

[REDACTED]

From: Clare Bartlett [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 September 2020 09:37
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: AL/49/20/PL Byfields & Nightingale Cottage

Morning Simon


I have to confess this is the first time I have received an EOT to allow for the release of a refusal notice!

Nevertheless in order to be helpful the applicant is agreeable to the request until the end of today. It is her intention to resubmit the application with additional information.

Kind regards

Clare

Clare Bartlett MRTPI PIEMA
Partner - Planning



Batcheller Monkhouse | Chartered Planners & Surveyors
3 Swan Court, Station Road, Pulborough, West Sussex RH20 1RL
[REDACTED]

From: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 September 2020 11:25
To: Clare Bartlett [REDACTED]
Cc: Daniel Vick <Daniel.Vick@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: AL/49/20/PL Byfields & Nightingale Cottage

Dear Clare,

We have now written the decision up for refusal and it is ready to be issued. The report took longer than anticipated to write and hence we are now past the standard expiry period. As such, I write to ask whether you client would agree to an Extension of Time until Thursday 17th September. Please advise whether you agree or not.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI

Principal Planning Officer
Directorate of Place

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

Arun is a CIL Charging Authority, for more information go to www.arun.gov.uk/cil

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: Simon Davis

Sent: 14 August 2020 15:08

To: Clare Bartlett [REDACTED]

Cc: Daniel Vick <Daniel.Vick@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: AL/49/20/PL Byfields & Nightingale Cottage

Dear Clare,

Thanks for your email and the amended plans which will now be changed on our system (not inc the sketch amendments plan).

I acknowledge the pre-application advice ref PAA/140/15/ as given previously however the advice letter was issued around 4 and a half years ago and predates the current Local Plan, the Aldingbourne Neighbourhood Plan, the current NPPF, the National Design Guide and the Council's emerging Design Guide. The presence of the PreApp does not prevent us from taking a fresh look and even more so given its age.

I accept that the boundary wall and verge are to be retained, please accept our apologies for arguing otherwise.

I note the suggestion of hiping the houses, however, I agree with you that hips are not prevalent and I do not consider that such a change would affect our consideration of the proposal.

Regarding scale, notwithstanding my comments on the PreApp above, I do note that I stated in that response that whilst an element of 2 storeys would be acceptable, the overriding scale of the new dwellings should be 1.5 storeys. I accept that the dormers are to the rear elevations however the presence of the front velux's still gives a 2.5 storey impression. Also I am not convinced that the presence of what is clearly an attic window in the Old Stores establishes a 2.5 storey character.

I am sorry but I do not feel that your arguments would persuade us to support the application.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer
Directorate of Place

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

Arun is a CIL Charging Authority, for more information go to www.arun.gov.uk/cil

From: Clare Bartlett [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 August 2020 15:35
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: AL/49/20/PL Byfields & Nightingale Cottage - Design & Highways

Dear Simon

Thanks for your email.

In relation to the Highways comments, I am waiting for the transport consultant to return from leave so he can confirm his advice. However I believe that only the wall to Nightingale Cottage needs to be removed to achieve the visibility splays. This of course is in the ownership of the applicants and is proposed as part of the application.

In relation to the comments about parking, please find attached amended plans which now show the following:

- Garages between dwellings 5 and 6 enlarged to 3m x 6m.
- Garages between dwellings 3 and 4 changed to car ports.
- 1 visitor bay assigned as a resident bay

The scheme now provides 12 resident bays, 1 visitor bay, and a cycle store for visitors.

In relation to your other points I comment on each of these in turn below:

- *The site is very much of an urban/rural edge character and the proposals do not reflect this character.*

The houses have been designed to take into account features of surrounding properties of a similar nature, ie terraced or semi-detached. Photographs of these are attached. The proposed properties would sit slightly lower than The Old Stores which is immediately adjacent.

The layout is similar to that presented as part of the pre-application enquiry, albeit that scheme was for 7 units. The pre-application advice received was that there were no objections to this layout.

The density of the scheme reflects the prevailing density of the immediate area. Elm Cottages and Coronation Cottages equate to a density of 44 dwellings per hectare. As the application site is located closer to the edge of the settlement boundary the lower density (of 18 dwellings per hectare) is considered entirely appropriate for the site.

