

## Land at Ford Airfield, Ford, West Sussex IRM (F/14/24/RES)

Design Advisor response, prepared on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2024

### 1. Introduction

This response relates to the resubmission of material for the **IRM** in December 2024. It comprises of a review of responses to the comments on the initial submission, followed by an overall conclusion in section '3'.

### 2. Response

Previous comments – October 2024		Resubmission response	Resolved
1	<p>Planning Statement:</p> <p>a) The total number of units (page 16) in the Planning Statement appears to be based on an earlier version. While noting that the quantum is not part of the IRM application, there is still a concern that this is skewed towards larger 3, 4 and 5 bed homes, with 22% fewer 1 and 2 bed properties.</p> <p>b) I am still unconvinced by the argument in favour of a relaxation in visitor and resident parking rates; it is acknowledged that three new bus stops will be provided. However, not all units will be within 400m of a bus stop and Ford railway station is still approximately 1.8 km away.</p>	<p>Ultimately, I would defer to highways officers regarding connectivity and whether the site represents a sustainable location. It is noted however, that the Active Travel officer also expressed a preference for a dedicated cycle path given the objective for sustainable mobility.</p> <p>From a design perspective, the reduction disproportionately impacts residents of affordable properties – or rather, there does not appear to be any reduction for market properties.</p> <p>In this respect, the proposed reduction is not supported.</p>	No
2	Of the possible locations for the pump station in this area, I feel that the one proposed has a greater visual impact through breaking the planting that is intended to soften the edge of the settlement. Also, it prevents a sense of openness when looking south along this edge. It is unclear what defines the edge of the red line around the Arun Way, but could the station not be settled into this rather than up against the western boundary?	The revised location of the pumping station on the western boundary now impedes an open view from along the first east-west connector and as such, has a greater visual impact than the initial location.	No
3	There is a slight variation in the geometry of junctions with connecting roads on the east side of RM1.	Resolved.	Yes
4	Chamfering the corners of intersecting pedestrian routes across the open space in the central section of the primary	No change, noting that the initial comment was offered as a recommendation only.	N/A

	route is recommended - otherwise, it is likely that people will cut the corner naturally.		
5	Suggest realigning the short access and turning head to the pumping station to be in parallel with the acoustic fence (to avoid an irregular, unplatable strip between the two).	The substitution of green mesh for metal palisade fencing around the pumping station is supported.	No
6	Two dashed red lines make it difficult to know where the acoustic fencing ends at the north and south. In the below plan, it is recommended to add one or two panels around the corner to integrate with the start of the long grass planting and close a view of the end edge of a panel.	However, the proposed 4m high fence is considered to be out of scale and character with proposed development and is not supported.	
7	It is not possible to consider the arrangement of level crossings and pedestrian and cycle links in isolation of the surrounding network. This relates to the final point of this response and the impact of determining the IRM prior to RM1 and RM4.	Advisory comment, where determining the IRM in advance of the adjoining areas could either constrain the emerging layouts for the neighbouring areas or, involve a revision of the IRM to ensure that foot and cycle links are coordinated.	N/A
8	Through the elaboration of the layout, I have maintained a concern for the impact of attenuation basins in Ryebank Park. The basins at Landings Green don't dominate the space and consequently, it has been possible to shape these around the master plan. As such, the northern neighbourhood has an east-west flow that links across north-south circulation and landscape links. Conversely, the basins at Ryebank Park fully dominate the area and there is limited left-over space to shape or knit these into the layout (despite clear attempts to do so). For me, the impact of the proposed basins is such that the area cannot be used for any meaningful activity	It is noted that the encroachment of development in RM4 reduces the amount of circulation space between the edge of the basin and the carriageway - this has been raised as a concern in response to RM4.  Overall, the basins continue to have a dominating impact on the character of Ryebank Park and its value as an amenity space.  While the illustrative layout in The Landings Master Plan Document did not intimate the dominance of basins in this area, it is acknowledged that the framework plan from the same document provides some indication of scale and impact.	No
9	Connected to the previous comment, there is a concern for the safety and experience of circulation around and between basins. The below section is an attempt to rescale the application plan to understand the character of a link between basins. From this, it appears akin to walking along a 5/ 6m ridge, with 1:3/ 1.35 drop on each side.	It is further acknowledged that some attempt has been made to mitigate the physical and visual impact of the basins through the landscape design.	
10	The requirement for basins is acknowledged. Also, the need to reduce constrained space and the existence of the open space parameter plan is acknowledged. However, the consequential		

