

- Refuse the applications made under ADC Refs: P/79/21/RES (duplicate application for undetermined application P/132/20/RES) P/132/21 RES and P/49/21/RES,
- Modify the OPPs granted under ADC Refs: P/30/19 OUT and P/134/16 OUT so that they are for 150 dwellings and the site layout as shown respectively and renegotiate their respective S106 Agreements so that they make contributions towards the delivery of the proposed facilities/Open space at Pagham South as under ADC Ref: P/57/21/PL,
- Approve the applications made under ADC Refs: P/57/21 PL and P/50/21 PL

Whether Members should do these things is a matter for their discretion and not that of their officers and whether or not that discretion should be considered and exercised or not should be based on Officer advice that is not inept, disingenuous and/or dishonest and any representations made by interested parties and/or their representatives.

There are issues and problems here and all that members are being asked to do is consider the options available to them for resolving same after receiving proper advice from officers in the light of any concerns raised and brought to their attention by the community, residents and their representatives and I for one (amongst many others) cannot understand why it is that Officers simply want to stifle any such debate and/or want to mislead/misdirect

their members and I am heartily fed up with having to say so on behalf of those I represent as I would much prefer spending my retirement time working with ADC so as to resolve the problems .

However and frankly, I no longer care whether or not ADC Officers/members do or do not do what they are reasonably being asked to do but if they do not do so they need to be aware that those people who have to live with the consequences of such decisions who do care will consider legal action to protect their interests in the event that this e mail goes ignored like so many others I have written on their behalf.

Please place this e mail trail and the attachments on the current files for P/79/21/RES, P/132/21 RES, P/49/21/RES, P/57/21 PL and P/50/21 PL and ensure that they are treated and reported as representations to your members when and if any officer reports or recommendations relating to same are presented to your Planning Committee and/or taken into account by officers when making delegated decisions.

Thank you

Paul Collins BA (Hons) DipTP

From: paul collins [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 11:30 AM
To: 'Karl Roberts' <Karl.Roberts@arun.gov.uk>; 'Neil Crowther' <Neil.Crowther@arun.gov.uk>; 'Simon Davis' <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>; 'Daniel Vick' <Daniel.Vick@arun.gov.uk>; 'Christopher Best' <christopher.best@arun.gov.uk>; 'Nigel Lynn' <Nigel.Lynn@arun.gov.uk>; 'raymond.cole@arun.gov.uk' <raymond.cole@arun.gov.uk>; 'planning.responses@arun.gov.uk' <planning.responses@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: 'Cllr. Shaun Gunner' [REDACTED]; 'Cllr. Emily Seex' [REDACTED]; 'Cllr. James Walsh' [REDACTED]; 'Cllr. Tony Dixon' [REDACTED]; 'Cllr. June Hamilton' [REDACTED]; 'Cllr. David Huntley' [REDACTED]; 'Cllr. Richard Bower' [REDACTED]; 'Dawn Hall' [REDACTED]; 'Cllr. Martin Lury' [REDACTED]; 'Cllr. Paul Kelly' [REDACTED]; 'Cllr. Hugh Coster' [REDACTED]; 'Cllr. Steve Goodheart' [REDACTED]; cllr.billy.blanchard-[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Pagham South

Dear All

See below and attached to which I have received no reply.

I now attach a copy of a Temporary closure Notice served by WSCC (without Notice) which effectively prohibits the developer and more importantly SWS Ltd and all landowners and residents from using Summer Lane for access on foot, bicycle, or by motorised vehicle from the effective date and the 21 day closure period and for 6 months thereafter. The reason given for the Notice is *The path closure is necessary to protect public safety whilst road widening and resurfacing works are undertaken* and as you are aware the 'road widening' and 'resurfacing works' are in fact engineering operations already underway which require PP but do not benefit from same and are only necessary in any case to serve the development planned for the western parcel of the site as the 46 dwellings proposed on the eastern parcel may be accessed from the public adopted highway without the need for such works .

This (and everything else you have so far planned for Pagham) is a complete pigs breakfast and once again I urge you to properly consider these matters (as requested by the Pagham Ward Members) and give proper consideration to the solutions I have suggested and will continue to suggest on behalf of my clients starting with the service of a Temporary stop notice in respect of the ongoing unauthorised development taking place at Summer

Lane and meaningful consultation with the WSCC Highway Authority (which includes their PROW Section), residents and landowners and their representatives.

Please place this e mail trail and the attachments on the current files for P/83/21/DOC, P/57/21/PL, P/69/21/CLP and P/70/21/DOC and ensure that they are treated and reported as representations to your members when and if any officer reports or recommendations relating to same are presented to your Planning Committee and/or taken into account by officers when making delegated decisions.

