





From: Fiona Fitzgerald
Sent: 22 January 2019 10:49
To: David Easton <David.Easton@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Y/92/17/OUT

Dear David,

In response to Matt Kennett's comments, we have reviewed the documentation sent by the applicant and are satisfied that conditions ENV 3 and 6 be removed. However we would like condition ENV 5 (unsuspected contamination) to remain.

Regards

Fiona

From: David Easton
Sent: 21 January 2019 14:45
To: Fiona Fitzgerald
Cc: Christopher Davis
Subject: FW: Y/92/17/OUT

Hi Fiona,

I sent this one through on the 11th Jan and would be grateful if you could please provide a response urgently. The application is due to be presented at DCC on Wednesday (23rd January).

I have also noted that the construction on this one have been conditioned as;

*7.00 a.m. and 6.00 p.m. on Mondays to Fridays inclusive
8.00 a.m. and 1.00 p.m. on Saturday
Not at any time on Sundays or Public Holidays*

I am not sure if this came from you or we have just pulled it through from another application, but are you able to confirm if these proposed construction hours are acceptable? I am just surprised it is not 8.00am Monday – Friday and 9.00am on Saturdays which has made me question it.

Many thanks,
David

From: David Easton
Sent: 11 January 2019 16:01
To: Fiona Fitzgerald <Fiona.Fitzgerald@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Christopher Davis <christopher.davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Y/92/17/OUT

Hi Fiona,

I have received the below email and large attachments from the agent on Y/92/17/OUT.

Are you able to take a look and confirm if the conditions requested by Matt Kennett in his consultation response dated 5th March 2018 are necessary?

Many thanks,
David

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

Internal: 37619 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737619 | E-mail: David.Easton@arun.gov.uk

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

From: Lisa Jackson [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 January 2019 13:01
To: David Easton <David.Easton@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Andrew Tice [REDACTED] Jacintha Carty [REDACTED]
Subject: Y/92/17/OUT

Dear David

Further to my voicemail I confirm I have made comments on all the draft conditions and these are with the client. I will forward these to you shortly.

However to aid consideration I attach the intrusive ground investigation that has been carried out by Landlink on the site which confirms there is no contamination. Therefore, I believe conditions 30, 31 and 32 are entirely unnecessary. Given this is a greenfield arable site unexpected contamination is entirely unlikely and given the extensive testing and sampling which looked across the entire site, including the canal and other off site historical uses it is difficult to envisage any other potential source of contamination.

I replicate the summary on contamination here:

Within the near surface soils over the site, no pesticide residues or asbestos fibres were recorded. Therefore, there are considered to be negligible risks to future residents or groundwater environment from pesticides. Site investigation and chemical testing of soil samples taken for the on site and off site canal infill indicate the site is uncontaminated from this source.

Site investigation and chemical testing of soil samples taken for the on site and off site canal infill indicate the site is not contaminated.
Site investigation and chemical testing of soil samples taken for the off site historic vehicle servicing and farm tank located to the north east of the site indicate the site is not contaminated.

None of the soil samples recorded any contaminants at concentrations exceeding their respective assessment criteria for human health.
With regards to the off-site canal infill source and the potential for gas migration, no evidence of a gas risk was identified by the investigation. Six monitoring visits were undertaken that all indicate the risk of gas migration is negligible.

I would be grateful if you can confirm with your EHO given the reports attached that the conditions regarding contamination are unnecessary.

Kind regards,

Lisa

Lisa Jackson

Jackson Planning Ltd



JACKSON PLANNING