

[REDACTED]

From: Richard Castro-Parker
Sent: 14 March 2019 15:59
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: FP/274/18/PL

Please could the attached comments from the planning agent be attached to EDRMS (CCUBE) for FP/274/18/PL.

Yours sincerely

Richard Castro-Parker

Senior Planning Officer (Contract)
Arun District Council.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 March 2019 14:09
To: Richard Castro-Parker
Cc: Daniel Vick; 'Tom Barnes'; 'Chris Moore'; 'James Bell'
Subject: FP/274/18/PL

Dear Mr Castro-Parker

Please find attached a letter that we have prepared on behalf of the Applicant, in relation to the above current planning application.

We look forward to hearing from you after you have reviewed our comments and the detailed documentation that accompanies this planning application submission.

Best regards,

TIM RODWAY
DIRECTOR [REDACTED]



RODWAY PLANNING
CONSULTANCY LIMITED

[REDACTED]

CONFIDENTIALITY & DISCLAIMER NOTICE: This e-mail is intended only for the addressee named above and the contents should not be disclosed to any other party. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender and delete the e-mail and any attachments from your system. Although this email has been scanned for viruses, I advise you to carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment as I cannot accept liability for any damage sustained as a result of any software viruses or other malicious code.



Arun District Council
Planning Department
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

12th March 2019

Dear Mr Castro-Parker

Application reference: FP/274/18/PL
Site at No. 10 Felpham Gardens, Felpham PO22 8QS
Proposed Demolition of 1 No. house & erection of 2 No. detached chalet style dwellings with garaging & car parking.

I refer to the above planning application.

Following our recent conversations, and having regard to the comments received from third parties, we would like the following to be considered during your assessment and formation of a recommendation in relation to this planning application.

We have previously discussed the proposed layout, and specifically whether this is out of character with the spatial pattern of development given the different orientation that we are proposing. In this respect I must urge you to review our Planning Statement, which was submitted with the application – as this assesses the proposal in the context of the surrounding area in detail. In essence, I can confirm that during the design process we have sought to reflect the pattern of development to the east where smaller plots back onto the recreation ground. There is also evidence of smaller plots in the local area, for instance at the junction of Felpham Road.

In relation to residential amenities, and specifically in respect of potential noise impacts on neighbours gardens, we consider it important to acknowledge that this is a modest increase of just one extra dwelling on a larger than average plot. The access arrangements follows the existing driveway and is set away from neighbours gardens. Our view is that the layout is such that no harm would be resultant.

With respect to the comments of the third parties, we would like to take this opportunity to correct a number of inaccuracies and answer queries that have been raised I respect of the proposed application submission:

1. The applicants – Mr Barnes and Ms Reddie – own the applicant site under their company name. Therefore, in signing Certificate A, the application has been correctly prepared and presented in respect of this submission.
2. We can confirm that the applicant, and previous owners of the site, have removed trees from the site. None of the trees that have been removed by the applicant prior to this application submitted were subject to any Tree Preservation Order, or subject to any other control. Therefore the applicant was not required to make any formal prior notification or submission in respect of the works to these unprotected trees.



RODWAY PLANNING
CONSULTANCY LIMITED

3. We note that the Arun Tree Officer has now provided his comments on this planning application, which confirm, inter alia that *“the original TPO (Bognor No.3 – 1962) makes reference to 7 fir and 1 hawthorn, none of which remain or seen to have been recently felled... There are a number of important trees within the adjacent public park that will be impacted upon from above and below ground. The tree protection measures proposed are adequate in principle and the extent of pruning works to accommodate the development is reasonable; both being achievable without undue detriment to the visual amenity they currently provide if correctly executed”*. The Tree Officer then confirms that he has no objections to the application and therefore recommends approval subject to conditions. It is therefore clear that the applicant has not acted improperly in respect of arboricultural matters, and the proposed development will accord with the relevant tree related policies contained in the Felpham Neighbourhood Plan and Arun District Local Plan. Further, there is no legislative or policy requirement to set out in the planning application submission that trees have been removed prior to the application being lodged.
4. The Arun Tree Officer has confirmed that one Ash tree on adjacent Council owned land was cut down by a Council’s in-house contractor. This work had nothing to do with the Applicant.
5. A site visit will confirm our opinion that the site appears to hold no biodiversity value in respect of protected species.
6. Mention is made of the ‘building line’ being contravened. We acknowledge that the frontage house would be positioned further forward than the existing house. However, the space to the front of the new house would be significant, thereby maintaining an open and spacious frontage onto Felpham Gardens. In addition, there is no defined building line, and further to the north at the junction of Felpham Gardens and Felpham Way there are houses that flank elevations are located much closer to the highway than that hereby proposed. This further reinforces our view that the built character of the area is varied, with examples of backland development, and a variety of plot sizes and shapes in and surrounding Felpham Gardens and its immediate locality.
7. Parking provision is detailed on the Proposed Site Plan. We can confirm that the proposals include 5 parking spaces on the application site, comprising 2 spaces to the site frontage, 2 no. integral garages (1 per dwelling), plus an extra space to the south side (front) of the rear dwelling.
8. Other residential amenity issues, as raised by the occupiers of Casa Mia in their letter of representation, are covered in detail within Section 6(c) of our Planning Statement, which accompanies this planning application. In summary, we consider that given the scale, orientation and positioning of the proposed development, will ensure that neighbouring properties amenities would not be unduly impacted upon.
9. We wish to reiterate our opinion that the proposed development represents a visual enhancement of the area. It is appreciated that the proposals will result in change, but this would not be harmful. It is noted that there have been a number of letters of support now received which reaffirm this view, with specific mention made to the public view of the site from the adjacent recreation ground.

It is therefore clear that, contrary to the assertions of one third party’s representations, that the applicants have not *“demonstrated a disregard for planning regulations and policies”*; quite the contrary, we consider that the



RODWAY PLANNING
CONSULTANCY LIMITED

proposals are in complete compliance with the relevant planning policy context, including the Government's stated intention for development to make efficient use of land within settlement locations such as this.

We would be grateful if you could review the application file taking into account our comments, and those originally made in support of the application as contained in our Planning Statement. Please could you then provide us with your views on the application, and confirm whether the application will be determined via Officer's delegated powers or the District's Planning Committee.

We look forward to hearing from you in this respect as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely,

Tim Rodway
Director

c.c. Mr Daniel Vick, ADC
Mr Tom Barnes, Applicant
Mr Chris Moore, Sussex Building Consultancy

