

Please log as a consultee response from Arundel Town Council

Nicola Spencer | Technical Support Manager, Planning Department, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37446 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737500 ext 37446 | E-mail: nicola.spencer@arun.gov.uk

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



Save the environment - think before you print.

Sent: 05 October 2017 11:24

To: Planning

Subject: AB/77/17/P

Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you very much for the extension of time granted to ATC to submit its comments on the above planning Application. I have tried to upload the objections into three separate "on line" comment boxes (the comments exceeded the word tolerance) but I believe it would far easier if I submitted them in one document by email.

Thus, I attach a document setting out the 12 reasons why the Arundel Town Council object to application No AB/77/17/P

Kind regards,

Sue Simpson
Locum Town Clerk



Arundel Town Council

OBJECTIONS TO APPLICATION NO AB/77/17/P SUBMITTED BY ARUNDEL TOWN COUNCIL

- 1) The Council objects on the basis that the development for 45 No sheltered apartments as it is contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan, namely, Policy 5 of the Arundel Town Council's adopted Neighbourhood Plan which has identified the site for a development of approximately 24 dwellings comprising a mix of dwellings including affordable housing.
- 2) The Council strongly endorses the professional views of the Council's Conservation Officer and the Conservation Area Advisory Committee that describe the building *"as essentially 2 massive, oversized boxes onto which subsidiary elements such as gable and dormers are attached. Together with the false pitch roofs and poor elevational treatment particularly on the red brick section"*. As such the Council objects to a proposed building that falls well below the quality and design that is required to ensure that it respects the exceptional architecture of Arundel and, so achieve the provisions of Policy Gen 7 of the Local Plan.
- 3) The site adjoins a nationally important conservation area and, by reason of its unsympathetic design, scale, massing and height it would harmfully detract from the exceptional architecture of the historic core of Arundel and the more modest, spacious, verdant and suburban character of the development along Fitzalan Road. Thus, it would conflict with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework in that it fails to make a positive contribution to, but significantly harms, both the Conservation Area and its setting.
- 4) On the other hand, the existing building on the site contributes significantly to the setting of the Conservation Area as borne out by the District Council's Conservation Officer; the Conservation Area Advisory Committee and English Heritage, all of whom, consider it to be a building of local interest and worthy of local listing. It is capable of reuse as demonstrated by a similar scheme in Little London, Chichester. As such the Council objects on the grounds that the scheme would result in the unacceptable loss of non-designated heritage asset contrary to Policy HER SP1 of the emerging Local Plan and the advice in the National Planning Policy Guidance.
- 5) The Council objects on the grounds that the development would cause considerable harm to the appearance of the streets scene along Fitzalan Road as it comprises a bulky uncompromising three /four storey continuous mass of building (where the "token" flying freehold does little to alleviate the imposing structure) that would occupy almost the full extent of, and be set in proximity to, the narrow road frontage where it would dominate and tower above other more discreet and domestic size buildings that predominate hereabouts.
- 6) The physical amount of development proposed and the degree of hardstanding required to provide associated parking and turning areas results only in very limited amounts of soft landscaping. The development is too large and represents an overdevelopment of the site (which the Council considers to be smaller than that shown on the drawings) that fails to reflect the spatial qualities of neighbouring development where gaps remain between buildings and their respective boundaries and soft landscaping is a feature of established and more modern development.

- 7) The poorly designed development would be prominently located in the forefront and against the backcloth of, the ancient, historic town of Arundel where it would dominate and appear incongruous in views from the bypass and footpaths and detract from the views of the townscape of Arundel, its castle, cathedral and its special setting contrary to Policy Area 3 and LAN DM2 of the District Council's adopted and emerging Local Plans.
- 8) Due to its overwhelming size, height and bulk it would result in a loss of sunlight; daylight and appear visually oppressive in neighbouring views from immediate properties adjoining and near to the site. Thus, the Council objects on the grounds that it would unacceptably harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers that they can expect to enjoy in this residential area.
- 9) Due to the number of units proposed and the poor internal layout of the development, it fails to provide for a level of accommodation that is capable of providing natural light to all useable rooms and, so the Council objects on the grounds that it would secure an inadequate and substandard level of residential amenity for proposed occupiers that would be inconsistent with that prevailing in the area.
- 10) As the development proposes charging residents for on-site car parking facilities, the Council objects on the grounds that it would indirectly result in a demand for on street parking in an area where such facilities are already in great demand, thereby leading to car parking congestion and implications for highway safety.
- 11) The proposed visibility splay at the junction with Fitzalan Road includes frontage obstructions in excess of 0.6 m in height and, is thus, substandard. In addition, the applicant has not provided a footpath along that section of Fitzalan Road which is the route mostly likely to be used by prospective occupiers to and from Town. Together with the limited visibility that would be associated with the use of the proposed buggy store, these shortfalls are likely to result in conditions that would be prejudicial to pedestrian safety, particularly in this instance, where the accommodation caters for elderly occupiers.
- 12) There are serious surface water and foul drainage problems in the vicinity of the site which have been identified by both residents and statutory consultees. The Town Council is not satisfied from the evidence produced by the applicant that the proposed solutions to these dire problems are capable of being implemented and maintained for the lifetime of the development. Thus, the Town Council objects on these grounds as it considers that the development would unacceptably exacerbate the severe surface water and foul drainage problems and, thus, add to the problems currently experienced by local residents and unacceptably detract from the standard of living conditions that presently prevail in the area.
- 13) The Town Council endorses the advice provided by the Environment Agency and objects to the development in a flood risk area until such time as the District Council has applied and scrutinised the application of a sequential test as laid down in the Chapter on "Meeting the Challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change" of the National Planning Policy

Framework and the applicant has conclusively demonstrated that there are no alternative sites in a lower flood risk area.

- 14) The Council is aware that the District Council's shortfall in housing supply but considers that the objections set out above amount to significant material considerations of such weight that they demonstrably outweigh the circumstances regarding the application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the "benefits" of achieving 21 additional units on the site. Thus, the refusal of the application would be entirely consistent with paras 11-16 in the section on "The presumption in favour of sustainable development" in the National Planning Policy Framework.