

Sandra Edwards

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 07 August 2017 09:25
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: WA/44/17/OUT Land East of Tye Lane Walberton Objection attached identical with email text.

From: Michael Eastham
Sent: 07 August 2017 08:08
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: WA/44/17/OUT Land East of Tye Lane Walberton Objection attached identical with email text.

Please upload this representation onto Ocella and send an acknowledgement to Mr Camerer Cuss.

Kind regards,

Michael Eastham

From: Edmund Camerer Cuss [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 August 2017 14:28
To: Michael Eastham
Subject: WA/44/17/OUT Land East of Tye Lane Walberton Objection attached identical with email text.

Dear Mr Eastham,

My objection to WA/44/17/OUT, the Wates application on Tuppers Field, is this:

The NPPF's first core principle that underpins decision-taking is that planning should be "*genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, with succinct local and neighbourhood plans setting out a positive vision for the future of the area. Plans should be kept up-to-date They should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency.*"

Recently the Supreme Court helped to indicate that when a Local Plan has no five-year housing land supply, that failure does not remove these key planning principles for decision-taking in a sustainable world. The NPPF para 6 says simply that "*The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.*"

The reference above to local people and their power to shape their surroundings concerns the Walberton Neighbourhood Plan (WNDP, made just five months ago). This allowed for an eALP Modifications strategic site of 400 houses, met its latest housing allocation and allowed for a 27% uplift in its parish housing numbers. It increased its BUAB and it promoted the development of brownfield sites. Of itself, the VNDP is in all respects a fully up-to-date and positively made plan.

Local people agreed that their VNDP should follow the long term ADC policy stance on this site, and that was to continue to protect it from development. The VNDP excluded the site from housing development and the current view of local people was reaffirmed by a 1,100-signatory petition, from a community with fewer than 1,000 houses, to both prevent development in line with their VNDP and to designate it as Local Green Space in line with the VNDP Examiner's report. The ADC policy stance which the VNDP was following - that the site is unsuitable and unsustainable for development - has been established for at least 60 years.

This is confirmed by ADC's past planning decisions, by all ADC's past and current Local Plans - including the current eALP at Inquiry - and by ADC's successive SHLAA / HELAA. It is further confirmed by ADC's independent Sustainability Assessment consultants LUC in the 2017 study presented in evidence supporting its Local Plan at public inquiry. It was confirmed by the WNDP Examiner and then confirmed by the WNDP, which was itself then approved by ADC and made in March 2017. Additionally, the principle of the site's unsuitability for development was yet again confirmed by a vote at ADC's Full Council, only last month.

Taken together, this very long list of consistent judgements has referenced positively the site's attributes of Landscape Value, Landscape Quality, Landscape Sensitivity, Low Landscape Capacity and Historic Environment and its proposed designation for Local Green Space. They referenced negatively the attributes of water quality and soil. The WNDP Examiner added that the site was "*valued by the community, and lies close to the heart of the village, and is to be considered to be a buffer between the residential areas and the golf course*". The site was and remains outside the BUAB in every ADC development plan document that has existed.

With "a high degree of predictability and efficiency", the framework for the decision on this application has been very consistently established, with crystal clarity and great weight over many years. Any other decision but a refusal would be utterly inconsistent and would be incapable of proper justification. It would be in direct conflict with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, only. It will undermine the legitimacy of the ADC evidence to its own eALP Inquiry, that the site is unsuitable for development. Any other decision but a refusal would be unconscionable, offend against all the principles established by the government's current planning regime and be open to legal challenge.

The application is contrary to the following:

Saved Policies from the 2003 Local Plan

Relevant saved policies that indicate permission should be refused include GEN: 2; 3; 22; 23; 27 and Policy Area 12 and Policy DEV11 Setting of Listed Buildings

Policies in the emerging Local Plan

SD SP1 Sustainable Development, SD SP2 Built Up Area Boundary; C SP1 Countryside; LAN DM1 Protection of Landscape Character; EMP SP1 Strategic Economic Growth; H SP2 Strategic Site Allocations; HER SP1 and HER DM3; The Historic Environment and Conservation Areas; W DM1 Water Supply and Quality.

Walberton Neighbourhood Development Plan

1. **Policies:** Policy HP 1; Policy GA 5; Policy VE 4; Policy VE 7.
2. **Objectives:** Cause the loss of green space that brings the countryside into the heart of the village; Not provide sustainable housing that makes a positive contribution to the village landscapes; Harm the distinctive and intrinsic rural character of the area which parishioners have voted to retain and not recognise the value of the farming landscape; Add to the congestion in the centre of Walberton village and additionally will add to through traffic and not reduce the problem of flooding; Will be development on open land and fields where there is overwhelming opposition.

Regards

Edmund Camerer Cuss

20 Hunters Mews

Fontwell

Arundel

BN18 0UW

