

Bronte Welham

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 24 April 2018 08:46
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Sunny Corner WA/75/17/PL

From: Ross Leal
Sent: 23 April 2018 14:45
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Sunny Corner WA/75/17/PL

Please upload to application - public.

Ross Leal, DipTP, MRTPI
Senior Planning Officer, Development Management, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council
Location: Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
[REDACTED]

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk P Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Susan Leeson [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 April 2018 12:09
To: Ross Leal
Subject: Sunny Corner WA/75/17/PL

Dear Ross

Further to our telephone conversation of yesterday, I am writing to you in support of the application following refusal of WA/73/17/OUT.

Looking at the reasons for refusal:

Reason 1 the site is unsustainable – Land East of Wandleys Lane was considered by the HELAA reference NEWWA13 as not developable due to site access constraints, impacts on the Lidsey Catchment and too remote and not a sustainable location.

Reason 2 The proposed highway upgrading of Wandleys Lane would have an unacceptable urbanising effect.

Reason 3 the lighting levels will detract from the existing unlit nature of the area.

Sunny Corner

Sunny Corner was considered by the HELLA reference 94 as a deliverable site “the site is considered suitable in principle and is an allocation in the unmade Walberton neighbourhood plan as a rural exception site to provide affordable housing.”

Therefore the HELAA conclusion was that Sunny Corner is in a sustainable location. It is close to bus stops in The Street and within walking distance to the shops at Maple Parade and the local school. The distance from the site to the shops is less than 1 mile (0.8miles). There is a footpath that runs from Long Mead (at the end of Copse Lane) to the shops. There is a Doctors surgery in the village, a dentist, and convenience store. There are no objections from Southern Water or the Drainage Engineers.

There are no highway changes proposed that would alter the character of West Walberton Lane as an existing access is being utilised. County Highways have raised no objections. The design of the houses is in character with houses in Walberton and therefore does not result in an unacceptable urbanising effect.

The site is adjacent to existing housing on either side and to the north of the site and it is not considered that the additional 9 houses would create significant light pollution compared to the refused schemes proposal of 157 houses.

The proposed development would provide a contribution to the housing land supply shortfall on a site that is currently not utilised, abuts residential properties, is of a size that would not be viable for any other use than residential and is in a sustainable location.

Walberton Parish Council did allocate the site for affordable housing, but the Inspector removed it on the basis that insufficient evidence had been provided to support the affordable housing need. This resulted in an objection based on the Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish were not unsupportive when the plans were presented to them and they have commented that the Parish is willing to consider this site during its NP review.

The application is similar to the approved application AL/83/16/OUT Land Southwest of Barnside, in that it was for 8 houses in a rural lane. If anything the site is less sustainable than this application in that there are a lack of the service in Aldingbourne that are provided by the village centre of Walberton. Aldingbourne Parish Council raised significant objections to the proposed development, however, on balance the application was approved.

It is therefore considered that the “tilted balance” should be in favour of approving this scheme given the insufficient 5 year housing supply and NPPF policy paragraph 14 that where a plan is out of date permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. It is considered that in this case, planning approval should be granted as there are no demonstrable impacts that would outweigh the benefits of providing 9 homes, and it is similar in scale and location to that recently approved AL/83/16/OUT.

I hope this is helpful, and that we can look forward to the application being presented to the May committee with a favourable recommendation. If you need anything further from me, please let me know.

Best regards
Susan

SUSAN LEESON BSc, M.Phil
ASSOCIATE



Please note my working days are Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday



Company Registration No. 07164666. Registered Office is at 1 & 2 The Barn, West Stoke Road, Chichester, West Sussex, PO18 9AA.

This email and any attachments are strictly confidential and intended solely for the addressee. It may contain information which is privileged. If you are not the intended addressee, you must not disclose, forward, copy or take any action in reliance of this email or any attachments.

DISCLAIMER

Neame Sutton Ltd has taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, however, this email and any attachments may contain software viruses which could damage your system. We cannot accept liability for any damage which you sustain as a result of software viruses and advise that you carry out your own virus check.