

REPORT UPDATE

Application No: F/16/24/RES

Reason for the Update / Changes

1. Report Clarification

Reference is made within the report to 7 bungalows, but this is a typographical error, and should read as 6.

2. Consultee Comments

The Conservation Officers comments have been taken into account whilst preparing the report, however a summary of their conclusions was not provided within the report. The comments can be found in full on the planning register for completeness.

3. Planning Conditions Updates

Since the publication of the Ford report, the following conditions have been changed / updated:

- Condition 1 (approved plan) has been updated to add in several plans which were missed (no new plans are proposed).
- Condition 2 (Play Area Detail) has been amended to add that the play areas will be in alignment with the approved Design Code.
- Condition 7 (RoSPA Certificate for play) has been updated to address omission of specific details.
- Condition 9 (hard and soft landscaping) has been amended to align the delivery of planting with the phasing strategy from the outline planning permission. This ensures a comprehensive overview of the planting strategy and more specific trigger points for each open space area.
- Condition 14 has been added to ensure details of the headwalls and any culverts are submitted for review by the Local Planning Authority to ensure a sensitive design treatment.
- Condition 15 has been added to secure specific material samples in accordance with the materials schedule for the site.

An updated conditions sheet accompanies this update.

Notes: Changes to recommendations, conditions and / or reasons for refusal will always be reflected in the recommendation section of the attached Officer's Report.

Recommendation Report for Approval of Reserved Matters Following Outline Approval

REF NO: F/16/24/RES

LOCATION: Land at Ford Airfield
Ford

PROPOSAL: Approval of reserved matters following outline permission F/4/20/OUT for phase reserved matters 4 (south), for the erection of 357 No. residential dwellings plus

REPORT_1011(ODB)

associated roads, infrastructure, parking, landscaping, open space & play areas and associated works. This application affects a Public Right of Way, may affect the setting of a Listed Building and falls within CIL Zone 1 (Ford strategic site - zero rated).

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION

This application seeks reserved matters approval for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the proposed development for 357 dwellings in the south of the development site, known as phase RM4. In addition, approval is sought for the Public Open Space (POS) known as Runway Park and the associated allotment area.

Access has already been approved as part of the outline permission F/4/20/OUT, however the spine road through the development site is being considered under F/14/24/RES (the infrastructure reserved matters). This application sits immediately south of the spin road in the southernmost part of the development.

SITE AREA

17.96ha.

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY

Approximately 19.87dph. Densities for each of the character areas vary with Ryebank Park at 27.5dph; Runway Park at 33dph and Runway at 39.5dph.

TOPOGRAPHY

Predominantly flat.

TREES

Individual trees are present along the hedge line of Yapton road, however there are no trees of any significant value present within the redline boundary.

BOUNDARY TREATMENT

A well-maintained and uniform mature hedgerow lines the north-east boundary along the southern arm of the Ford runway. A more established and rural hedgerow and tree treatment is found to the south-east of the development site. Both Yapton Road to the west and Horsemere Green Lane to the south are bounded by mature hedgerows.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The whole of the site lies within the Parish of Ford; the southern and western boundary of the site abuts the Climping Parish boundary. The site has historically been used as an airfield, and most recently has been used for agriculture, however hard standing remains to facilitate various access and rights of way.

The boundary of this application encompasses a small portion of the western arm of the former Ford Airfield runway. Yapton Road and Horsemere Green Lane bound the south and west of the site, but are screened by vegetation.

PROW 175/1 runs approximately east-west through the site, which is bounded by a small hedgerow, and connects the settlement of Yapton with the Rudford Industrial Estate to the

east of the site.

A dilapidated and disused hanger building is present, which is due to be demolished as per the outline permission.

CHARACTER OF LOCALITY

Generally, the overall site is a mixture of semi-rural and rural character, with increasing rural character towards the north. This character is enhanced by the views experienced of the South Downs National Park, located approximately 2km to the north of the site.

Existing industrial uses are present to the north-east and west of the application site. However, these uses are largely screened by vegetation so as not to be prominent visually from within the site.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

F/22/25/NMA	Non-material amendment following the grant of F/4/20/OUT relating to the rewording of condition 17 (to allow the ecological protection and enhancement plan to be delivered in 2 parts, and to amend the trigger related to the submission and approval of the Bewick Swan mitigation from prior to commencement to prior to above slab level.	Approve 13-10-25
-------------	--	---------------------

F/3/25/NMA	Non-material amendment following the grant of F/4/20/OUT relating to the rewording of condition 13 (contamination verification).	Approve 12-02-25
------------	--	---------------------

F/15/24/RES	Approval of reserved matters (layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) following outline permission F/4/20/OUT for phase RM1 (North), for the erection of 341 No. residential dwellings plus associated roads, infrastructure, parking, landscaping and associated works. This application affects a Public Right of Way, may affect the setting of a Listed Building and falls within CIL Zone 1 (Ford strategic site - zero rated).
-------------	---

F/14/24/RES	Approval of reserved matters (layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) following outline consent F/4/20/OUT for the infrastructure reserved matters including the provision of a primary spine road and associated secondary road junctions, pavement, footpaths, cycle infrastructure and bus stops; site wide drainage infrastructure including foul pumping stations, foul sewer
-------------	---

infrastructure, SUDS basins, SUDS swales, surface water infrastructure; acoustic fencing; public open space including landscape details, play areas, footpaths & associated works. This application affects a Public Right of Way, may affect the setting of a Listed Building and falls within CIL Zone 1 (Ford strategic site - zero rated).

F/4/20/OUT	Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for access) for the development of up to 1,500 dwellings (Use Class C3), 60-bed care home (Use Class C2), up to 9,000 sqm of employment floorspace (Use Classes B1), local centre of up to 2,350 sqm including up to 900 sqm retail / commercial (Use Classes A1-A5) and 1,450 sqm community / leisure floorspace (Use Classes D1-D2), land for a two-form entry primary school (Use Class D1), public open space, allotments, new sports pitches and associated facilities, drainage, parking and associated access, infrastructure, landscape, ancillary and site preparation works, including demolition of existing buildings and part removal of existing runway hardstanding. This application affects a Public Right of Way. This application is the subject of an Environmental Statement. This application may affect the setting of a Listed Building. This application falls within CIL Zone 1 - Zero Rated.	App Cond with S106 30-05-23
------------	--	--------------------------------

No comments.

REPRESENTATIONS

- 4 no. public representation were made (two from the same person), which are summarised as:
- Query if planning permission has not been granted for this why there are fences erected.
 - Ryebank Park is a confusing name as there is a Ryebank Gate already in Yapton
 - PROW 175 is a road and cycleway now which is unfortunate for leisure walkers. Wished to see permissive path through Ryebank Park area.
 - Queries whether the treatment undertaken to PROW 175 will also be used within other phases where the PROW is present.
 - Concern over the highways being unable to cope.

Ford Parish Council comment are summarised as below:

- Basins along Yapton Road conflict with policy LC6 of the Ford NDP2 as they are designated open space.
- In contravention of Policy EH5 as the site lies within Grade 1 agricultural land.
- Parts of the site in the north and northeast of the site conflicts with Policy EH5 of the FNDP2 and SP1 of the ALP.
- Queries over whether the plan meets policy EH1 of the FDNP2 and the need for 30% tree cover and whether there is a long term management for the open spaces.

- Concern over the primary road becoming a rat-run and wish for this to be 20mph.
- Wish to know why there is a difference in tree sizes being planted.
- Concerns that the noise assessment has not covered sufficient times of day and night to give a meaningful noise assessment.
- Concern over rear alleys being provided to grant rear access as they would increase anti-social behaviour. Also, at 0.8m they are not wide enough.

