n.j.a town planning Ltd

Applications & Appeals Services
The Beehive, City Place, Gatwick, RH6 0PA
Tel: 01403 252231 email: njaltd@gmail.com

FAO Ms Rooney
The Planning Inspectorate
Room 3/C
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

NJA Ref: 19/296

14 April 2020

FINAL COMMENTS

Dear Ms Rooney

PINS Ref:	**APP /Y3805/W/20/3244893**
Appellant	**Randall & Chisnall Ltd**
Site:	**Former Manor Filling Station, Old Shoreham Road, Lancing, West Sussex , BN15 0QS**

Thank you for your letter dated 1st April on behalf of the Appellants, please find enclosed final comments in respect of the Council's Statement of Case and third party comments.

If you have any queries or require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

NJA

Nikolas J. Antoniou
BSc HONS DIPTP MRTPI
Chartered Town Planner
For and on behalf of NJA Town Planning Ltd

RTPI Chartered Town Planner

Appeal Ref: **APP/R3650/W/20/3245049**

Appellant: Randall & Chisnall Ltd
Site: Former Manor Filling Station, Old Shoreham Road, Lancing, West Sussex , BN15 0QS

APPELLANTS' FINAL COMMENTS

The Appellant has had an opportunity to study the representations of the Council and would offer the following observations and comments. The Appellants are aware that they cannot introduce new material or put forward arguments that should have been included in the earlier statement.

Comments on the Local Authority's Statement

The Council's statement is confusing in that it states it both can't and can demonstrate an up to date Land supply position. What is very striking is that the Council has only secured 56% of its Housing Delivery Test requirement. Just over half of what is required. The last three reported years of delivery are 64, 114 and 122 units respectively compared to an annual requirement of at least 177. The two sites referred to are not going to change that position significantly because the first one has only just started and therefore any significant delivery is some time away and the Sompting site is still subject to securing approval. Unfortunately, the Covid 19 situation is not going to assist with the delivery of any homes in the short term.

In order to have a reported supply of 5.2 years it requires the strategic sites listed to provide 520 homes. Approaching a third of the total requirement.

In calculating the actual Housing Supply position, the decision maker is required to demonstrate that sites are deliverable.

The definition of deliverable in the NPPF is set out below.

Deliverable: To be considered deliverable, sites for housing should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years. In particular:
a) sites which do not involve major development and have planning permission, and all

sites with detailed planning permission, should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that homes will not be delivered within five years (for example because they are no longer viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans).
b) where a site has outline planning permission for major development, has been allocated in a development plan, has a grant of permission in principle, or is identified on a brownfield register, it should only be considered deliverable where there is clear evidence that housing completions will begin on site within five years.

The appellants would contend that the Council has not demonstrated that the Sompting site is deliverable as required by the definition and therefore the Council should still be required as not having a 5 year supply of housing. Whilst, it is acknowledged this site is only a single unit, the degree of under delivery is concerning and this home will make a contribution to addressing this, albeit only a small one.

Conditions

Whilst the appellants have no objection in principle to the conditions suggested the appellants are concerned that some of the conditions do not appear to reflect what has previously been agreed where conditions which have been discharged for previous schemes also related to this site. Therefore, requiring details to be agreed again is unnecessary.

An example is the common purpose served by conditions 7 and 11. In the circumstances condition No.7 seems superfluous. Notwithstanding this, the Appellants would happily accept all conditions if it makes the possibility of allowing the appeal less complex and more straightforward.

For the reasons outlined above and in the Appellants' statement of case it is respectfully requested that the appeal be allowed.