

From: Simon Davis

Sent: Friday, February 10, 2023 4:49 PM

To: Emily Rickard [REDACTED]

Cc: Tim Burden [REDACTED] Henny Handley [REDACTED] Katie Lamb

[REDACTED] Tom Davies [REDACTED]

Subject: Arundel Road, Angmering A/46/22/RES and A/282/22/RES

Dear Emily,

Please see the following comments:

- I note the mix of market houses has only changed slightly. I acknowledge the presence of the submitted housing mix assessment and the flexible nature of ALP policy H DM1 however ANDP policy HD3 encourages the delivery of greater smaller and fewer larger dwellings. Therefore, the mix remains in conflict with this.
- I note there is a photo in the D&A showing an instance of white weatherboarding presumably in the local area. Can you indicate the address of the pictured property.
- The affordable housing distribution is now much better but there are still issues. Firstly, two of the three flatted buildings are 100% affordable with the third being 100% market. There needs to be some mixing of tenures in each building. We requested and achieved this with the Drove Lane Yapton strategic site by BDW (Y/49/21/RES). Secondly, the affordable housing is still in their own specific house types. For example, there are no instances of market houses in the terraces. Some terraced affordable homes should be swapped for market ones.
- The submission suggests that all M4(2) and M4(3) provision are in the flats, but the plans are not clear which is which i.e. I can't tell which flat is M4(3) and which is M4(2). An update to the accommodation schedule would assist. However, in any case, we would expect to see the M4(2) and M4(3) spread across the site and so equally distributed between market and affordable and by house size so this provision needs to be changed.
- There are no details of the northern boundary bund in the submission. I raised this in the A/46/22/RES report stating *"Condition 6 requires that the reserved matters submission include details of the landscape treatment along the northern boundary of the site with Steyne Wood to deter unauthorised access by motorcycles and vehicles to the Wood. The application submission does not clearly respond to this requirement. However, the plans include land along the northern edge of the development, and it is indicated that this will feature an earthwork bund as well as new buffer planting. This will deter access into the adjacent land by motorised vehicles. As there are no details of the dimensions of this bund, a condition will be required to secure these."* We can use a condition to secure these details, but it would be helpful for you to confirm that the bund indicated is to serve this purpose (i.e., that my assumption is correct).
- Unlike with A/46/22/RES there do not appear to be any cross sections of the attenuation pond.
- There is no detail of the play provision or how the link path to the public RoW adjacent to the western boundary will be achieved (as it crosses a ditch). We can however use conditions to enable this to be agreed at a later date.
- I note that the commercial area appears to have shrunk in size with this layout but recognise this is subject to a separate submission.
- I believe that the overall parking provision is slightly short per the ADC Parking SPD. I consider that the requirement is for 364 spaces and 32 visitor spaces. My calculation is that the scheme provides 362.5 (noting that garages are treated as half a space each) and 32 visitors so you are short by 1.5.

- We also need to secure 5% of all parking spaces as disabled suitable. This is as per MfS and is also stated in the Arun Design Guide (ADG) and Parking SPD. Your D&A states those provided for the 6 x M4(3) dwellings will be a total of 3.6m in width allowing for a 1.2m wide transfer zone and 5m in length. This should mean 6 disabled spaces (1.65%), but the parking plan only seems to indicate 4 larger spaces (1.1%). As we have requested the M4 units are spread across the site then so should the disabled spaces. There should also be a proportion of the visitor spaces as disabled suitable.
- Garden depths and interface distances are generally fine. The exceptions are few and far between and the shortfalls are minor.
- However, the ADG states flats should have both private amenity space and communal space. The proposed flats include no private amenity spaces (balconies or patios) and except for 135-142, there is insufficient communal space. The requirement for the 143-151 and 152-160 blocks would be 130m² but the space to one end of each building appears to be in the region of 30m² and 50m² respectively. This communal amenity space is a separate requirement to the POS provision and so it is not appropriate to argue that there is POS adjacent. This was an issue we had with the aforementioned Y/49/21/RES scheme but they resolved this with clear communal spaces around their flatted buildings. I also feel that balconies would work on the flatted building elevations where these look out over the POS or parking areas.

Overall, this submission is much better and has responded to some of the previous concerns. This is clearly a step in the right direction, but the scheme is not yet capable of officer support.

I look forward to discussing this next week.

Simon.

Simon J 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>