Climping Parish Council - Objects to the application and queries how the existing footway along Church Lane is to be widened to 2.5m / 3m. They are also concerned about how Church Lane will be crossed by pedestrians from Horsemere Green Lane.

Ford Community Land Trust - Support the principle of the development, however, raises the same concerns as Ford Parish Council regarding highways queries and principle of development outside of policy boundary.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

Issues relating to the principal of development and off-site highway works were dealt with as part of the outline planning permission. Therefore, details of off-site works previously approved can be found within the existing Section 106 agreement under reference F/4/20/OUT. This includes details of long term management, these arrangements are set out within the Section 106 agreement, which was approved as part of the outline.

Matters relating to the design of the spine road and drainage basins are being considered through the Infrastructure Reserved Matters application (F/14/24/RES) and are not material in the determination of this application.

Other material consideration raised will be addressed within the report.

CONSULTATIONS

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH - Objection.

Concerns over noise assessment and cumulative noise impacts being assessed. In addition, have concerns over odour from the Ford Waste Water Treatments Works.

ADC DRAINAGE ENGINEERS - Objection.

WSCC LLFA - No objection.

WSCC PROW - PROW FP175 is being subsumed into a secondary street as part of the development phase to create residential development. There is a need to know whether the highway will be adopted under a Section 38 agreement of the Highway Act 1980, and if so, its surfacing will need to be approved by them. Additional advice provided.

WSCC Highways - No objection. Visibility splays, tracking and transport links are all adequate. Highlighted a couple of plots without EV charging facilities.

DESIGN OFFICER - Advice provided to ADC.

CONSERVATION OFFICER -

GREENSPACE OFFICER - No objection subject to conditions.

General comments were provided to bolster the number and specification of trees across the site and noted several areas of verge which were underutilised and could support tree species. The amended plans have addressed this comment and provided semi mature and mature trees throughout the phase. Support the tree selection but requested condition of tree pits to ensure no conflict with underground infrastructure.

Street furniture should be consistent across the entire development in accordance with the Design Code, and their location and appearance should be secured by a condition.

Full details of private landscaping for plots are not shown, therefore a suitably worded condition will be required.

The LEAP and LAP proposed were found to be appropriate in location, and size, providing adequate amenity distance from dwellings. However the indicative play areas whilst starting to form an ambitious scheme in line with the Design Code, contained duplicated play experiences and items which would not be supported. The play plans are noted as indicative, and therefore a condition requiring full details would make this acceptable. A condition is also required for details and appearance of signage, interpretation boards and public art.

The number of interpretation boards and public art is lower than the approved Design Code, but subject to a condition to require these details in full this is acceptable.

ARBORICULTURAL OFFICER - No comments provided.

HOUSING OFFICER - No comments provided.

ACTIVE TRAVEL ENGLAND - No support, as further information requested.

Support the fact that this reserved matters application does not provide a through route, and supports the active travel routes being overlooked.

Hoggin unsealed footpaths are unsupported as they are not considered to be fully wheelchair accessible for wheelchair users according to LTN1/20 and Inclusive Mobility.

WSCC FIRE and RESCUE - No objection. Recommends inclusion of a condition to adequately secure fire hydrants and their supply.

SUSSEX POLICE - Comments provided on Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). Public areas, play areas and streets should be well overlooked and ground planting should be no higher than 1 metre with tree canopies no lower than 2metres. Parking should be situated with good natural surveillance from active rooms. Adequate lighting should be provided within the development to provide safe and secure spaces at night.

WSCC PROW - No Objection.

ECOLOGY OFFICER - No objection. Suitable quantum and location of ecology provisions, and timeline for implementation is acceptable.

SOUTHERN WATER - Objection.

Objection based upon concern that the Ford Wastewater Treatment Works may result in adverse odour impacts on new sensitive development that would prejudice the operation of the treatment works.

Development not within southern waters statutory area for water supply drainage services. Need to contact Portsmouth Water. Any new proposed pumping stations that require adoption must be planned in accordance with the Southern Water Services Specification. Further advice to applicant on connections to public sewers is available online.

COMMENTS ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

It should be noted that the objections from Southern Water and Environmental Health relates to odour. However, odour impacts were assessed through the determination of the outline application under reference F/4/20/OUT and conditions were imposed to control development within the identified odour contours. This application sits outside the extent of the odour contours identified at outline stage and as such is not relevant to the determination of this reserved matters application.

POLICY CONTEXT

The application mostly sits within the SD8 Ford Strategic Housing Allocation, as per Policy H SP1, which supports the principle of residential development to meet the housing needs of the district. The northeastern corner of the site is located outside of the Built Up Area Boundary and the SD8 strategic allocation.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES[Arun Local Plan 2011 - 2031:](#)

AHSP2	AH SP2 Affordable Housing
DDM1	D DM1 Aspects of form and design quality
DDM2	D DM2 Internal space standards
DSP1	D SP1 Design
ENVDM4	ENV DM4 Protection of trees
ENVDM5	ENV DM5 Development and biodiversity
ENVSP1	ENV SP1 Natural Environment
GISP1	GI SP1 Green Infrastructure and Development
HDM1	H DM1 Housing mix
HERDM1	HER DM1 Listed Buildings
HWBSP1	HWB SP1 Health and Wellbeing
OSRSP1	OSR SP1 Allotments
QEDM1	QE DM1 Noise Pollution
QEDM2	QE DM2 Light pollution
QEDM3	QE DM3 Air Pollution
SDSP1	SD SP1 Sustainable Development
TDM1	T DM1 Sustainable Travel and Public Rights of Way
WDM1	W DM1 Water supply and quality
WDM2	W DM2 Flood Risk

WDM3	W DM3 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems
WMDM1	WM DM1 Waste Management
WSP1	W SP1 Water

Ford Neighbourhood Plan 2024-2041 Policy EH1	Protection of trees and hedgerows
Ford Neighbourhood Plan 2024-2041 Policy EH4	Surface water management
Ford Neighbourhood Plan 2024-2041 Policy EH8	Light Pollution
Ford Neighbourhood Plan 2024-2041 Policy GA1	Footpath and cycle path network
Ford Neighbourhood Plan 2024-2041 Policy GA2	Parking and new development
Ford Neighbourhood Plan 2024-2041 Policy GA3	Streets and Access Ways to serve new development
Ford Neighbourhood Plan 2024-2041 Policy H1	Quality of Design
Ford Neighbourhood Plan 2024-2041 Policy H2	Housing Mix
Ford Neighbourhood Plan 2024-2041 Policy H4	Recreational Space
Ford Neighbourhood Plan 2024-2041 Policy H6	Integration of New Housing
Ford Neighbourhood Plan 2024-2041 Policy SA1	Ford Airfield

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:

NPPDG	National Design Guide
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance

SUPPLEMENTARY POLICY GUIDANCE:

SPD11	Arun Parking Standards 2020
SPD12	Open Space, Playing Pitches & Indoor & Built Sports Facilities
SPD13	Arun District Design Guide (SPD) January 2021

POLICY COMMENTARY

The Development Plan consists of the Arun Local Plan 2011 - 2031, West Sussex County Council's Waste and Minerals Plans, The South Inshore & South Offshore Marine Plan and Made Neighbourhood Development Plans. The policies are published under Regulations 19 and 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

The Ford Neighbourhood Development Plan was made on 9 January 2019. However, the plan was updated and the Ford Neighbourhood Plan 2 was made on 19 March 2025.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:-

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

The proposal is considered to comply with relevant Development Plan policies.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no overriding material considerations to warrant a decision other than in accordance with the Development Plan and legislative background.

BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN

In England, a 10% increase in Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021).

However, the outline permission pre-dates the requirement imposed by the Environment Act 2021. Therefore, only Policy ENV DM5 of the Arun Local Plan applies, which requires an uplift in Biodiversity in the first instance.

