



Ben Daines &lt;ben.daines@adur-worthing.gov.uk&gt;

**Re: 1207 Steyning Road, Shoreham - planning application AWDM/1953/16**

1 message

**James Appleton** <james.appleton@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

25 March 2017 at 13:11

To: Peter Barnett &lt;peter.barnett@adur-worthing.gov.uk&gt;, Robert Thornton &lt;robert@thornton-design.com&gt;

Cc: Ben Daines &lt;Ben.daines@adur-worthing.gov.uk&gt;, Kate Collins &lt;kate@sheilsflynn.com&gt;, Moira Hayes &lt;Moira.Hayes@adur-worthing.gov.uk&gt;, William Thornton &lt;willdthornton@gmail.com&gt;

Dear Robert,

As you are aware the Council is still concerned about the principle of development on the site and notwithstanding the supporting information with the current application feel that the proposal cannot be supported.

In many respects the proposed layout, form and height of the proposed development designed to address the clear site constraints only serves to reinforce the Councils view that the principle of development is not acceptable. I note that the noise issues across the site have resulted in a high density form of development being proposed to create an acoustic barrier along the northern/eastern boundary of the site. This in itself at a height of 3 stories to address flooding concerns of the Environment Agency would, in itself, create a very alien form of development compared to the surrounding development at a scale and density inappropriate to the sites location not only on the edge of Old Shoreham but also adjacent to the National Park and heritage assets in the locality of the site.

You will note that a number of consultees responses have raised significant concerns about the impact of the proposed development on the landscape and it is not apparent that these can be overcome given the constraints on any development on this site. Whilst I appreciate that there are considerable differences of opinion about various aspects of the Councils landscape advice you will note that concerns from Landscape Officers of both the National Park and West Sussex County Council express concern about the visual impact of the development when viewed from the Downs Link path, approach into Shoreham and from the National Park. The scope to mitigate development at this height and density is seriously questioned and the proposed scheme does not provide adequate mitigation to justify development on this site.

The Council is currently reviewing the impact on heritage assets and I will provide further information in respects of these matters in due course. I should add that following your presentation to the Major Projects Board I have received concerns from the local ward Members about the scheme and many of the above concerns have

In terms of a timetable for determination I apologise for the delay in coming back to you on this matter since the Examination but we were keen to get a clear steer from the Inspector about his reporting timetable and review consultation responses on your application. As you indicate depending on the views of the Local Plan Inspector it maybe possible to take this application to the Committee at the end of May but this would not allow much time to address any particular issues that the Inspector raises and of course we can review the matter at this time. I have advised the EA of this timeframe but I am not sure whether they will delay the current timetable for this reach.

I appreciate this response will come as a disappointment to you but given the Councils Landscape advice and consultees responses on the application so far, the principle of development on this site remains unacceptable to the Council and in many respects the consultation responses have reinforced the Councils concerns about the appropriateness of this site for development.

I acknowledge that there is little agreement on a number of matters regarding the Councils Landscape advice. We have sought to confirm to the Inspector that we are in agreement about the levels proposed along the proposed Tidal Walls for this reach and that the application for the Tidal Walls seeks to retain existing vegetation. At this stage until a detailed landscaping scheme has been submitted for this reach it is difficult to comment definitely on what can be retained or the level of additional planting that can be undertaken. There has been some confusion in connection with the EAs stance to planting on the flood defence embankment and therefore the Council is relying on the EAs general standing advice not to plant any trees that would undermine the integrity of the flood defence feature.

Regards James

On Thu, 23 Mar 2017 at 09:38, Robert Thornton &lt;robert@thornton-design.com&gt; wrote:

Dear Peter,

The statutory determination period for our planning application, above, runs out tomorrow. We believe that you want to take more time in which to determine the application, but despite

asking directly, we are still waiting for you to clarify how much time you believe you need and formally request an extension of time. We are agreeable to this in principle, but do want to set as short a time limit as absolutely necessary due to the pressure upon us from the EA over the TWS.

Given that the Local Plan Inspector is due to release an initial statement on his position on 5th May 2017, we should be able to reach agreement that our application will be taken to committee at the first opportunity thereafter (30th May). In the meantime, there is no reason why you cannot set out the principles upon which our application will be determined. In other words, you should be able to tell us whether there are any other issues, on which you might require further information, other than those you are waiting for the Local Plan Inspector to clarify for you, i.e. your Gap Policy and your Allocation Policy. We believe it would be unfair of you to raise other issues thereafter, which can and should be raised now.

For example, you should be able to confirm whether you are happy that the consultation responses you have received have either been satisfactorily addressed by our original submission and/or subsequent responses, or are not considered significant enough to inhibit a positive recommendation, in terms of their planning weight or relevance.

Regards,

**Robert Thornton**

Thornton **architecture + design**

**T:** 01798 368623 **M:** 07773 245612 **W:** [www.thornton-design.com](http://www.thornton-design.com)

This e-mail is intended for the named addressee only. It contains information that may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the named addressee you may neither copy nor use nor disclose it to anyone else. If you have received it in error please notify us immediately and destroy the e-mail. The copyright of all files attached to this e-mail, unless stated otherwise, remain the property of Thornton Architecture + Design who grant licence to approved parties to utilize the data solely in connection with the project for which it was prepared.

---

James Appleton Head of Economic Growth Adur District and Worthing Borough Councils 01903 221333 or mobile - 07912276867 [james.appleton@adur-Worthing.gov.uk](mailto:james.appleton@adur-Worthing.gov.uk) Sent from Gmail Mobile