

Please upload on Ocella the email below which is a representation from a local resident to reserved matters application **A/109/20/RES** relating to Land South of Water Lane, Angmering.

Thanks,

Michael

Michael Eastham
Principal Planning Officer,
Planning Department



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



Dear Sirs,

Re: Application Ref : A/109/20/RES

Re: Approval of reserved matters following outline consent A/99/17/OUT for 175 No dwellings & associated infrastructure.

We write regarding the above application.

As will have been highlighted by the conservation officer, the proposal affects the setting of a number of listed buildings and affects the character and appearance of the Angmering Conservation Area.

To build in the area despite the above, there are a number of minimum requirements as evidenced in the plethora of previous applications.

1) Overall massing

The overall massing of the properties is hugely significant for the area. Previous applications in the area required low density developments, low visual bulk and consideration of other dwellings. There appears to have been no such consideration for this proposal.

As per previous recommendations, I would not have expected to see approval for a plan with such a site density for this many Units/Ha for this area.

This mass build completely erodes the open farmland associated with the farmhouse and blurs the distinction between what was historically an isolated group of agricultural buildings and the nearby settlement of Angmering, and thereby transforms the way in which the heritage asset is perceived. It diminishes the pre-eminence of the historic building, both within the farmstead and the wider landscape.

Quite apart from the above, this also leads to the following issues:

a. Car Parking

There are not anywhere near enough spaces on the plans to allow for demand. **It was previously deemed that what is required is two Car Parking Spaces per dwelling plus 2 visitor parking spaces per block.**

Water lane is already a “rat run” due to a lack of car parking spaces and excess cars. This will make matters far worse if the requirement above is cut.

b. Water Lane accidents

Whether this project is deemed an overdevelopment or not, the sheer amount of traffic is more than this road can cope with. We know this development will easily generate 300 cars. There is already daily congestion, delays and frustration on Water Lane with current levels of traffic.

Further, there are safety issues that appear to have not been considered properly. There are no safe foot paths around the relevant area of Water Lane and this is even more dangerous by the fact it is now a rat run as stated above. And the access onto Water lane has poor visibility and exiting onto the road can be precarious at the best of times. There have been two serious accidents in recent years.

c. Limits on Artificial Light

To maintain the edge of the village aesthetic, it was previously required by the council that narrow spectrum light sources are used, minimal ultra violet light, explicit height and time restrictions for the lighting options. There needs to be dark periods from 23.00hrs as per previous requirements.

2) Design of Proposal

a. Building Requirements

There is a minimum requirement to ensure the properties are in keeping with the surrounding area. New buildings in this area were previously required to have a low profile, simple aesthetic and high visual quality. Examples of farm labourers’ cottages were suggested in previous applications.

For example, conclusions reached on previous applications in this location required new developments to be “modestly scaled” i.e. “a pair of 1½ half storey (‘Chalet style’) dwellings - reminiscent of rural workers cottages”.

The point made by the council was that such buildings were deemed to have a less harmful presence on such a site, as they would relate to the scale and form of other curtilage buildings and avoid overtly competing with, or greatly distracting attention from, the principle listed buildings.

Such previous applicants were required to use flint work on all the elevations in order that the buildings are of a high visual quality from any viewpoint.

I am sure the council will make the point that the material palette of the proposed scheme is somewhat incongruous with the rural setting, being more new build urban in feel.

The materials suggested are not in keeping with surrounding buildings or the local area. The proposals should have drawn inspiration from the neighbouring listed buildings including orange-red clay brick for quoins, arches and plinths, orange-red clay tiles to the double pitched roof, coursed flintwork and dressings.

Window joinery was previously requested to be painted timber with either naturally weathered oak front doors or alternatively black or heritage coloured painted and rainwater goods should be half-round black gutters and circular downpipes.

b. Height overlooking property

The proposed properties are much larger than anyone had anticipated. As said above, the designs should have sympathy with the built structures of the listed buildings and their outbuildings.

Again, with previous applications it was required that such buildings were not higher than 8,000mm ridge height. It was previously deemed that 11,000mm was too tall.

c. Hard landscaping, hardstanding and close-boarded fencing to allow for vegetation

There are no clear fencing options. It is unclear whether a visually permeable boundary treatments such as post or rail, five bar gates are to be installed so a connection with the wider landscape is retained both into and out of the existing heritage asset.

Previous applications required boundaries to either have timber post, rail fences, indigenous hedge planting, well screened fences, rows of mature trees just outside of the site. Neither are there any clear sheds for garden equipment and bicycle storage.

As detailed above, the current designs do not represent a positive contribution to the setting and the wider landscape, but it also too visible from the areas of the listed buildings.

Many thanks,

Chris