A BNG Assessment was provided collectively for all RMs (IRM, RM1N and RM4S), and whilst this was undertaken at outline stage and therefore unlikely to be exact, no objection has been raised by the Council's Ecology Officer as it demonstrates compliance with Policy ENV DM5.

CONCLUSIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

Both the Arun Local Plan (ALP) and the Ford Neighbourhood Development Plan (FNDP) allocate the site for residential development of at least 1,500 dwellings to be delivered as part of the strategic housing allocation (SD8) at Ford. Outline permission was granted (under reference F/4/20/OUT) which establishes the principle of development, for up to 1,500 dwellings, care home, primary school, and a new Local Centre incorporating various retail, commercial and community uses.

Parameter plans were approved through the outline planning permission, which established the general land use areas for the residential development, local centre, and school, along with maximum heights and densities. In addition, areas of open space, buffer planting, and retention of footpaths were shown. The approved parameter plans also include the general location of the spine road which connected Ford Lane and Yapton Road.

The three reserved matters applications which have been submitted include the north-western phase of the development for 341 dwellings (Phase RM1 under F/15/24/RES), the infrastructure phase including the primary spine road and the majority of the open spaces (including the open drainage features) (IRM under F/14/24/RES), and this application which consists of the southernmost part of the site for 357 dwellings (Phase RM4 under F/16/24/RES).

This application seeks to secure reserved matters approval for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 357 dwellings (Phase RM4) in the south of the site. All other matters were considered through the granting of permission F/4/20/OUT with conditions included in relation to the following matters which will require discharge prior to the commencement of development:

- Archaeology (Condition 6).
- Construction Management Plan (Condition 10).
- Contamination Scheme (Condition 12 & 13).
- External lighting details (Condition 15).
- Updated Badger Survey (Condition 16).
- Ecological Protection and Enhancement Plan (17).

- Employment and Skills Plan (Condition 19).
- Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan (Condition 22).
- Location of rising main and foul sewer pipes (Condition 27).
- Foul Drainage (Condition 28).
- Surface Water Drainage (Condition 29, 30, 31 and 32).
- Scheme for managing explosives (Condition 34).

Additional conditions required submission of details to be included within the RM applications. These include:

- Ecological Protection and Enhancement Plan (Condition 18).
- Layout and appearance particulars (Condition 20).
- Landscaping particulars (Condition 21).
- Noise scheme (Condition 25).
- Renewable Energy (Condition 26).

Furthermore, Condition 7 of the outline permission required a Design Code to be submitted and approved prior to the submission of any reserved matters. The Design Code established the design objectives and strategy for the delivery of the strategic allocation. The Design Code was approved under F/10/24/DOC and sets out the strategy in relation to character areas for both residential and public open space, including the design approach to the character areas, such as density, elevational treatments, height, and materials. In addition, the Design Code included a play strategy, and detailed the design objectives for the development of the historic canal alignment and runway areas.

Through the development of the Design Code, Pre-Application workshops and subsequent planning application, the Council instructed an independent external design consultant to provide advice to the council.

DESIGN AND LAYOUT

A Design Code was approved through the discharge of Condition 5 imposed on F/4/20/OUT. The Design Code established that the development of the site will incorporate a total of seven distinct residential character areas, which are identified as follows (north to south):

- Ford Lane Character Area is located along Ford Lane to the north of the site.
- St Marys Meadow Character Area is located to the western boundary of the northern part of the site, and faces open countryside.
- Arun Way and Landings Green Character Area forms the bulk of the development in the north of the site, and is located north of the Arun Way Green Infrastructure Link.
- Heart of Ford, which is the centre of the site and includes the Local Centre.
- Runway Character Area which includes land either side of the newly established linear park, formed along the existing runway.
- Runway Park Character Area which fronts the edge of the Runway Park Public Open Space in the south of the site.
- Ryebank Park Character Area which largely adjoins the Ryebank Park POS and Climping Edge Public Open Space.

The development proposed in this application is located within the very south of the site only and falls within three of the identified character areas. These are Ryebank Park; Runway Park; and Runway.

Street Hierarchy

The access arrangements were approved under the outline planning permission, securing roundabouts on both Ford Lane and Yapton Road. Therefore, in terms of highway safety the proposal is in accordance with policies T SP1 or T DM1 of the ALP and will not have an unacceptably adverse impact upon the safe operation of the highways network.

The development has been designed around the provision of a primary spine road which links the approved Ford Lane and Yapton Road roundabout accesses, which was considered as an acceptable principle as part of the outline, and WSCC Highways raised no objections. Future Reserved Matters are then able to establish secondary and tertiary, streets which connect into the primary spine road to create a legible street hierarchy, which is supportable.

The approved Design Code establishes the general principle of road hierarchy with various street types to be delivered as part of the proposals. These are:

- Primary Street: 6.5m wide with 2m footway on one side and 3.5m shared footway/cycle way. Verges should measure a minimum of 2m on both sides and mature large tree specimens.
- Secondary Street: 5.5m wide with 2m wide footway on one site and 3m footway/cycleway. Verges should measure a minimum of 2m on both sides with medium tree specimens.
- Tertiary Street: 5m wide with 2m wide footway on both sides and 2m footways on both sides and verges measuring a minimum of 2m on both sides with medium to small tree specimens.
- Mews Street: 4.8m wide shared surfaces (minimum of 4.5m wide at pinch points) with no footways and context driven use of verges and tree planting.

The proposed secondary street measures a minimum of 5.5m, and provides a circulatory route around the development. The pedestrian and cycle path would be 2m and 3m cycleway respectively along the secondary route. The 3m cycleway continues beyond the secondary street to follow the existing east-west PROW route which is to provide through access between Yapton to Climping. Both sides of the road feature tree lined verges of a minimum of 2m, however verges are predominantly in excess of this. The junctions have been designed in accordance with LTN1/20 which prioritises cycle and pedestrian movements. As such, the secondary street design is in accordance with the Design Code.

Some cul-de-sacs within the proposal are designed at a lesser width than the Mews Street, however these are limited to streets which lead to a small number of dwellings, and would not cause adverse harm to the operation of the highway.

WSCC Highways have reviewed the application and raised no objections to the design of the highways from a safety and operational perspective. Tracking details have been provided and demonstrate that fire and refuse vehicles can access the site. In addition, the visibility splays provided were deemed acceptable by WSCC Highways.

Therefore, the proposal is in accordance with policies T SP1, T DM1 and D DM1 of the ALP which seek to ensure safe operation of a highway and facilitate good placemaking principles through well-functioning streets.

Layout

Throughout the determination period, several amendments to the design have been undertaken to respond to officer and consultee advice and recommendations.

- Visitor parking has been better distributed across the site to avoid a overprovision towards the peripheral areas of the site.
- Rationalisation and design amendments to individual house types.

- Extension of the secondary street to create more circulation throughout the site.
- Joining up of footpaths along green infrastructure routes.
- Removal of rear-parking courts.
- Amendments to proposed house types, which allows for improved rear garden layouts/depths, increased habitable window separation distances, improved front-to-front / front-to-side / rear-to-rear separation distances, and increased depth of defensible spaces.
- Amendments to parking layouts and locations.
- Amendments to rear garden circulation routes and reduced waste bin drag distances.

The outline planning permission approved a parameter plan which set out development extents and areas for open space. On submission, the Design Officer commented that the layout felt rigid and urban, building up to the parameter line with little variation in set back distances and front garden depths. In response, the applicants amended the design to allow variation in the building line along Yapton Road. The applicants 'Encroachment Plan' submitted demonstrates that while some built form sits outside of the development boundary, other areas are far within the line, equalling the area of built form parameter.

The Design Officer also raised concerns that the basins and the changes to the building line squeezed the Ryebank Park POS (submitted within F/14/24/RES) and diminished its contribution to amenity. However, the Ryebank Park POS was never intended to provide a key principal open space. Nonetheless, it is felt that there is sufficient circulation around the basin to provide suitable amenity despite the proximity to dwellings.

