

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 29 January 2025 15:10
To: 'Dawn Appleton'
Cc: 'Peter Cleveland'
Subject: AL/137/24/RES Land Rear of Meadow Way

Dear Dawn,

Our concerns with this application are set out per the following headings (as taken from the text of the refusal reasons):

(1) Clustering of affordable housing along the southern edge of the site

Whilst we accept the individual clusters are not joined so do represent small clusters (of 7, 4, 7, 9 as west to east), all AH units are in the cramped denser area along the southern boundary. There has been some mixing (44-46 albeit to resolve Tree issues) but no real change to the previous scheme and so no real change to our previous position. We accept that there is little visual difference between the AH & MKT house types, but the flatted building remains all AH so is not tenure blind.

(2) The failure to ensure a sufficient off-set distance between important offsite trees and plots 38 & 46-48

The scheme has resolved the issue with plots 47 & 47, but concerns remain ref 39-46 (note we are awaiting Tree Officer comments).

(3) The failure to provide an appropriate location/amount/detail of play areas and useable Public Open Spaces

The scheme includes a token amount of central POS (although this has little use value, and its use may result in conflicts with adjacent properties) but otherwise no change with the bulk of POS at the eastern end. Also LEAP and LAP still next to each other and the scheme is missing a 2nd LAP. Landscape Officer comments are awaited but likely to say the same as last time i.e. total POS amount still deficient having regard to the usability of the spaces.

I note your submission states the Outline PP requested 1 LAP and 1 LEAP only. However, the officer report stated LAPs and LEAP whilst appeal condition 4 stated "play areas" so I'm unclear why you think there is only a need for 1 LAP.

(4) The failure to properly accommodate tree planting within the layout

I note changes have been made – we are awaiting Landscape comments.

(5) The failure to provide sufficient accessible parking provision

12 Accessible spaces are now shown. On the PreApp, I asked that 4 of the 12 (not just 2) be sited in the western half of the site (plots 19-61) but only 1 is shown in the western half (previously on the PreApp you showed a second one outside plot 67 but this has now been omitted).

(6) The failure to provide sufficiently sized parking spaces (resolved)

This has been resolved (all now 2.5m by 5m).

(7) The failure to ensure all dwellings have a sufficient depth of rear garden

No change. We previously said: *rear gardens mostly fine except 46 (9.2m), 68 (9.6), 71 (9.5) 77 (8.6) – all where a back alley is included.* I have measured these as follows:

- 45 & 46 still around 9m
- 68 is 9.5m
- 71 is 9.3m
- 77 is 8.4m

(8) The failure to provide the flatted building with sufficient communal space

This has now increased to 88m² versus the 150m² requirement (up from 69m²) comprising the strip to immediate SE of the building. You state the under-provision is acceptable as adjacent to POS however, our view is that overall, the POS is deficient in area.

(9) The failure to ensure sufficient interface distances between new dwellings

You state you have removed direct facing windows, and any shortfalls are 0.8m max. However, I note the following:

- Plots 65F to 18F is 14.2m (requirement is 16m)
- NW Flat (FF & 2F lounge windows) to 80S (FF landing/bathroom) is only 13m (14.5) – this would be ok if the flank window were o/s glazed.
- Plot 49F to 32S (FF large landing) is 12.2m (14.5) – this would also be ok if the flank window were o/s glazed.

(10) The failure to create distinctive character areas within the development

Your submission states see P.44 of the DAS but I can't see that defines any character areas.

(11) The location of the substation in the main streetscene (resolved)

This must be on the route of existing services. This is unfortunate but is accepted. Enhanced landscaping is proposed.

(12) Inappropriate scale of the flatted building in relation to the streetscene & the character of the area

The flatted building has a more interesting design now but remains at 2.5 storeys and in the same location. You repeat that as the parameter plan said up to 2.5 storeys, the height must be accepted. We still disagree with this.

(13) Insufficient information has been provided to adequately demonstrate that the proposed layout is appropriate for the requirements of pedestrians and cyclists (resolved)

I note you have widened the pedestrian & cycle path linking the site with Hook Lane to the west to 3m (from 2m). Final WSCC comments awaited.

(14) Insufficient information has been submitted to show that the proposed number of units, the landscaping, and the layout are implementable without detrimentally impacting surface water drainage on and off the site

We are awaiting WSCC Drainage comments (they were re-consulted 21/01).

(15) Insufficient information has been provided to comply with the requirements of outline condition numbers 4 (lighting on homes, lighting in relation to bats, biodiversity gain, hedgehog holes in fences, amount & distribution of Public Open Space), and 5 (proposed Electric Vehicle Charging Point specifications) (resolved)

All were considered resolved on PAA/76/24. NB no lighting proposed on actual homes. Hedgehog holes shown in the biodiversity enhancement strategy and on hard landsc plan. EVCP specification now provided. Therefore, no further concerns with compliance.

Given that the above largely reflects the views expressed in AL/50/24/RES and PAA/76/24, I do not see the value of a meeting and once all consultation responses (and relevant re-consultations) are in, we will proceed to determine the application for refusal.

Kind Regards

Simon

Simon Davis MRTPI

Principal Planning Officer, Directorate of Growth

T: 01903 737874

E: simon.davis@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF

www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to

<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>