	impact is, for me, an unusable landscape between the edge of the development and Yapton Road. Not only should this area be providing space for informal recreational activities but its treatment is also significant to establish the value of the prime plots that overlook it.	Ultimately, I would defer to the Landscape Officer regarding the impact of the basins on useable amenity space.	
11	As a minimum, it is recommended to reprofile the basins to allow some access between these, perhaps with dense planting and/ or a knee rail fence on one or both sides to define an edge. In this manner, the area might at least be treated as a nature trail through a protected landscape rather than as open parkland. Otherwise, could the applicant provide some long sections through the basins to show the extent and character of the area of the space that would be level? Without reprofiling or further evidence, it is difficult to support the character of the above schematic from a design perspective.	From a design perspective, the dominance of the basins is clearly not ideal. For the residents of adjacent properties, there remains a concern for how the space will appear in the dry season and, while retention of the hedgerow will mitigate the visual impact from Yapton Road, it is a shame that this can be seen as a positive given the immense scale of opportunity to create an attractive linear park along this edge.	
12	The following space (at the end of the Arun Way) involves the connection between five different paths and four different materials. Could this be simplified, perhaps by rerouting the two east-west permissive paths to avoid a forming a 3-way junction? In general, the routes around and across this play area are a touch complicated with different hierarchies of movement - it might all benefit from removing some sections of formal path.	No change.	No
13	Suggest a pedestrian connection at the north-west corner to Ford Lane to improve accessibility. Without purposely creating this, it is likely that an informal path will form along the desire line in any case.	No change - this is a quick win that would have significantly improved pedestrian and cycle connectivity to Ford Lane and the employment area along this and also, community cohesion.	No
14	There is no footpath alongside the following section of the route to the north of the Arun Way. While it is acknowledged this area is outside of the IRM application, in the absence of showing where the footpath would be, it is unclear how pedestrians move from the footpath to the crossing, which is part of the current application. It is assumed the RM1 material will show a	No change and there remains a lack of coordination between this connection across the Arun Way that illustrates the aforementioned point '7'.	No

	connection. This relates to the timing of IRM in advance of RM1 and RM3, which is noted below.		
15	Determination of IRM (before RM1 and RM4) would fix structuring elements such as the geometry of junctions and utility sites that prevents any flexibility for even minor adjustment in RM1 and RM4. For this reason, it would be preferable to determine the IRM only after determination of RM1 and RM4. This will also avoid duplication and resubmission of the IRM package should any minor adjustment of parcellation and road alignment in RM1 and RM4 be required.	Referred to in response no. '7'.	N/A
16	The termination of the route to the north of the Arun Way is not supported. This is because forming a connection will improve the connectivity of the network and reduce trips on the lowest grade of route in the proposed hierarchy to the north of this. If the routes to the north were tertiary roads, then traffic can be dispersed. However, as these are proposed to be mews streets with the most minimal ROW and no designated footpath, a connection to the secondary road is considered necessary for access and design purposes.	<p>Given the objective for a permeable circulation network, extending the local road into the secondary road would certainly have improved connectivity.</p> <p>From a response in RM1, it is understood this is not possible as it would create a 4-way junction. However, as trip generation is likely to be greater closer to the spine road, it is envisaged that connecting this route and moving the adjacent connection would have improved traffic dispersal across the network.</p> <p>Overall, the significance of forming this connection is now reduced having revised the network to create a continuous north-south route to the Arun Way and upgrading the hierarchy of the western end of the route to the north of the Arun Way.</p>	Yes
17	In its present location, the southern pumping station encroaches into the area that was reserved for open space and buffer planting (Land-Use and Density Parameter Plan). Additionally, its proposed location aligns with the local road to the north. In the least, the enclosure should be realigned behind the building line to conceal a view and it is recommended that the access be aligned to the local road to improve access for service vehicles. A comment in response to the landscape	Resolved.	Yes

	components of RM1 and RM4 does not support 1.8m steel fencing around enclosures given the sensitive edge of settlement context and the rural outlook.	
--	---	--

### 3. Conclusion

- 3.1. Overall, the IRM submission achieves a number of attributes at a particularly complex and challenging site that has reduced in area since the Strategic Site Allocation.
- 3.2. As the proposed reduction in parking disproportionately impacts residents of affordable properties, this is not supported.
- 3.3. The new location of the pumping station along the western boundary has a greater visual impact than the previous location and is not supported. In the meeting following the initial submission, a possible location to the north of the Arun Way was discussed where the station would not impact the sense of openness along the western edge. A review of this location is recommended.
- 3.4. While drainage requirements are acknowledged, together with attempts to soften the impact of the basins along Yapton Road through grading and landscape design, it is difficult to support the proposed arrangement given that Ryebank Park is almost exclusively occupied by SuDS. Overall, it is recommended to reduce the extent of encroachment that is proposed in RM4 to be more reflective of the scale of the original park according to the approved parameter plans and, in the least, this will allow a greater allowance of level amenity space between the carriageway and the edge of the basin.
- 3.5. Proposals of a 4m high fence within a predominantly residential development are not supported and instead, a greater planted buffer is recommended.