Three key green infrastructure links are provided within the site to provide amenity and swale infrastructure for the sustainable drainage scheme. The largest corridor forms a key link between the Ryebank POS and the Runway POS, creating a corridor of approximately 12-15 metres in width with greenspace and planting. A second link connects Ryebank Park POS with the Runway Park, this link connects the spine road. The third swale is a shorter section, approximately 7 metres wide, starting from the secondary street near Plot 61 and continuing south to the basins within the Ryebank POS; this swale is complemented by additional verges. Collectively, these tree-lined swales create substantial green links that integrate the Runway Park POS, Ryebank Park POS, and surrounding neighbourhood parks. These green infrastructure corridors align with the Runway Park and Ryebank Park Character Area objectives shown in the approved Design Code.

A 0.2ha Neighbourhood Green is located in the southern part of the site, adjacent to Plot 320, providing some additional doorstep open space and amenity for residents locally. Dwellings front onto the Neighbourhood Green to provide natural surveillance and is centrally located within the parcel to provide maximum benefit to residents.

Plot 107 was originally located to the southwest corner of the site, however its position resulted in its rear garden presenting to open space, and resulting in an awkward appearance for users on the circulatory route. The applicants have amended the design and the bungalow has been pulled into the site, creating a more natural outward facing corner of the site. It also provides better natural surveillance to users of the path adjacent to the dwelling.

Vehicular parking across the site is provided through a combination of allocated on-plot, and off-plot spaces, alongside garages, which meets the Arun Parking Standards SPD guidance. The predominant arrangement is tandem on-plot parking, supplemented by visitor spaces located in parallel bays along the highway. Cars would generally be kept out of the street scene, with tandem parking locate between dwellings and set back from the building line.

However, there are some areas which would be car dominated (for example, around plots 266-271 & plots 18-19 & plots 95-97). Soft landscaping has been proposed in these locations, and, whilst not

entirely removing the presence of cars, softens their visual impact.

Parking is also prominent along the runway frontage, where spaces extend along much of the building line. However, this is a deliberate design choice, which also incorporates soft landscaping, to reflect the nature of the character area.

Rear parking courts were removed by the applicant due to concerns of natural surveillance, and increased potential for on-street parking. One parking court in the south remains, however this has been broken integrated further natural surveillance and openness to allow these concerns to be satisfactorily addressed.

The Design Code establishes that the block structure of the development will become looser around the perimeter of the development to reflect the rural context of the site. Development along the southern edge, facing the open countryside consists predominantly of larger detached dwellings, allowing for space between the built form and a looser grain of development. This is considered an appropriate response to the edge of the development which would help to soften the transition between the site and the wider countryside.

In the Runway Character Area, the proposed building line is consistent in order to exaggerate the placement and linear nature of the former runway arm, in line with the approved Design Code. Formalised and smaller front gardens also reinforce the industrial character of this area.

Dwellings in the Runway Park Character Area front onto the Runway Park POS, establishing good natural surveillance for the park and play areas. Front gardens are typically larger along the Runway Park POS (2.5m-4m), to establish good public and private realm. Dwellings are all eaves fronted except where they demarcate the entrance of a swale, where the roof form is punctuated with gable fronted dwellings.

Dwellings proposed on the edge of the Ryebank Park Character Area face outwards towards the attenuation basins along Yapton Road, and the open space along Horsemere Green Lane, providing a strong active frontage to the open space.

Pedestrian and Cycle Connections

Various footpaths, bridleways and cycleways are proposed throughout the development and provide several circular recreational routes of varying lengths through the open spaces around the development, which will help to promote active travel and recreation for future occupiers as well as existing nearby residents.

In the south of the site, a 3m wide macadam pedestrian/cycle path provides a circular route around the residential development, connecting the Runway Park POS with the Ryebank Park POS (not included in this application). This application would facilitate part of the 3m macadam surfaced footpath route connecting Climping Edge POS and Runway Park POS. The path network would also provide continued access along the PROW 175 and into the Rudford Industrial Estate.

Runway Park POS provides several further hoggin surfaced footpaths which would allow access to the LEAP and allotment area. Both macadam and hoggin footpaths are shown up to the northern boundary, with the intention that these will join up with future phases, particularly the civic runway open space.

Density

Page 77 of the Design Code sets out density guidelines for each character area. The Design Code sets

out that the lowest densities are located along the edge of the site, to provide a softer transition to the edges of the site. The Design Code states that the development densities of each character area are: Ryebank Park a 20-28dph; Runway Park at 25-35dph and Runway at 27-38dph. Ryebank Park should be the lowest density, reflecting the edge of settlement location and its function as a transition to the open countryside to the west.

The density of the proposals would be Ryebank Park at 27.5dph; Runway Park at 33dph and Runway at 39.5dph.

It is acknowledged that the Runway Character Area would be outside of the proposed range by 1.5 dwellings per hectare, however this character area was intended to support flatted development to provide a more enclosure, compact and formalised frontage. The proposed development consists of two apartment blocks, which are likely to contribute to the higher density. Nonetheless, no harm to the character of the development has been identified by virtue of the proposed density, and therefore the densities proposed are acceptable.

Scale

The approved Design Code on Page 79 set out a hierarchy of built form identifying that taller buildings should be positioned along key routes such as primary and secondary highways and green infrastructure routes. The height of the development ranges from 1 storey bungalows to 2.5 storey development to provide a range of heights and good placemaking.

Along the spine road and the runway, apartment blocks are proposed at three storeys to provide marker buildings and emphasize the status of the road and runway feature. Development adjacent to the apartment blocks is proposed at 2.5 storeys, to ensure a suitable transition of massing and built form.

Single storey bungalows are proposed in the southeast corner of the site, closest to Horsemere Green Lane. This ensures a softer transition to Horsemere Green Lane and provide greater sense of separation to Climping.

There are some instances where 2.5 storey dwellings are proposed in areas identified as being a maximum of 2-storey in height. However, where such deviation occurs the 2.5 storey dwellings create an appropriate sense of hierarchy, which is supported by Officers.

Therefore, the proposed scale of development across this parcel of the development would provide suitable legibility for the site layout and is acceptable given the character of the site and wider locality.

Elevational Treatments and Materials

Page 89 of the approved Design Code sets the general principles towards materials. This approach was supported by officers as it will ensure that each character area has a distinct identity to assist with legibility and interpretation of the development, whilst simultaneously providing a palette of materials and detailing across the site which is cohesive.

Throughout the determination period, several amendments to the design have been undertaken to respond to officer and consultee advice and recommendations, which are summarised as below:

- Door styles are consistent, but door colours now range depending on character area and size of units.
- Several canopy styles have been amended and are dependent on house type size and location (spine road, outer line of housing) and have adjusted slightly to provide a more varied street scene,

colours match the doors as per the above.

- Render that previously went down to plinth height now goes all the way down to DPC level.
- Bay windows have been added in key plots to the south-east to provide more appealing focal points facing onto key landscaped areas.
- Certain flat block elevations adjusted with paired windows on feature gables, alongside adjusted detailing to increase appeal.
- All flat block bin and cycle store door styles have been adjusted to suit specific council comments.

The Design Officer raised concerns with the many of the house types, where bathroom windows were not centred to the front door. In some instances, the use of facing bricks or other elements disguised this, however these are still apparent in those simpler material treatments such as render. The applicant was asked to change these, however they advised that it was not possible given the housebuilder has set elevational treatments. Whilst, this amendment would have improved the appearance of the units failure to amend does not result in harm to the extent that refusal of the application would be justified.

