

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: Michael Eastham <Michael.Eastham@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 January 2021 08:08
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Application Ref : A/109/20/RES

Please upload onto Ocella the email below which is a further representation from a local resident objecting 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

T: 01903 737772
E: michael.eastham@arun.gov.uk

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



Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: Christopher J. Chapman [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 January 2021 09:36
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>; Michael Eastham <Michael.Eastham@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Application Ref : A/109/20/RES

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.

I think like many, this has been a difficult application to follow because of the deluge of documentation since the last consultation 3 months ago. With more than 200 “new” documents since then (although there does seem to be a fair amount of repetition) the current position has now become somewhat bewildering. As a result, like many (including the Parish Council and the Fire and Rescue Service) I have a couple of questions for the Applicant. At time of writing there are 458 documents in respect of this application (not counting the associated withdrawn application), so I apologise for any repetition on my part but want to be safe in the knowledge I have put my concerns forward.

1) Overall massing

The surprise at the site density has been raised by almost every respondent but it seems to me that the research carried out by the Parish Council shows decisively that the site density is not in keeping with the surrounding area and thus contrary to local development plans / compliance with nearby heritage assets.

Almost every respondent who lives near the site has said from the beginning that the density and layout is contrary to the common-sense reality of living and travelling around the village. We all know the roads in and especially out of the village are frequently gridlocked and the schools and medical facilities are stretched arguably beyond capacity. And this is just one of a number of new developments in the village being considered.

I agree with my fellow residents and the Parish Council that the site density (although the loss of one unit is noted) is still too high for this area.

2) Car Parking

There are still not anywhere near enough spaces on the plans to allow for demand. It was deemed in previous applications that what was required is two Car Parking Spaces per dwelling plus 2 visitor parking spaces per block. In addition to the two spaces per house, at present there appears to only be about 40 unallocated spaces. You only need to drive down Water Lane, and see the number of cars per 2-3 bedroom properties to know that is not enough. These 3 or 4 bedroom properties are going to need the required amounts as previously demanded by the Council for other developments in the area.

3) Limits on Artificial Light

I repeat everyone’s concerns over light pollution, at present the light will remove all aspects of the edge of the village aesthetic. The Velux roof lights have been identified as non-compliant and harmful to wildlife. I have read nothing else regarding explicit height and time restrictions for the lighting options. Perhaps the Applicant can elaborate on this.

4) General Access and Weavers’ Hill Access

The lack of access for this development has already impacted those on Water Lane and The Avenals Farm / Barn buildings. Heavy machinery and all the workforce is now only able to access the site through a narrow road which services a number of properties already. The previous proposal regarding access to the site from a south road appears to have not materialised due to some third-party disagreement of which I have not been fully informed. This is frankly unacceptable.

Our recent experience therefore raised stronger concerns over the removal of the Weaver Hill Emergency Access. This is a significant change to the Parameter Plans and there have been stark warnings by the Parish Council as well as Fire and Emergency Experts – so I would refer to their submissions. This entire development is now on a dead-end access road which to anyone who has experience of driving out onto Water Lane, will know that it is not often an easy manoeuvre. From personal experience, vehicles travel so fast from the bypass, the field of view is so very narrow that if there is an emergency, you had better hope no more than one or two cars are in front of you trying to pull out into Water Lane.

5) Design of the Buildings

I take the point the taller, totally unsuitable, building have been removed from the plan. That said, there appears to have been only lip service paid to the concern that the properties are not in keeping with the surrounding area.

I would refer to my previous comments in that the council's planning team had made it abundantly clear what they required from the look and materials used in a development in this location when dealing with previous applications. Being (apologies for the repetition) low profile, simple aesthetic, high visual quality (e.g. farm labourers' cottages), flint work on all the elevations, orange-red clay brick for quoins, arches and plinths, orange-red clay tiles to the double pitched roof, coursed flintwork and dressings, window joinery; and painted timber and either naturally weathered oak front doors or black or heritage coloured painted.

However, the most recent plan shows flint work on only about half a dozen properties in total either facing Weaver's Hill and Water Lane. The rest are just red brick (particularly around the listed buildings) and they do not appear to have changed in style in any noticeable way. As has been identified by other respondents, surely the flint walls and sympathetic materials used should also surround the listed buildings as well.

6) Buffers and Landscaping

I repeat the concern of the Parish Council and other respondents in that the the landscaping is lacking both in maturity and density; the height of the boundary hedgerow is not acceptable and there needs to be an "assured" level of screening from the listed buildings. I repeat the Parish's comments that the buffer, if there is one, has been reduced and foliage cleared. The proposed buffer is not generous if it can be considered a buffer at all.

Apart from now including a close board fence, which should have been included originally, it is very unclear what has been done to create a landscape buffer to protect the heritage assets. The Applicant keeps using the words "enhanced" but I see nothing enhanced about the buffer. A "varied" mix of thinly spread trees is neither a "substantial" nor "enhanced" buffer able to create a "neutral heritage impact". It is just a very poor attempt at screening.

Unless the design of the buildings change (as per my comment above), it doesn't matter whether you put one type of tree or four types of tree across the boundary, it won't hide the fact the buildings are not in keeping. For the same reason, you could not build a block of flats on the doorstep of Ecclesden Manor just because you have planted a "very varied" selection of trees.

Bearing in mind we are talking about a fence and a few trees, I do not see how the plan has sufficiently reduced "inter-visibility" or provided "an increasingly sympathetic and natural transition between the site and heritage assets." The by numbers building designs (as per say Madgwick Park in Chichester) and the "less than substantial" buffer (as per Parish Council's comments) will only serve to prove that development is in stark contrast with the rest of the area.

I agree with my fellow respondent and therefore quote his inciteful comments which I think addressed this point very clearly:

"The proposed landscaping is also lacking, both in maturity and density and whilst it may blend-in in 30 years' time, more investment now would shield the shocking immediate affect this development is going to have. At the rear (South side) of Avenals Farm the proposed link road has I see included a gateway to future development on the south side of this site. On the south side of this ridiculous link road, the plan allows for a tall acoustic fence on the southern flank but no fencing on the northside along the border with Avenals Farm buildings (Grade 2 Listed). Surely this should be the least the developers should do. Furthermore the fence running the entire length of the north side of the western part of this development should also be entirely 2.2m closeboard fencing and not the mix of this and 3 bar fencing proposed. I do not want the residents of this site being tempted to shortcut across my land to the village, which they will. Overall this is a very poor quality development by a poor quality developer, not the better quality developer that achieved the outline permission with a promise of something more superior, more stylish."

As per the commentary of others above, we also do require the taller 2.2m fencing including the generous landscape and planting buffers and additional tree planting and property design measures (i.e. flint work) to mitigate heritage impact.

Regards,

Chris