




From: paul collins [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 July 2018 15:59
To: Karl Roberts; Neil Crowther; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Cllr. Stephen Haymes; Planning.Responses
Subject: Y/91/17OUT & Y/92/17 OUT and SD7 ADLP 2011 - 2031

Dear Mr Roberts


I had noted the attached correspondence dated 21 May (which states had been written under your authority following a meeting with Councillor Haymes) relating to a refusal of both these applications under delegated powers. I now note the correspondence relating to an extension of time until September dated 31 May 2018 (but only uploaded to both files this month) contrary to that correspondence. I also note that the last of this correspondence refers to e mails from yourself to the agents which are not recorded on the file.

Given the e mail exchange with YPC dated 21 May 2018 and the fact that the submitted proposals are now in direct conflict with SD7 and other policies in the ADLP 2011 – 2031 adopted on 18 July 2018 I (like YPC and any other member of the public with an interest) would be entitled to assume that both applications would have been refused by now under delegated powers for those reasons as stated in the e mail exchange dated 21/5/18 and/or in accordance with the adopted ADLP. Therefore in the interests of openness and transparency please can you now explain to all those with an interest why this is not the case and what you now intend to direct officers to do with these applications.

Please place this e mail and any response on both your public files.

Thanks

Paul Collins BA (Hons) DipTP



[REDACTED]

From: vicky newman [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 May 2018 22:48
To: David Easton
Cc: Claire Potts; Neil Crowther; Karl Roberts; Cllr. Stephen Haymes; Yapton Parish Council Clerk
Subject: YAPTON PC additional response to Y/91/17/OUT and Y/92/17/OUT

Dear David

Thank you for your email of today's date, its contents has been noted.

I would remind you that whilst Yapton Parish Council supported these two separate outline applications covering Strategic Housing Site SD7 in Yapton, as a Parish, it had strong reservations.

YPC made it clear in both our responses to Y/91/17/OUT and Y/92/17/OUT that the current applications will have many mitigating impacts upon YPC's existing Community and believe that unless these are fully addressed both planning applications could not be successfully implemented. YPC's support was therefore conditional upon detailed and considered planning obligations and conditions being agreed for the whole site (SD7) to ensure a legacy that promotes a fully integrated and sustainable community which will have minimal impact on the existing Community and its stretched facilities but integrate the two in a positive and seamless manner. YPC is determined that both proposals must have an overarching public benefit for the whole of YPC and not solely for the new combined development. I would remind you that YPC remain of the view that this strategic site must fully address and promote the one primary school solution for the Parish thus safeguarding the village's social cohesion and inclusivity for future generations.

As a Parish we are therefore disappointed to learn that ADC is of the view that insufficient evidence has been brought to light to provide confidence in either proposal to effectively address these concerns especially with regard to satisfying YPC's concerns with regard to Primary education in the village, a scheme that reflects the character and heritage of the village and all the associated infrastructure concerns highlighted in our response dated 1st February 2018.

YPC fully accept ADC's need to refuse both applications at this point in time until meaningful and tangible action has been adopted to address these points. YPC understand that ADC have decided to complete this application under delegated powers and have no objection to this approach.

YPC await to hear the final outcome of this application

Yours sincerely

Vicky Newman

Chair of Yapton Parish Council Planning Committee
[REDACTED]

From: David Easton [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 May 2018 14:09
To: Yapton Parish Council Clerk [REDACTED]
Cc: Claire Potts [REDACTED] Neil Crowther [REDACTED] Karl Roberts
[REDACTED]
Subject: Y/91/17/OUT and Y/92/17/OUT

Dear Yapton Parish Council,

Following discussions earlier today between Cllr. Haymes and Karl Roberts please find below the reasons for refusal which have been identified by the LPA in relation to Y/91/17/OUT and Y/92/17/OUT. I would be grateful if you could please provide written confirmation of the withdrawal of the Parish Council's support for these applications.

Y/91/17/OUT – Land at Bilsham Road, Yapton

1. The application has failed to provide sufficient detail to adequately demonstrate that the proposed development will reflect the established character of Yapton or constitute high quality imaginative design giving a sense of place. The proposals are not of a sufficient quality for the Local Planning Authority to endorse the proposals and as such the proposal is deemed to conflict with policy GEN7 of the Arun Local Plan (2003); policies H SP2 and D DM1 of the emerging Arun Local Plan; and paragraphs 8, 17, 56, 57, 63 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The application has failed to provide sufficient detail to adequately demonstrate that the proposed development will provide adequate mitigation for the impacts associated with transport and highways or provide adequate measures to encourage walking, cycling and sustainable travel. In the absence of these details, the proposals will result in severe impacts on highway capacity and safety. As such the proposal is deemed to conflict with policies H SP2 (k) of the emerging Arun Local Plan; and paragraph 32 and 34 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The application has failed to provide sufficient detail to adequately demonstrate that the proposed development will make provision for open space of a sufficient size and quality and re-inforce existing green infrastructure. The application has also failed to provide sufficient detail to demonstrate that ecological enhancements can be provided and designed as part of an overall masterplan. As such the proposal is deemed to conflict with policies H SP2 (c, d and e) of the emerging Arun Local Plan; and paragraph 32 and 34 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. The application fails to provide for the necessary infrastructure, or make provision within the application site for this infrastructure, for education (primary and secondary), libraries, fire services, police services, leisure, health, playing pitches, highways mitigation, sustainable transport measures, walking and cycling, affordable housing. As such the proposal does not adequately mitigate against the impact of the development upon existing services and facilities. Therefore, the proposed development is deemed to conflict with policies H SP2 (n), H SP2c (SD7) and INF SP1 of the emerging Arun District Local Plan.