The Runway Character area development proposed larger townhouses along the runway itself to provide enclosure. The proposed buildings would feature black balcony railings, protruding brick features and contemporary door canopy detailing to emphasize the industrial character of the airfield.

PUBLIC OPEN SPACE (POS) AND PLAY PROVISION

The Open Space, Playing Pitches, Indoor and Built Sports Facilities (January 2020) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) requires a development of 1,500 dwellings to provide a minimum of 1.815ha of play provision.

The approved Ford Design Code (pg. 38) sets out that the overall development will provide a mixture of play provision quantum of 1.815ha, through the provision of a mixture of LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs across the site. Individual play areas have been made larger than the minimum requirements, and each public open space area has a bespoke theme to provide a genuinely exciting and contextually led play design strategy.

The Ford site includes several areas of Public Open Spaces (POS):

- Landings Green POS is in the north-eastern corner of the site.
- St Marys Meadow POS forms the open space to the western boundary in the north of the site (and to the west of residential phase F/15/24/RES).
- The Arun Way POS forms a key linear pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian route from east-west in the northern part of the site (connecting St Marys Meadow POS and Landing Green POS). It is an existing PROW, which is to be upgraded as part of the development, and retain the existing mature hedge and tree boundary.
- Runway Park POS is located in the south of the development, along the northeast boundary.
- Runway POS is a linear civic space, located along the former arm of the runway.
- Climping Edge POS is located on the southern boundary of the site, adjacent to Horsemere Green Lane.
- Ryebank Park POS is located on the western boundary of the southern part of the site, parallel to Yapton Road.

This application encompasses the Runway Park Public Open Space (POS), which includes the allotments and the southern Neighbourhood Green. The open space provided is consistent with the Design Code, and a locally equipped area of play (LEAP) is provided within the open space. The proposed LEAP will measure 1,800sqm and feature an airport theme drawing from the sites historic use. This phase also include a Neighbourhood Green which will be located in the centre of the residential development and contains a LAP.

The LEAP and LAPs proposed in this application are of a sufficient size that accord with the play strategy in the approved Design Code, and all have appropriate buffer distances to the proposed dwellings in line with the Council's Open Space SPD to ensure adequate amenity of occupiers.

The Play Designs have been submitted as an indicative example, however the Greenspace Officer has commented that they would require amendments to ensure that they do not duplicate items and provide a high-quality scheme in line with the approved Design Code. However, the play areas will be subject to a planning condition for the submission of full details (mounding, levels, equipment, planting etc) and is therefore acceptable.

A bund is proposed along the eastern boundary of Runway Park public open space. This is proposed to be planted with structural woodland planting, and whilst is not required for any noise mitigation with the associated industrial uses to the east, this would provide visual screening and a well defined vegetated boundary to the site.

Benches and bins have been located along key routes to aid in promoting health and wellbeing along the circular routes within the site. The Greenspace Officer advises that these should be consistent with the rest of the development, noting character areas, and as such a planning condition would be imposed to secure the appearance of these.

The POS and play provision proposed through this application aligns with the principles established through the outline application (F/4/20/OUT) and reflects the Design Code. Therefore, the POS and play provision are acceptable and would accord with permitted details and relevant development plan policies.

ALLOTMENTS

Policy SA1 of the FDNP2 requires that any masterplan for Ford included provision for allotments, which was included in the outline proposals. Policy OSR SP1 of the ALP relates to allotments and requires that any such proposal incorporates adequate water supply, parking, secure boundaries and natural surveillance.

The Runway Park POS includes 9,804sqm of allotments, equating to 69 plots of varying sizes. The allotments location is within walking distance to the entire Ford strategic allocation and wider locality including Yapton and Climping. Therefore, the siting of the allotments is deemed to be highly accessible and is supported by officers. The layout of the proposed dwellings in this application has taken the presence of the allotments into account and due to their outward facing design give rise to natural surveillance of the allotments.

A 2m high post and wire deer proof fence is proposed around the entirety of the allotment area. A grasscrete path across the open space provides suitable vehicle access to minimise damage to the grass and maintain amenity value.

The allotment area includes 13 parking spaces, of which 2 are designated for disabled users. In addition to this 5 Sheffield cycle stands are proposed to facilitate sustainable transport modes. The Council's Parking SPD does not specify minimum requirements for allotments with provision assessed on a case-by-case basis. Given the location of the allotments, and provision of cycle stands, it is expected that most users will arrive by sustainable transport methods. However, it is expected that some vehicle trips will be required, particularly for maintenance purposes or by those with limited mobility. Allotment visits would be typically infrequent, with no fixed or peak times, and vary in length and duration. Therefore, there is sufficient variation in parking patterns that the 13 spaces proposed are sufficient.

Additional communal space, along with benches and picnic benches, and communal raised planters and open spaces are proposed within the allotment area. The surrounding area proposed to be well planted, and individual trees are also proposed to provide amenity for users.

A condition will be imposed to ensure adequate water supply for the allotment area, and various elements are provided prior to first use. The Greenspace Officer supports the details shown within the allotment area, and commends the additional details which will facilitate social interaction.

Therefore, the development would be in accordance with policy OSR SP1 of the ALP.

PUBLIC ART AND SIGNAGE

Page 68 of the Ford Design Code identifies locations for Public art, interpretation boards, and way marking signage across the site to provide interest, educational value and amenity. Different zones have been identified to help provide various contextual themes across the site, such as Industrial Heritage, Aviation Heritage and Natural Heritage.

The locations of public art, interpretation boards, and signage posts have all been identified on the proposed soft landscaping plans. The public art in the Runway Park POS will need to accord with the scale parameters set by the Ford Design Code (pg. 68), and the space provided is sufficient to achieve this.

Therefore, subject to a planning condition to secure the detailed appearance and scale of these items, this is acceptable.

HERITAGE

ALP policies HER SP1, HER DM1 and HER DM4 are relevant to the consideration of impacts of the development upon heritage assets. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings and their setting when determining planning applications.

Only one non-designated heritage asset is located within this application (Former Ford Airfield Runway), however no designated heritage assets are located within or in close proximity to the application. One locally listed building is located to the south of the application site, along Horsemere Green Lane.

Runway (non-designated heritage asset)

The western arm of the former Ford Airfield Runway is partially within this application, and is a non-designated heritage asset. The Ford Airfield Runway makes a significant contribution to the historic character and context of the site and its former use as an airfield. This application only contains a small portion of the western arm of the runway.

The details considered through the outline permitted the western runway arm to narrow and as a result the building line would be located on the arm of the runway. The buildings in this location would provide for a strong linear frontage, which is supported by officers and complies with the ambitions of the Design Codes, and contributes to retaining the linear form of the runway. The principle of this approach was considered and accepted at outline stage where it was concluded that the delivery of much needed housing and 450 affordable dwellings, when balanced against the moderate adverse harm upon the significance of the non-designated heritage asset would be acceptable. There are no additional material considerations which would warrant a different conclusion in the determination of this application.

Paragraph 216 of the NPPF states that in weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

The proposed development and impact upon this non-designated heritage asset would be in accordance with paragraph 216 of the NPPF, policy EH3 of the FNDP2, and policy HER SP1 of the ALP, and would conserve and enhance the former Ford Airfield Runway and is acceptable.

March Elms / Southdown Cottage

A locally listed pair of semi-detached cottages (March Elms / Southdown Cottage), believed to have been constructed in 1877, are located south of the application site along Horsemere Green Lane. Their setting includes their curtilage, neighbouring lane and the surrounding agricultural landscape.

They are separated from the development by open space to be provided within the infrastructure reserved matters (F/14/24/RES). The Conservation Officer acknowledged that the dwellings proposed in this application are set back behind the Climping Edge Public Open Space (POS). The distance between the proposed new dwellings and the proposed structural landscaping is supported.

