

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 27 January 2022 16:09

Subject: RE: BR/324/17/PL - Chichester Road - Condition 14.

Dear Michael,

I wasn't aware of any other changes. These would also need to be covered by the S.73 at the same time as the floorplans/elevations are included in the approved plans. If there are now no balconies then it would be sensible at the same time to also propose removing condition 10 as well as varying condition 2. Further you may also want to review whether any of the other conditions that relate to the apartment building should be varied or deleted.

You may want to see if ADC Housing will pay for the application as it is only because you brought it to my attention that it has become an issue but I am sure the end user (ADC) would not want to own a site that has been built contrary to the approved planning permission – and it sounds like it was them who requested the changes.

This application may also require amendment of the agreed legal agreement as it is specific to BR/324/17/PL and so would no longer apply to the development if a variation is approved.

I will separately alert ADC Housing of the advice that I have given.

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

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>

Arun is a CIL Charging Authority, for more information go to www.arun.gov.uk/cil
Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



Sent: 27 January 2022 15:35
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>

Cc: Alex Eggett [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: BR/324/17/PL - Chichester Road - Condition 14.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Thank you Simon,

What a headache and more administration. We just assumed that the ADC Housing team at the time had sensibly reviewed all this with ADC Planning before they asked us to make the changes and signed up the Developer Agreement.

Our contact now is Gillian Taylor [REDACTED] who is very new to the position. Previous to her, it was Ian Taylor [REDACTED] and previous to him it was Mark Coats [REDACTED] and previous to him Austin Wade [REDACTED] though I believe they are not involved with the project now and may have even left ADC? There were others too, such as Charles Hothersall.

Also, what about the aspects such as we were asked to remove the second bathrooms and the balconies etc. Do we need to apply for a S73 to cover/regularise these aspects too? I am sure all this is very straightforward, but who pays for it? ADC Housing or is it the developer? I assume the S73 application is to vary condition 2 of BR/324/17/PL?

Best wishes,

Michael.

Michael Bish RIBA
ADM ARCHITECTS

Office - TRINITY, GOODWOOD, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 0NW, UNITED KINGDOM.

[REDACTED]
website - <http://www.admarchitects.co.uk>

On 27 Jan 2022, at 14:34, Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Michael,

I was not aware of ADC Housing's involvement in this project and I don't recall being involved in any previous discussions. The plans approved by BR/324/17/PL were:

Dwg. 01 Rev A "Location Map";
Dwg. 03 "Block Plan as Proposed";

Dwg. 11 Rev B "Site Plan as Proposed";
Dwg. 12 Rev A "Landscaping Plan as Proposed";
Dwg. 20 "Ground Floor Plan As Proposed" (Apartments);
Dwg. 21 "First Floor Plan As Proposed" (Apartments);
Dwg. 22 Rev A "Second Floor Plan As Proposed" (Apartments);
Dwg. 25 "Flat Block North Elevation as Proposed";
Dwg. 26 "Flat Block West Elevation as Proposed";
Dwg. 27 "Flat Block South Elevation as Proposed";
Dwg. 28 "Flat Block East Elevation as Proposed";
Dwg. 35 Rev B "2 Bed House Ground Floor Plans as Proposed";
Dwg. 36 Rev B "2 Bed House (Elevations) as Proposed";
Dwg. 39 Rev A "2 Bed House First Floor Plans as Proposed";
Dwg. 40 "Refuse Store as Proposed";
Dwg. 45 "Street Elevation as Proposed";
Dwg. 52 "Ground Floor Plan as Proposed";
Dwg. 53 "First Floor Plan as Proposed";
Dwg. 54 "North East Elevation as Proposed";
Dwg. 55 "South East Elevation as Proposed";
Dwg. 56 "South West Elevation as Proposed";
Dwg. 57 "North West Elevation as Proposed";
Dwg. 2017/3765/001 "Site Overview, Visibility Splays and Parking Swept Path Analysis";
and
Dwg. 2017/3765/002 "Refuse Vehicle Swept Path Analysis".

Condition 14 refers to the approved plan within that list not to any subsequent plan that has been approved. I see that changes have been made on the ground in respect of parking and landscaping but we haven't had any s73 application to regularise these changes.

I acknowledge that we have approved certain condition discharge applications which showed a lesser amount of parking: BR/13/21/DOC which included plans that showed a row of 7 to the front of the building (not the approved 7 + 2) and then BR/140/21/DOC which included plans that showed a row of 6 with access to a new area of hardstanding at the rear plus an extra space behind the one on the W boundary. This plan was 12 Rev D and you are now showing me 12 Rev F.

However, the effect of these decisions do not supersede the plans approved by BR/324/17/PL as it is clear that they were only approving the details required by the conditions (in respect of drainage and landscaping). Therefore, the developer needs to submit a section 73 application to vary condition 1 of BR/324/17/PL and so to agree the layout and parking changes.

Please can you advise who your contact is at ADC Housing as I may need to discuss this with them separately.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer
Directorate of Place
<image011.jpg>
T: 01903 737874
E: simon.davis@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltrovers 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>

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

Sent: 24 January 2022 20:41

To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: BR/324/17/PL - Chichester Road - Condition 14.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Evening Simon,

I am looking through the other Planning Conditions regarding this project. In particular Condition 14 which refers to the vehicle parking being laid out in accordance with the approved plan (ie. drawing 1532/12A).

As I am sure you are aware the Housing team at ADC decided to purchase this site and requested a few changes to the Landscaping and vehicle parking arrangement. Several meetings were held at ADC offices with the Housing Department and other interested parties. I think I recall you may have been involved on occasions too? Though, it was so long ago that my memory is not clear now on this. In essence the Landscaping was changed to suit the particular special housing need with the associated requirements, ie. larger hard-standing patio areas, safe access from the parking area to the rear, more landscaping at the entrance to the flats and higher fences for children safety etc. It was suggested to reduce the amount of car parking adjacent to the building and the entrance etc. and to only maintain the one vehicle parking space per unit. WSCC Highways consultation response stated that just one vehicle parking space per unit would be required as a minimum for the flats. Visitor parking could be achieved via local parking on adjacent streets. This is mentioned in the WSCC Highways Further Response document (attached), which describes the Lambeth Methodology system being used as a measure to establish adequate on street parking.

These changes were requested as part of the ADC Development Agreement, which is now in place with the developer, Jent Estates Ltd who is building the project for ADC. The Housing Department and other interested parties were quite firm on the required Landscaping and amount of vehicle parking which would be required for the particular housing need. I even recall at one time a suggestion to reduce the vehicle parking requirement further and to provide more green space.

So I assume that the current Landscaping drawing 1532/12F (attached) which illustrates the hard and soft landscaping now requested by ADC, can be considered as appropriate to comply with Condition 14.

For your information, I have attached the recently approved revised S73 application associated to the three houses to the front of the site (BR/107/21/PL).

I just wanted to be absolutely clear on this matter. Thank you.

Best wishes,

Michael.

Michael Bish RIBA
ADM ARCHITECTS

Office - TRINITY, GOODWOOD, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 0NW, UNITED KINGDOM.