Y/92/17/OUT – Land east of Drove Lane, Yapton

1. The application has failed to adequately demonstrate that the proposed development will reflect the established character of Yapton or constitute high quality imaginative design giving a sense of place and as

such the proposal is deemed to conflict with policy GEN7 of the Arun Local Plan (2003); policies H SP2 and D DM1 of the emerging Arun Local Plan; and paragraphs 8, 17, 56, 57, 63 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The application fails to make financial contributions towards necessary infrastructure and as such does not adequately mitigate against the impact of the proposed development upon existing services and facilities. Therefore, the proposed development is deemed to conflict with policies H SP2, H SP2c (SD7) and INF SP1 of the emerging Arun District Local Plan.
3. The application has failed to adequately demonstrate that the proposed development will not adversely impact upon the significant of nearby heritage assets (Conservation Area and Arundel to Portsmouth Canal) in conflict with policy AREA2 of the Arun District Local Plan; policy E8 of the YNP; H SP2 (m), HER DM1, HER DM3 and HER DM5 of the emerging Arun Local Plan; and paragraphs 17, 131, 132 and 137 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. The application has failed to provide sufficient detail to adequately demonstrate that the proposed development will make provision for open space of a sufficient size and quality and re-inforce existing green infrastructure. The application has also failed to provide sufficient detail to demonstrate that ecological enhancements can be provided and designed as part of an overall masterplan. As such the proposal is deemed to conflict with policies H SP2 (c, d and e) of the emerging Arun Local Plan; and paragraph 32 and 34 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
5. The application fails to provide for the necessary infrastructure, or make provision within the application site for this infrastructure, for education (primary and secondary), libraries, fire services, police services, leisure, health, playing pitches, highways mitigation, sustainable transport measures, walking and cycling, affordable housing. As such the proposal does not adequately mitigate against the impact of the development upon existing services and facilities. Therefore, the proposed development is deemed to conflict with policies H SP2 (n), H SP2c (SD7) and INF SP1 of the emerging Arun District Local Plan.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss the above further.

Yours Sincerely,

David Easton

David Easton | Principal Planning Officer, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

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

NLPG UPRN 100062237016

DX 57406 Littlehampton

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.

Karen Parsons

From: David Easton
Sent: 18 July 2018 12:59
To: Karen Parsons
Subject: FW: Y/91/17/OUT

Hi Karen,

Could the below please be logged as an extension of time agreement for Y/91/17/OUT until the 12th September 2018.

Thanks,
David

From: Adam Ross [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 May 2018 09:23
To: David Easton
Cc: Zoe Knott; Peter Rawlinson
Subject: RE: Y/91/17/OUT

David

Further to your email, and that from Karl Roberts last Friday, in the circumstances I can confirm my client's agreement to extend the time for determination of this application until the 12th September. This would allow the application to be reported to Committee on 5th September 2018, and provides a week thereafter to complete the associated S106. I understand that this position is consistent with that agreed by Landlink.

I would be grateful for your confirmation of receipt of this email, and if you would circulate dates for the proposed meeting referenced by Karl in his email.

It would be helpful in advance of such a meeting if Officers could identify what their outstanding concerns are. The concerns referenced in recent correspondence were very high level and new to us, so we remain somewhat unclear on the issues between us. Such clarity would allow us to consider them fully and make our meeting as positive as possible.

Thank you


Adam

Adam Ross
Executive Director

[REDACTED]

Nexus Planning
3 Weybridge Business Park
Addlestone Road, Weybridge
Surrey KT15 2BW

[REDACTED]





From: David Easton [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 May 2018 14:28
Subject: Y/91/17/OUT & Y/92/17/OUT

Dear Lisa and Zoe,

Following on from the email from Karl Roberts in relation to the above planning applications on Friday afternoon I can advise that I need to speak with Karl to confirm who from the LPA will be attending and once I have this information I can identify and distribute dates/times.

I am also aware from conversations with Karl and Neil on Friday that we will require written confirmation of agreement to an extension of time for the determination of these applications. This will allow further discussions to be undertaken and solutions identified to address the concerns of the LPA. I have been advised that failure to secure extension of time agreements on these applications will result in the LPA presenting these applications to the Development Control Committee on the 6th June 2018.

Therefore, I would be grateful if written confirmation could be provided confirming your agreement to an extension of time for determination until the **1st September 2018** in accordance with the request from Karl Roberts in his email of the 25th May.

Many thanks,
David Easton

David Easton | Principal Planning Officer, [Arun District Council](#) | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

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

DX 57406 Littlehampton

You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <http://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.