Comments were raised regarding whether the structural woodland planting proposed is native and mature enough to provide reduced short-term harm, however this is considered through the report for F/14/24/RES as the planting is proposed through that application.

The separation of the built form and the locally listed building and the inclusion of substantial structural planting will ensure that there is no harm upon. The proposed development would conserve the setting of the cottages, in accordance with paragraph 216 of the NPPF, policy EH3 of the FNDP2, and policy HER SP1 of the ALP, and as such is acceptable.

VEHICLE PARKING

The site sits within Parking Behaviour Zone 1 of the Arun Parking Standards SPD, and as such 2 parking spaces are required per 1, 2, and 3 bedroom dwellings. Each 4+ bedroom dwelling requires 3 parking spaces. In addition, 20% of the total number of residential units must be visitor parking spaces. As such, the proposed development is required to provide 802 residential parking space and 71 visitor spaces (873 total).

The proposed development would provide:

- 632 no. allocated parking spaces;
- 39 no. allocated parking spaces for flats;
- 41.5 no. garage spaces (i.e. 83 garages);
- 87 no. visitor parking spaces; and
- 2 no. service / maintenance spaces.

The total number of parking spaces (excluding service spaces) of 821.5 no. spaces, would equate to a provision of 94.1% of the expected requirement as per the Arun Parking SPD, an under provision of 5.9%. The under provision is primarily due to the flatted developments, consisting of 1 and 2 bedroom apartments, having an under provision of parking spaces. In total 33 flats would have a total of 39 parking spaces, which would allow for one allocated parking space per flat, and 13 as shared visitor spaces.

Paragraph 3.2 of the Arun Parking SPD states that "To satisfy the promotion of sustainable travel modes

and choices it is considered that a 10% variation below the target parking demand value be allowed where appropriate travel option provision is provided including travel plans, public transport contributions (e.g. through section 106 contributions involving Strategic Allocations and Community Infrastructure Levy once adopted, for other non-strategic sized developments for offsite infrastructure of a strategic nature) and other sustainable travel initiatives. This is also as a result of increasing affordability issues resulting in young people staying with parents for longer."

The applicant has acknowledged the under provision of car parking spaces and notes that the outline application is subject to a Travel Plan which promotes sustainable travel modes. The proposed development would incorporate a bus route along the primary spine road, with a new school, care home, community centre, and retail/commercial space within the Local Centre.

The Local Centre is in walking distance of all the dwellings in this application. It would be approximately 0.54 miles from Plot 107 in the southwest corner to the Local Centre, approximately a 10-minute walk utilising the circular pedestrian path through the public open space. However, under provision is concentrated on the apartment blocks, which significantly reduce this distance given their location along the spine road. Furthermore, bus stops are located along the spine road, and would increase the likelihood of sustainable transport methods being utilised.

Both the Arun Design Guide and Manual for Streets require 5% of the overall parking requirement to be provided as accessible bays or bays for use by people with disabilities. These spaces should be well distributed across the site, with both curtilage spaces and visitor spaces provided as disabled standard. The parking requirement for this development would therefore require 40.7 spaces designed to disabled parking standard.

22 allocated parking spaces are proposed as disabled parking spaces, allowing for all M4(3) units to be provided with disabled parking. A further 5 visitor parking spaces are identified as disabled. This is an under provision, however many visitor spaces within the layout, particularly along Runway Park POS, are perpendicular to the road, allowing access to both rear and side of the vehicle. Therefore, whilst not always suitable in length (required to be 4m), the hard surfaced low speed road would allow suitable use of the spaces by those with disabilities. In addition to this disabled parking bays can be provided on the highway if required by future occupiers.

Therefore, proposed layout provides a parking quantum in accordance with the policy T DM1 of the ALP, policy GA2 Ford NDP2 and the ADC Parking Standards SPD.

EV CHARGING

Policy QE DM3 and T SP1 of the ALP promote the inclusion of Electric Vehicle (EV) charging in order to promote better air quality and a lower carbon future. The Council's Parking Standards SPD (January 2020) states that all dwellings with a driveway or garage must be provided with an EV charging facility.

The WSCC Highways officer noted several plots without EV charging facilities, where it appeared that there were no constraints to their delivery. The applicants have updated the proposed parking plan which now demonstrates that all dwellings with a driveway or garage would have an EV charging facility, either through a free-standing feature or a wall mounted point. This level of provision accords with the Council's Parking SPD.

The Parking SPD requires a minimum of 30% of the parking spaces for other developments to be provided with an EV charging facility. The flatted development would provide 1 EV charger per allocated space and therefore would provide above the 30% requirement.

A condition is proposed to secure delivery of the EV chargers prior to occupation of any dwelling, and subject to this the proposals would be in accordance with the objectives policies QE DM3 and T SP1 of the ALP.

CYCLE PARKING

The Arun Parking SPD stipulates that 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings are required to provide a minimum of 1 cycle storage space; 3+ bedroom dwellings should provide for 2 cycle parking spaces, and; flats with communal storage should have one space per unit.

Cycle storage is proposed to be located primarily in rear gardens within cycle storage sheds, which is acceptable in principle. Details of their appearance and size can be adequately conditioned. A total of 324 cycle sheds are proposed, providing 648 cycle parking spaces. In addition, 33 cycle spaces are to be provided within the proposed garages, which is acceptable given that garages account for just 0.5 of a vehicular parking space.

Therefore, the quantum of cycle parking far exceeds the Arun Parking Standards SPD and is in accordance with Policy T DM1 of the ALP and the Arun Parking Standards SPD.

NOISE

Policy QE DM1 requires new noise sensitive development to not be adversely impacted by existing or future noise exposure. Policy QE DM1 also states that to safeguard the continued use of existing industrial and commercial uses and to protect amenity, noise sensitive development should not normally be permitted where:

- High levels of noise will continue throughout the night, especially during the hours when people are normally sleeping.
- There is a likelihood of complaints about noise from industrial development.

During the determination of the outline planning permission, it was identified that mitigation would be necessary through the provision of acoustic barriers given the adjoining uses. However, given no layout was provided through the determination of the Outline application, further information on noise was required, and as such Condition 25 was imposed on the outline application to ensure that noise mitigation measures were identified and submitted as part of each reserved matters application. The condition wording makes it clear that designing out noise through the siting of gardens, buffer zones and orientation of living spaces would be needed to demonstrate acceptable living conditions for future occupiers and ensure there would not be a scenario where the adjoining uses were prejudiced.

The application was accompanied by a Noise Assessment prepared by Ardent (Ref 2205771-R04D) which satisfied the requirements of Condition 25 imposed on the outline planning approval. The assessment identified that the main noise sources at the Biffa Waste site are the delivery and processing of waste, along with HGV movements which are offloaded inside the building. At Rudford Industrial Estate, the main sources of noise were HGV and car movements at the main access road, fixed mechanical plant at Styropack and noise compressor at Bear Kustoms Paintworks. The Ford Airfield Market & Car Boot Sale, operating on Thursday and Sundays, had its main noise source from patrons and a small loudspeaker system.

The Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) raised an objection to the proposed development based upon insufficient detail and the assessments not taking account of cumulative noise impacts.

An updated Noise Assessment has been submitted to address cumulative noise sources (Noise

Assessment 2205771-R04E). The cumulative noise modelling shows that during the day noise environments would have a low impact, and during the night there would be an adverse impact without mitigation. Therefore, mitigation has been proposed which includes mechanical ventilation to allow windows to be closed for further acoustic performance. In addition, balconies within flatted developments would be required to have a translucent noise attenuating balustrade.

The Council are currently reviewing the updated Noise Assessment, and will provide an update on the conclusions in relation to this matter at Planning Committee.

HOUSING MIX

Policy H DM1 of the Arun Local Plan seeks to secure a mix of dwelling types and sizes, including affordable housing units. The policy seeks to secure the provision of some serviced sites for the development of self-build homes. Policy H2 of the FNDP2 requires a range of house types and tenures, including bungalows.