Thank you

Paul Collins BA (Hons) DipTP

From: paul collins [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2021 5:04 PM
To: 'Karl Roberts' <Karl.Roberts@arun.gov.uk>; 'Neil Crowther' <Neil.Crowther@arun.gov.uk>; 'Simon Davis' <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>; 'Daniel Vick' <Daniel.Vick@arun.gov.uk>; 'Christopher Best' <christopher.best@arun.gov.uk>; 'Nigel Lynn' <Nigel.Lynn@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: 'Cllr. Shaun Gunner' [REDACTED] 'Cllr. Emily Seex' [REDACTED] 'Cllr. James Walsh' [REDACTED] 'Cllr. Tony Dixon' [REDACTED] 'Cllr. June Hamilton' [REDACTED] 'Cllr. David Huntley' [REDACTED] 'Cllr. Richard Bower' [REDACTED] >; 'Cllr. Martin Lury' [REDACTED] 'Cllr. Paul Kelly' [REDACTED] 'Cllr. Hugh Coster' [REDACTED] 'Cllr. Steve Goodheart' [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: Pagham South

Dear All

Frankly ADC Officers and members have been faffing around with this for far too long and in so doing are failing the Pagham Community they are supposed to serve.

I attach a plan that based on my detailed professional knowledge, experience and the well documented evidence shows how Pagham South can and should be developed over the next 10 years given all the available evidence, the acknowledged needs to safeguard Pagham Harbour from the impacts of future development both inside and adjoining the Parish , the need for a comprehensive SW and foul drainage solution for Pagham that minimises flood risks, protects the water quality in the Harbour and takes account of climate change issues, improves the level of infrastructure and community facilities that Pagham Residents can access without travelling further abroad and properly addresses the well documented concerns of local residents, Pagham Parish Council and the elected ward members

Indeed I go further in saying that given the fact that all the relevant the Local Plan policies are hopelessly out of date and the presumption in favour of sustainable development that now applies in this district this is what must happen at Pagham South if the Council is truly committed to the principles of delivering sustainable development in Pagham that underpins the purpose of the planning system and should underpin every decision that the Planning Committee makes.

What Officers can and should do in order for what I show on the attached plan to happen is to stop being obstructive and downright obstinate and give members the opportunity to discuss the issues and consider their discretionary powers to resolve those issues in accordance with the wishes of the 3000 + people who have signed the well documented and submitted petition, Pagham Parish Council, the ward members and the residents who I represent and ensure/demonstrate that they are not giving members inept, disingenuous and/or dishonest advice when they do so.

What members can do in order for what I show on the attached plan to happen (recognising that whether or not it does is in the hands of others) is :

- Serve a Stop Notice with regard to the development unlawfully proceeding under the auspices of OPP P/58/15 OUT
- Modify P/58/15 OUT so that it grants detailed PP for 46 dwellings with access from the adopted section of Summer Lane and not the 90 dwellings as now approved
- Serve an enforcement notice requiring the removal of all unauthorised works undertaken to date under the auspices of P/58/15 OUT and the reinstatement of the land and Summer Lane to its original condition before those unauthorised works took place
- Serve a completion notice regarding the detailed pp granted by way of modification at bullet point 2
- Revoke OPPs P/25/17 OUT and P/140/16 OUT
- Decline to defend the outstanding appeal in respect of P/1/21 PL (this does not need to happen because based on the information provided by ADC Officers to date in respect of this appeal ADC will lose it anyway) and approve the current application made under ref: P/57/21/PL

Whether Members should do these things is a matter for their discretion and not that of their officers and whether or not that discretion should be considered and exercised or not should be based on Officer advice that is not inept, disingenuous and/or dishonest and any representations made by interested parties and/or their representatives.

There are issues and problems here and all that members are being asked to do is consider the options available to them for resolving same after receiving proper advice from officers in the light of any concerns raised and brought to their attention by the community, residents and their representatives and I for one (amongst many others) cannot understand why it is that Officers simply want to stifle any such debate and/or want to mislead/misdirect their members and I am heartily fed up with having to say so on behalf of those I represent as I would much prefer spending my retirement time working with ADC so as to resolve the problems .

However and frankly, I no longer care whether or not ADC Officers/members do or do not do what they are reasonably being asked to do but if they do not do so they need to be aware that those people who have to live with the consequences of such decisions who do care will consider legal action to protect their interests in the event that this e mail goes ignored like so many others I have written on their behalf.

Paul Collins BA (Hons) DipTP

