

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 01 July 2020 11:37
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: BN/50/20/PL Land W of Fontwell Avenue - Design Comments

Application Correspondence "LPA comments on layout"

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 01 July 2020 11:37
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: BN/50/20/PL Land W of Fontwell Avenue - Design Comments

Dear Maddi,

Further to my email yesterday, I write to advise you of some concerns I have with the development proposal. I reviewed this yesterday but sought Team Leader review before sending to you.

- Many of the residential gardens are not 10.5m in length (as per emerging Arun Design Guide). I have measured some in the range of 8-9m long.
- Plots 12, 16, 23, 35 are first floor only with garage parking below. I don't think these can be termed flats. They seem to have either very little strips of garden or none at all and in all cases do not meet the garden length as per the SPD.
- I acknowledge that the 10.5m length is partly required to ensure 21m distance in a back-to-back arrangement. Therefore if no back-to-back arrangement exists, this can be relaxed somewhat but we still need to ensure decent sized private amenity spaces.
- Plots 36-39 (Flats) don't have enough garden to meet Design Guide (they need either balconies of at least 3sqm of useable space or a residential communal shared space of 40sqm plus 10sqm for each unit (so 80m2 in total).
- The front of plots 36-39 (Flats) look straight onto the garden of house 40. Windows in this elevation are bathroom and kitchen. Whilst we would o/g bathroom windows, and could do the same for kitchens, it's not ideal for future occupiers of the flats and a sense of perceived (fear) of overlooking would remain.
- The rear of house 12 looks straight onto the garden of 13. The 2 x bathroom windows can be o/g and fixed shut (the plans should be updated to reflect this) to remove overlooking but would leave a sense of perceived overlooking which whilst not ideal would be acceptable.
- We have some concerns with the layout in terms of the large frontage parking areas at the northern end. However, if the landscaping along the roads is strong enough, then this will be screened out from the streetscenes. I am not convinced that the landscaping is significant enough and there is also a question as to how long it will take to fully mature.
- The parking proposal vs the requirement is off. Your plans show 66 on plot spaces, 22 garage spaces (note that the schedule Rev L says 18 and I think miscounts the number of garage spaces in plots 12/16/23/35) & 10 visitor spaces. Garages are treated as half a space in the Arun Parking Standards SPD therefore the proposal is 87. The requirement on the other hand is 96. I accept that our policy allows for 10% variation if a Travel Plan is provided and that you have supplied one. However, I'm not convinced that this is sufficient to warrant an under provision particularly given the countryside location. You could swap out the 10 detached garages for car ports and thus gain 5 proposed spaces which would help and may om balance allow this to be overcome. Incidentally, there are no plans that I can see of the 10 single garages. Please provide these or if swapping with car ports then provide plans of those.
- Our Open Space SPD requires 2,957m2 of POS (see calculator on this page: <https://www.arun.gov.uk/supplementary-planning-documents-spd#openspaces>). Your proposal is only 1,488m2 and this represents a big shortfall.

These issues suggest that the scheme proposes too many dwellings. Notwithstanding that we have started the S.106 process, I do not believe that we can support the scheme at present given these issues. Therefore please consider and advise whether you would agree to making changes.

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](#)