This application includes 357 no. dwellings proposed and are comprised of the following housing mix:

	Dwellings	Overall % mix
1 bed dwellings -	15	4%
2 bed dwellings -	97	27%
3 bed dwellings -	157	44%
4 bed dwellings -	81	23%
5 bed dwellings -	7	2%

The Design Officer has raised concern about the overprovision of 3 and 4 bed dwellings, and the need to facilitate a much higher level of 1 & 2 bed dwellings within the Local Centre as a result. However, the design rationale for a higher provision of larger detached dwellings facing the open countryside to create a looser built form and transition to the countryside is supported. In addition, a denser development is supported closer to the Local Centre where important community uses are to be located.

This application deals with one parcel of development, out of a potential 1,500 dwellings. Therefore, accepting this mix would not prejudice the delivery of a policy compliant housing mix across the entire site. In future phases, a cumulative assessment will need to be undertaken, taking into account previously approved phases, to ensure that the housing mix accords with policy. The Housing Officer has been consulted on the proposals but has not provided any comments on the proposed mix.

No custom build housing is proposed within this phase, in line with the phasing strategy approved under discharge of condition application F/36/24/DOC, which requires the delivery of custom build units in future phases. This is acceptable and complies with the S106.

The proposal includes 7 no. bungalows, located along Horsemere Green Lane. Bungalow provision is supported through policy H DM1 of the ALP and ADC's 'Accommodation for Older People and People with Disabilities' Guidance note (2020), and as such this element of the proposals is a positive addition.

The housing mix proposed would not prejudice the delivery of a policy compliant housing mix over the entire development and as such the proposals would allow for the development to accord with policies H DM1 of the ALP and H2 of the FNDP2.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Policy AH SP2 of the ALP requires a minimum of 30% of affordable housing, which was secured by the

Section 106 agreement which formed part of the outline permission granted under reference F/4/20/OUT.

Of the 357 dwellings proposed, 30.3% of dwellings (107 dwellings) are proposed to be affordable units. The site will comprise up to 1,500 dwellings and as such it is likely that the overall level of AH provision will vary slightly between phases. However, in this case the level of provision proposed within this application accords with the S106 agreement and policy AH SP2.

It was identified through the S106 at Outline that there were two scenarios for the tenure mix depending on the disposal method of the affordable housing. The affordable housing units could either be taken on by a Registered Provider or the Ford Community Land Trust (CLT) and the S106 requires the tenure split to be as below unless otherwise agree with the Local Planning Authority:

- The Community Land Trust tenure mix would be: 37% Affordable Rented Housing; 38% Intermediate Housing; and 25% First Homes (FH).
- The Registered Provider tenure mix would be: 67% Affordable Rented Housing; 8% Intermediate Housing; 25% First Homes (FH).

The indicative mix of affordable dwellings proposed should an Affordable Registered Housing Provider be the successful bidder, is proposed to be as follows:

	Total No.	% Total	First Homes	Aff Rent	Intermediate
1 bed dwellings -	12	11.2%	0	12	0
2 bed dwellings -	64	69.8%	28	35	1
3 bed dwellings -	23	21.5%	0	18	6
4 bed dwellings -	8	7.5%	0	6	2
Total	107	100%	28	71	8

The proposed tenure mix will secure a significant under provision of 1 bedroom dwellings (-23.8%), a significant overprovision of 2 beds (+29.8%) and a slight overprovision of three beds (+1.5%) contrary to the tenure mix identified through policy AH SP2. However, this parcel by virtue of its design principles will secure a higher proportion of three bed dwellings as part of its overall mix due to responding to the character area principles established through the Design Code. The applicant has also demonstrated that the tenure mixes identified through the S106 agreement could be complied with through the proposed housing mix.

The overall mix of affordable dwellings is a deviation from the preferred mix identified through Policy AH SP2 of the ALP. However, this application equates to 357 dwellings which equates to just 23.8% of the 1,500 dwellings to be delivered by the allocation. Therefore, future reserved matters applications will need to ensure that the overall affordable mix aligns with policy AH SP2 of the ALP.

ACCESSIBLE DWELLINGS

The proposed dwellings all meet the minimum size standards specified by the Nationally Described Space Standards which ensures the development is in accordance with Policy D DM2 of the ALP.

ADC's 'Accommodation for Older People and People with Disabilities' Guidance note (2020) was approved at Planning Policy sub-committee on 27 February 2019, and forms a material consideration for planning decisions. The document suggests developments should secure 50% of the overall units to be designed to M4(2) standard (accessible and adaptable dwellings), plus two units for every 50 dwellings to be designed to M4(3) standard (wheelchair accessible).

The proposed development would deliver 186 units which meet the M4(2) standard, and 14 units which

would meet the wheelchair accessible M4(3) standard. This would represent a percentage of 52% and 4% respectively. This level of provision exceeds the requirements specified through Condition 5 of the Outline permission, and will allow full compliance with the S106 requirements and ADC's 'Accommodation for Older People and People with Disabilities' Guidance note (2020) in accord with policy D DM1 of the ALP.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY AND PRIVACY

ALP policies D DM1 and QE SP1 are relevant. The Council's Design Guide sets out guidance on interface distances between houses:

- Back to Back: min. 21m between habitable rooms of properties or to existing buildings.
- Back/Front to Side: min. 14m between habitable rooms and side gable of adjacent property.
- Front to Front: min. 16m between habitable rooms of properties facing each other.
- Back to Boundary: min. 12m between habitable rooms and site boundary to existing landscaping.
- There are no standards for either side to side or front to back.

Except for two instances, all dwellings comply with the back-to-back separation distances of 21m. Plots 178 and 188 are 20.63m apart, which is a minor conflict, and the buildings are substantially offset so that there is no impact to privacy. In addition plot 206 and 207 are 18.75m apart from their closest corner, however this raises to 20m at their furthest point, however the dwellings are offset so that they do not directly look into the other, resulting in no unacceptably adverse impacts on privacy.

Front to front distances are compliant with the Design Guide, except for one instance where Plot 37 and Plot 41 have an interface distance of 14.85m. Both of these plots feature the same internal floor plans, where one is shown as 'handed' and the other is as shown on the floor plan. This would result in both living rooms and upper bedrooms facing each other. The applicants have amended the plans in order to ensure that habitable rooms do not directly face each other thereby limiting any privacy concerns.

Regarding Deviations in the layout for Front/Back to Side, the following fall short of the minimum distances:

- Plot 20 & 19: 11.65m
- Plot 37 & 28: 12.11m
- Plot 36 & 37: 13.29m
- Plot 62 & 81: 13.67m
- Plot 70 & 71: 13.84m
- Plot 91 & 92: 11.82m
- Plot 88 & 89: 13.90m
- Plot 94 & 95: 11.09m

Most deviations would be unlikely to be noticeable or visually apparent. However, in cases where the distance falls below 13m, the alignment of the relationship would be east to west, which would allow for a southern facing garden without any built form giving rise to unacceptable overshadowing. Where this isn't the case, for example plot 94 & 95, the dwellings are offset so that there is reduced overbearing on the rear private garden. In addition, there are no proposed first floor windows on plot 37 or plot 19, which removes any potential for unacceptably adverse overlooking.

Overall, the interface distance result in a development which would not give rise to any unacceptable adverse overbearing, overshadowing, or overlooking, and therefore the layout as proposed is acceptable.

In addition, building frontages have been set back at least 2m from the plot boundary to ensure defensible space, providing a distinction between private and public areas, and ensure privacy of occupiers from passers-by (part H.01 and H.04 of the ADG). Two plots have failed to achieved this 2m set back but in these cases the shortfall is less than 10cm and as such this deviation is not considered to result in unacceptable harm. The layout incorporates a number of larger front gardens which provides variation and adequate amenity within the street scene.

