

[REDACTED]

From: Zoe Knott [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 March 2021 17:28
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Mykena Mortimer-Davies [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Land at Bilsham Road - Y/155/20/DOC

Hi Simon,

Thank you for your email and your time yesterday.

I have responded to each point in blue below and would welcome the opportunity to discuss these comments with you further. On condition 7 I can confirm that my client is happy to withdraw this condition as the information has been submitted as part of the reserved matters and was included for information purposes.

You mentioned yesterday that you have minor comments on the reserved matters application would you be able to share these?

Many thanks,

Zoe

Zoe Knott
Associate


[REDACTED]

Nexus Planning is thrilled to have been awarded RTPI Planning Consultancy of the Year 2020





Nexus Planning - Reading
5th Floor
Thames Tower
Station Road
Reading
Berkshire RG1 1LX



nexusplanning.co.uk



From: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 February 2021 17:14
To: Mykena Mortimer-Davies [REDACTED]
Cc: Zoe Knott [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Land at Bilsham Road - Y/155/20/DOC

Hi Mykena,

I concur with your assessment of the position in respect of this DOC. However, please consider my thoughts below:

7 – We do not consider this can be discharged as it is worded “*The landscaping and layout particulars to be submitted in accordance with Condition 1 shall include: ..*” and so applies to the information to be submitted with the RM. This will thus be assessed as part of the RM application. Can you withdraw this from the DOC please. The alternative is that we refuse it but this will then be confusing for my colleagues to monitor compliance as it will look like we’re still waiting for further info hence our preference that it be withdrawn. If you can do this, please just send me a clear email.

8 – I have today chased the Tree Officer and requested a response by the end of next week. I have a concern though that if we approve this and then request a change to the RM layout the Tree Protection Plan would be out of date but it appears to compliance colleagues that the scheme has been finalised & agreed. This therefore means that we either hold onto the DOC (which affects our performance figures – we are now monitored internally) or we refuse it as being ‘premature’. Given your concern here and being proactive to work together, we would be happy to agree an EoT to help with your performance figures and agree to a date of 15th April which would then line with the reserved matters application.

10 – Our engineers object and our internal instructions on DOC’s are not to entertain changes to submissions that prolong the application expiry. Therefore it is our intention to refuse this. Even if you make changes and these are agreed, the same concern re the layout plan arises as for condition 8. As we are suggesting agreeing to an EoT for condition 8 and as this work is underway rather than refuse the

application could we agree to the required extension which would give you comfort that we would accord with the layout.

13 – Ecology are happy with the Ecological Mitigation & Management Plan. The Plan does not include any layout drawing therefore, we can approve this. Thank you for confirming that this condition is acceptable. Would you be happy to part discharge this set of conditions? We are aware that this happened on other schemes namely Burndell Road.

15 – The EHO comments are awaited however I am not prepared to chase as they have long enough. As such, we could approve this. But, the lighting plan is based on the layout plan and therefore the same concern arises as for condition 8. As the lighting is linked to the layout plan we would be happy to agree an EoT until 15th April to allow comfort that any lighting accords with the layout and reserved matters applications.

21 – WSCC have agreed the slight amendments. The TP does not include any layout drawing therefore, we can approve this. As with condition 15 would you consider approving this condition at this time? Alternatively we can agree to include this in the set of conditions with the extension until 15th April.

It would be my preference if you would withdraw conditions 7, 8, 10 & 15 and we just issue approvals for 13 & 21. You then revisit the withdrawn conditions at a later date say when RM has been granted or close to the time when/if* I advise we are issuing a RM approval.

* note, we are still assessing the RM submission and will provide an update soon.

Please also note that the same concerns arise for Y/3/21/DOC. Our Engineers object to the discharge of condition 9 and whilst Southern Water are happy re condition 12, the foul plans are based on an unapproved layout. Therefore, my preference is that this DOC is also withdrawn. We have been reviewing comments received closely and will provide a response on condition 9 shortly. As with the conditions above we would be happy to agree an extension to give you comfort that any condition will accord with the layout.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer
Directorate of Place

T: 01903 737874
E: simon.davis@arun.gov.uk



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
www.arun.gov.uk/planning

Arun is a CIL Charging Authority, for more information go to www.arun.gov.uk/cil

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)

