

AL/143/24/RES

Outline Conditions

Condition	Compliance
Condition 7 requires 1.8m high acoustic fencing to protect the houses adjacent to the western boundary and also adjacent to the northern boundary of the northern most part of the site. The RM shall include full details of this including design and placement.	Yes, shown on layout plans. EH raise no concerns.
Condition 8 requires: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tree survey documents - Details of boundaries inc hedgehog holes - Mitigation Method Statement ref 5m wide dark buffers on W & S boundaries - Landsc Management Plan - External Lighting proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes - Yes but no holes shown (or at least not obvious) and no fence elevations Applicant response: The amended boundary treatment plans now show the inclusion of hedgehog holes - Yes - State is included but not obvious where. - Street Lighting plan provided. No details of any lighting to individual homes – assume none? Applicant response: Street lighting is shown on the lighting plan, sensitive porch lights will be provided to individual plots
Condition 9 requires that the RM submission includes full details of POS and play provision.	Play Area plans are provided.
Condition 10 requires that the RM submission include details of EVCP, a levels survey, 5% disabled parking, cycle storage details (including elevations), and a colour materials schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EVCP locations not shown (DAS states to each dwelling) and no details of spec (EH have asked for this) Applicant response: An EV charging plan is now provided, showing location of charging points, as required by Building Regs - Levels survey included - (see comment elsewhere) - State in sheds or garages (no plans of sheds – need condition) - Materials Plan indicates base colour of materials. Materials are then shown in colour in the DAS.
Condition 12 requires M4(2) and M4(3)	Planning Layout shows 65 x M4(2) and 2 x M4(3)

Consultee Issues

WSSC Highways request amendments – please see attached responses
Ecology request further information – please see attached responses

EH request further details ref EVCP

WSCC Drainage objection – discussions being held with WSCC Drainage Officer
(SD chased Trees and Landscape 13/02)

Senior Officer Comments

(Officers will also discuss the scheme with the Group Head of Planning and this may generate further issues).

Pre-Application Issues Comparison

None undertaken.

Parking

10 x 1bed = 20 spaces

42 x 2 = 84

30 x 3 = 60

13 x 4 = 39

Per Arun Parking SPD, requirement is 203 allocated spaces and 19 visitor spaces (222)

Propose 179.5 spaces plus 11 visitor spaces (189.5):

- 9 garages at over 3 x 6m (counted as 4.5 per Parking SPD)
- 1 garage at 2.7 x 5.4m (counted as zero as less than 3x6m standard)
- 4 FOG garage spaces at 2.9 x 5.9m (zero)
- Allocated spaces (175)

NB Only 2 of the 11 visitor spaces shown in the northern half (north of the access track)

10% reduction in parking provision allowed where a Travel Plan (equates to a 22-space reduction) – still below this, also we don't want to encourage overspill parking on Lidsey Road nor on-street parking within the layout.

Applicant response: An improved level of parking is provided, with additional visitor parking, including 3 spaces as disabled visitor parking

All spaces appear to measure 2.5m x 5m

Need 5% of all spaces to be disabled suitable (so 10 based on current parking or 11 based on requirement). Several (way more than 10 or 11) spaces have hatched overrun areas, **but we would expect to see actual marked disabled spaces for the M4(3) homes and also disabled visitor spaces and there are none.**

Applicant response: Two allocated disabled visitor parking spaces provided and an additional three disabled visitor parking spaces are provided, and annotated by the disabled parking symbol for ease of reference. The disabled visitor parking spaces are well distributed within the site to ensure they are accessible.

Landscaping, POS & Play

Need 7,838m2 of POS and Play provision to include 2 x LAP and LEAP (400m2).
Provide LEAP and 2 x LAP (which are all spread out) and state they meet the POS requirements **but no info on proposed amount of open space in m2 (no breakdown of areas to check whether useable)**. Await Landscape comments

No detailed drawings of landscaping yet landscaping applied for (await Landscape comments).

Applicant response: A landscape area calculation is now included, showing that landscape/open space provision meets required standard. Detailed planting plans are being prepared

Layout & Design inc AH

AH is all in the Northern area but is in small clusters/mixed with Market so ok.