Taking all of these factors into account we are confident that the scheme presented is appropriate for the site.

- *The elements that make up the character of this site – boundary wall, grass verge, landscaping, spacing will all be destroyed as a result of the proposals.*

The boundary wall to Byfields will not be destroyed. The vast majority of it is to be retained. It is only a short section of the western end of it that is proposed for removal to allow for the creation of a safe pedestrian access.

The vast majority of existing landscaping will also be retained and for every tree removed two will be planted in its place so there will be an increase in landscaping.

The grass verge will also not be destroyed. A footpath is proposed to pass over it but the majority of grass will remain as is.

There is also sufficient spacing between the neighbouring properties and this accords with Arun's Design Guide. This was also the opinion given within the pre-application advice.

- The design is poor and does not appear to be based on local character/context. Either side of the site are dwellings with a relatively strong character, yet what is proposed is at odds with that.

As per my comments above, the scheme has been designed to reflect the style, design and materials of the existing cottages on Nyton Road. The Old Stores is a 'feature' property on the road and it is not considered appropriate to try and copy this. The existing cottages successfully contribute to the character of the road without taking anything away from The Old Stores so we are confident the proposed approach for the application site is the right one.

Most of the surrounding properties have simple pitched roofs with gables. There are only a couple of houses with hipped roofs or barn ends which could be incorporated if you considered this to be more appropriate. Attached is a rough sketch ('sketch amendments') to show what this would look like.

- Surrounding dwellings are predominantly 1.5 storeys yet these are 2.5.

I disagree. Only Mill View has 1.5 storeys and this is the most recent addition to the road. The established character is provided by The Old Stores which has the appearance of a 2.5 storey building, and the cottages which are 2 storeys. The proposed scheme has the appearance of 2 storeys from Nyton Road, with the use of loft space only apparent to the rear and this view is screened by trees. The height of the dwellings is also lower than The Old Stores.

- The trees on the frontage should be respected & retained.

These are not Category A trees and overall the scheme replaces each lost tree with two.

- There may be a scheme here but definitely not 6 dwellings.

The density is lower than the neighbouring cottages to reflect the site's location at the edge of the settlement boundary. 6 units complies with the spacing, size and garden requirements set out with Arun's Design Guide. We therefore consider the site to be suitable for the proposed number of homes.

We are confident the proposal is appropriate for the site and is consistent with the advice received at the pre-application stage. Could I please therefore ask you to reconsider the scheme based on the above. The applicant is open to making design changes in order to avoid an appeal.

Many thanks

Clare

Clare Bartlett MRTPI PIEMA | Partner



Batcheller Monkhouse | Chartered Surveyors
New Bartram House, 3-5 Swan Court, Station Road, Purborough, BH20 1RL

www.batchellermonkhouse.com

From: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 August 2020 14:56
To: Clare Bartlett [REDACTED]
Subject: AL/49/20/PL Byfields & Nightingale Cottage - Design & Highways

Dear Clare,

Please see attached Highways comments. You will note they request more information re visibility and parking (the latter reflects my comments to you already).

I have also been able to discuss the scheme this morning with senior colleagues and the upshot of this is that we cannot support the Byfields part of the scheme as it stands. I provide the following comments:

- The site is very much of an urban/rural edge character and the proposals do not reflect this character.
- The elements that make up the character of this site – boundary wall, grass verge, landscaping, spacing will all be destroyed as a result of the proposals.
- The design is poor and does not appear to be based on local character/context. Either side of the site are dwellings with a relatively strong character, yet what is proposed is at odds with that.
- Surrounding dwellings are predominantly 1.5 storeys yet these are 2.5.
- The trees on the frontage should be respected & retained.
- There may be a scheme here but definitely not 6 dwellings.

In our view the harm outweighs the benefits therefore we would refuse the application.

There are no current issues with the replacement dwelling at Nightingale however our Conservation Officer is yet to respond.

We will not accept amendments to the scheme as this will delay the determination of the application so will determine on this basis unless you wish to withdraw & resubmit. If you wish to do this then I am happy to provide informal pre-app advice between applications.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer
Directorate of Place

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

Arun is a CIL Charging Authority, for more information go to www.arun.gov.uk/cil

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)

