

[REDACTED]

From: Daun Johnson on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 04 April 2019 10:34
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Concerns with planning application WA/95/18/RES

[REDACTED]

From: Michael Eastham
Sent: 04 April 2019 10:20
To: 'Darran Trent'
Cc: [REDACTED] Planning.Responses; Nicola Spencer; Andy Peppler
Subject: RE: Concerns with planning application WA/95/18/RES

Dear Darran,

The areas of open space would be managed by a management company and it would be not intended that the paths would be dedicated as a formal Public Right(s) of Way (PROWs).

With reference to the timing of the changes, reading your latest email it would seem this relates to the plans shown indicatively at the outline planning stage in August / September 2017 and those which are proposed as part of the detailed Reserved Matters application. The plans the applicant has submitted have not substantially changed in this part of the site since the applicant's consultation event in August nor the plans which were submitted with the Reserved Matters application in November 2018. The layout has not moved any closer to the eastern boundary through the revisions submitted in this application. You may be referring to the outline layout which was indicative. In any case, the proposed layout is consistent with the approved outline planning permission's parameter plans and provides more than sufficient separation coupled with additional landscaping to this boundary.

Kind regards,

Michael

From: Darran Trent [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 April 2019 22:30
To: Michael Eastham; Darran Trent
Cc: [REDACTED] Planning.Responses; Nicola Spencer; Andy Peppler
Subject: RE: Concerns with planning application WA/95/18/RES

Dear Michael,

Thank you greatly for your reply, it is appreciated.

Whilst I understand the spirit of your reply it has not diluted my concerns.

A path 'formal' or 'informal' is still considered to be a public right of way unless declared otherwise under section 31(6) of the highways act, is my understanding. Which I believe would mean the informal path could be pathed at any point in the future without consultation, thus making it a far more frequent passage way for pedestrians. That is

to assume that your suggestion that the informal path will see less traffic, which I think will only be proved if constructed.

In fairness my main concern is centred around the timing of the changes. Since June 2017 all plans exhibited throughout consultation (WA/44/17/OUT) showed the space in question to be a 'LAPS', then the month before a decision was due to taken on the application, which I appreciate was subsequently delayed, the plans have changed (WA/95/18/RES) it would seem with little regard to those most impacted.

To me the above seems to make a mockery of the public consultation process, so would you be able to explain to me how it is justified to make significant changes to the plan at such a late date?

Additionally, what would need to happen to revert to the original consulted plan for this space?

One final question for the moment, this might just be a result of not having scaled plans but it appears on the substitute plans that the closest residential property to be construct is now closer to our boundary line than in the original plans. Would you be in a position to provide the exact distances in the original and substitute plans and the reasoning for any differences?

I look forward to your reply.

Kind regards

Darran Trent

From: Michael Eastham [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 April 2019 14:44
To: 'Darran Trent' [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]; Planning.Responses [REDACTED] Nicola Spencer
[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Concerns with planning application WA/95/18/RES

Dear Darran,

Your representation has been treated as an objection to the reserved matters application (WA/95/18/RES).

The objection regards the proximity of paths on the site to your boundary fence. The plans show an informal path in the area adjoining the properties on Manser Road. It is not a formal path and would not be hard surfaced. Indeed there are formal paths nearby but further away from your house, which provide a hard surface link from the properties through the community orchard and out to Avisford Park Road and the other parts of the site. This is the intended route for pedestrians in this part of the site and anticipated to be the main path. The applicant has also taken the opportunity to bolster the planting on the boundaries with the existing properties on the revised landscaping plans. The landscaping includes a secure boundary fence (post and rail) along with a range of additional planting including hedgerow, trees and wildflower mix. This is considered to provide a landscaped buffer to the eastern edge of the site with Manser Road, whilst bolstering the ecological habitat of the site. It is therefore considered that the informal nature of the path shown in combination with the position of the formal path nearby along with the additional landscaping already proposed on the boundary with the houses on Manser Road, ensure that there would be no adverse impact on the amenity of the properties adjoining the site.

Kind regards,

Michael

From: Darran Trent [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 April 2019 14:26

To: Planning; Michael Eastham
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Concerns with planning application WA/95/18/RES

Hi Michael,

I just realised that your actual email address was on the planning portal and thought mailing you directly may be beneficial.

Please see my previous emails in the trail below.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards

Darran Trent
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

On 1 Apr 2019, at 22:14, Darran Trent [REDACTED] wrote:

F.A.O - Michael Eastham

Dear Michael,

As I had not received any contact in reply to my original email, dated 11/03/19, I thought it best to follow up.

I believe my original email would have been considered as "all other correspondence" and as such warranted a reply within 10 days.

" All Other Correspondence

All other correspondence will be allocated either to the specific officer dealing with the matter or if more general the relevant team leader or manager so that they can allocate the enquiry to an appropriate officer. In this case, if the content requires a response, you should receive a response from one of our officers within 10 working days."

As it is we are now on day 21 and whilst I appreciate your are no doubt very busy my concerns still stand and I would greatly appreciate a reply.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours respectfully

Mr Darran Trent



Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Darran Trent [REDACTED]
Date: 11 March 2019 at 16:05:56 GMT
To: "[REDACTED]"
[REDACTED]
Subject: Concerns with planning application WA/95/18/RES

F.A.O - Michael Eastham

Dear Michael,

I write to you to highlight concerns that have arisen from a recent alteration, dated 15/02/19, to the planning application WA/95/18/RES Land East Of Tye Lane, Walberton.

We are residence of Manser Road, I have highlighted our property in the pictures below as we are adjacent to the proposed development plot and to this point had been reasonably accommodating of the plan.

To my concern, below is a copy of the reactional plan prior to 15/02/2019, it showed a 'LAPS' immediately adjacent to our property. This we felt would allow for a buffer to our property and whilst we are not excited about the development, we felt at least the planners had been considerate to the **very few residential properties** that immediately abut close proximity buildings on the new development.

<image002.jpg>

I am sure you will understand why I am raising my concerns when today I realised that the 'Substitute Plan – Landscape MasterPlan 3823/111 REV B' dated 15/02/19 had seen a significant alteration to the area immediately next to our property. The 'LAPS' had been removed and replaced with a path running immediately adjacent to our fence. With 3 small children in our house I am sure you can appreciate my concern of access to our property with a planned path in such close proximity, not to mention the reduction in our privacy and potential noise disruption.

<image004.jpg>

The reasons for this communication is to understand which of the plans will come to fruition?

I am hopeful it will not come to this but if the later of the plans is the one ultimately concluded upon, I would like to seek your advice on how we can address the concerns I have raised above.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours respectfully

Mr Darran Trent



<http://www.arun.gov.uk>

DX 57406 Littlehampton

You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.