Both of the flatted buildings are solely AH. But accept this can't be mixed.

Positive that there are some terraced dwellings in the Market tenure.

Parking in around the FOGS/Parking Courts is complicated

Very northern part feels cramped and overdeveloped. **Applicant response:** The scheme has been re-designed, with a reduction in 2 dwellings, reducing overall density.

FOG 66 has a triangular garden tucked away in a corner which is not ideal.

Looks to be standard design/materials. **Applicant response:** A varied approach to materials and design is proposed, to respond to its surroundings. A condition is anticipated to agree final materials details.

Some alteration in roof forms, and inclusion of rendered dwellings, but no chimneys

The DAS does refer to character areas.

The 2.5 storey terraces (plots 43-48) look bulky on the streetscene drawing when seen alongside the two storey gabled homes on either side. **Applicant response:** Plots 43 & 48 have been changed to two storeys, to allow for improved transition to 2.5 storey dwellings at plots 44-47.

Scale

2 x s/s bungalows

71 x 2 storey

17 x 2.5 storey houses

1 flatted building (5 flats – 77-82) is 3 storeys

M4(2) & M4(3)

Need 50% M4(2) so 48 no. and 2 no. M4(3).

Show 65 x M4(2) and 2 x M4(3)

Market Housing Mix

In conflict with the SHMAA mix (no 1 bed Mkt, slightly too high on 3-bed %).

No justification but not a significant deviation so ok.

Accessibility

1 road access and 1 footpath access to A29 at northern end

Also show links to future development.

Amenity Spaces

No communal space provided for flats 77-82 (need 90m² per ADG) **Applicant response:** The amendments to the scheme have allowed for the provision of 91sq.m of communal amenity space, to meet the required standard

No amenity space shown for FOG 85 (need at least 3m²) **Applicant response:** The changes to the scheme have removed this dwelling

Space is shown for FOG 66, but this is detached from the building and tucked away in a corner. **Applicant response:** The relevant levels of amenity space is provided, in a position which is accessible and well related to the plot's parking

Insufficient Garden lengths:

- None of 1-15 achieve 10.5, many are under 10m.
- 93's garden is 7.6m
- 92's is 9.8m
- 37's is 8.7m
- 38/39's is 9m
- 40's is 8.8m
- 58's is 8.5m
- 59's is 9.5m
- 67's is 6.9m
- 76's is 9.1m

There are plenty of others which do not meet 10.5m but would be ok if 10m and achieve interface distances or have extra width.

Applicant response: All gardens now meet a minimum 10m in length, and all but 1 dwelling now meet or exceed 10.5m, with many gardens significantly exceeding this standard

Interface Standards

Existing Properties:

The Paddock, Lidsey Road – bungalow with bedroom/lounge/kitchen windows facing the site but no window-to-window interface issues (however, ensuite window in FF side of 70- will overlook the garden – remove or o/g). NB plot 64 has no FF flank window
April Cottage, Lidsey Road – bungalow – 60-63 has a FF flank but not an issue.
Woodgate House – a two-storey house. Gardens will be overlooked on all sides but no privacy issues to its windows.

New:

Front of 77-82 (FF & 2F bed & lounge) to Side of 68/69 (FF bed & lounge) is 13.1m (should be 16m)

40 & 41 Front (FF bed) to 38 & 39 front (FF bed) is 14.5m (16m)

38 & 39 Rear (FF bed) to 30 & 31 Rear (FF bed) is 19.5m (21m)

Applicant response: The amendments to the scheme has allowed for the relevant interface standards to be met

48 Rear (FF bed) to 50 Side (FF en-suite) is 13m (14m) - ok if o/g

Rear of 35 (FF bed) to side of 37 (FF en-suite) is 11.5m (14m) - ok if o/g

20 Rear (FF bed) to 22 Side (but no side windows) is 11.7m (14m) - ok

21 Side (FF study) to 13 Front (FF bed) is 12.5m (14m) – ok

Other

Need to query relationship of thick black lines on plans versus the red edge (lines do not match).