The Council's Design Guide sets out guidance on minimum garden depths in order to provide adequate private amenity space. Private rear gardens should be a minimum of 10.5m deep, and flats with balconies should be at least 3sqm to ensure adequate external amenity and functionality. In addition, Policy H4 of the FNDP2 requires that private rear gardens should be commensurate in size to the size and type of dwelling.

Following amendments to the design, the proposal would result in largely regular shaped gardens which will assist with maintenance for future occupiers. All dwellings, except the below plots, are a minimum of 10.5m deep, with the majority exceeding this minimum standard.

- Plots 330-331: 10.48m
- Plots 356&357: 10.48m
- Plot 127: 10.20m
- Plot 132: 10.07m
- Plot 187: 10.11m
- Plot 188: 10m
- Plot 204: 10.19m
- Plot 208: 10.04
- Plot 207: 10.04m

The above garden depths, exceeding 10m, would still ensure adequate private amenity space for enjoyment and recreation of occupiers as well as complying with the back-to-back minimum distances between dwellings necessary to retain sufficient privacy for their use.

Overall, there are relatively minor deviations in minimum interface distances and garden depths across the site. However, where minor deviations have been identified, these maintain adequate amenity and privacy for occupiers and would not result in unacceptably adverse harm. Therefore, the proposed layout would achieve an acceptable level of amenity in accordance with Policies D DM1 and QE SP1 of the ALP

HARD LANDSCAPING

Where rear garden boundaries are prominent in the streetscene, the plans show brick walls instead of close boarded fencing.

There are several instances where roads or pedestrian accesses cross over swales, however the exact design has not been provided. Within the Neighbourhood Green, a Timber Bridge is proposed, however no details of the height or form have been provided. There is potential that a culvert is necessary, which can detract from the soft landscaping and rural character supported by the swale features. Therefore a suitably worded condition requiring details of the design and appearance of these crossings will be necessary.

Details of hard surfacing treatments throughout the development have been provided by the applicant and reviewed by officers. The details provided are acceptable and would ensure appropriate surfaces are provided throughout the development.

SOFT LANDSCAPING

Trees have been included in verges and along streets with a total of 405 trees proposed, these will make a significant contribution to the character of the street scene. There are areas where trees are reduced in number within certain parts of the layout but this has been to ensure that visibility splays are protected.

A total of 231 individual trees are proposed within the Runway Park POS and Climping Edge POS. In addition, structural woodland planting, is proposed along the boundaries of the site.

Many street and public area trees are native species, with some non-native species present to provide for seasonal interest. The majority of trees to be provided are specified as being mature or semi-mature which will ensure instant impact in the street scene.

The Greenspace Officer has requested further details of tree pits and servicing infrastructure to ensure street trees are provided adequate room for underground growth, particularly with reference to the swale infrastructure. However, they have noted that this would not preclude the proposed soft landscaping proposals from being brought forward. Details of tree pits and servicing can be adequately controlled through conditioned and therefore the tree planting within the street scene as proposed is acceptable.

The Greenspace Officer has highlighted that the softworks plans have failed to incorporate full details of on-plot planting for the front gardens with no detail of species and quantum of planting for each plot. Therefore, a condition will be required to ensure full details are secured. Therefore, subject to the proposed conditions the details for soft landscaping are acceptable and would accord with relevant development plan policy.

ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY

The outline planning permission included two conditions which required details of the mitigation measures for protected species.

Condition 17 of the outline permission requires details prior to the commencement of the development in relation to the ecological provisions, such as bat boxes, bird boxes and hibernacula. To date, this has not been approved, however the Reserved Matters submission states the following will be provided across the reserved matters phase:

- 164 no. bat boxes on dwellings;
- 161 no. bird boxes on dwellings;
- 4 no. Hedgehog nest boxes;
- 4 no. freestanding insect hotels;
- 15 no. Bee bricks; and
- Hedgehog Highways.

It is noted that the NPPG was updated in June 2025 (Paragraph: 017 Reference ID: 8-017-20250609) to reflect a general aim of one swift box for every dwelling, however, the Council's Ecology Officer has confirmed that there is no objection to this given that the outline permission pre-dates the PPG guidance.

Reference is also made in Condition 17 to the mitigation measures for Bewick Swans, which encompasses vegetation along surrounding footpaths. Condition 17 requires full details and a timeline prior to occupation of the development (see F/22/25/NMA), and therefore this can be adequately dealt with through the discharge of Condition 17.

Condition 18 of the outline permission requires that the reserved matters application includes details showing the location and implementation timelines for the ecological features listed above. An Ecological Protection and Enhancement Plan (UES04099/22 V8) has been submitted in support of condition 18.

The locations have been provided, and delivery triggers have been specified within the application to address Condition 18. The Ecology Officer has reviewed the application raised no objection to the locations or the delivery measures and therefore the details provided are acceptable. Therefore, the application would accord with the outline planning permission, and policy ENV DM5 of the ALP.

TREES AND HEDGEROWS

Policy ENV DM4 of the ALP and EH1 of the Ford Neighbourhood Plan seek to protect trees unless it is demonstrated that the benefits of the development outweigh the loss.

There are no Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) issued on any trees within the site, nor any conservation areas which give rise to additional considerations. The outline application consented removal of several trees and hedgerows to enable delivery of the accesses along Ford Lane and Yapton Road, and removal of these trees will not be a consideration in the determination of this application.

The application proposes the felling of several trees, as identified in the Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement RM4_09.B December 2024. With the following trees identified:

Category C Trees: H1161 (fell part), H1162, H1171 (fell part), H1178, T1179, H1180, T1181, T1182, H1183, T1184, T1185, and H1186

The Arboricultural Officer has not provided any comments, however on the outline submission noted that the proposed development would be achievable without the significant loss of trees, and the loss of trees and hedgerows of low-moderate value can be adequately mitigation with an ambitious and detailed soft landscaping treatment.

All trees are Category C trees, which are considered low quality which are unlikely to contribute substantially to amenity. The trees and hedges to be removed will facilitate the development and it is acknowledged that the landscaping scheme provides more than two trees for every one tree lost, amounting to 636 no. proposed trees (excluding structural woodland planting), which would exceed ALP policy requirements.

Policy EH1 of the FNDP2 requires 30% tree cover across developments, however an exact percentage has not been calculated as part of this application. Regardless, the number of trees retained and proposed throughout the development provides for verdant open spaces, and mature planting within the street scene.

A condition imposed on the outline required tree protection details to be submitted prior to commencement, including protection fencing and these details will need to be agreed through the discharge of condition process. The proposal would comply with policies D DM1 and ENV DM4 of the Arun Local Plan, Policy EH1 of the Ford Neighbourhood Plan 2, the NPPF and the Arun Design Guide.

AIR QUALITY

Paragraphs 191 and 192 of the NPPF seek to ensure that new developments are appropriate for their location taking into account any likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment. Although the site and proposed development is not located in an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), account needs to be taken of the fact that traffic generation from

the proposed development could have an impact on the AQMA on the A259.

Policy QE SP1 and QE DM3 of the ALP requires development to provide an Air Quality Impact Assessment, assessing the impacts of the development on air quality and provide sufficient mitigations for any negative impacts. The development has the potential to generate impacts on local air quality during the construction period through dust and particulate matter. The developer proposes mitigation through a Construction Management Plan (CMP) for suppressing dust throughout the construction period which would reduce air quality impacts on existing neighbouring uses. This detail can be suitably secured through condition 10 imposed on F/4/20/OUT.

Operational impacts on air quality relate primarily to vehicular emissions. The indicative site layout includes several pedestrian and cycling routes to help promote active travel, and the planning statement confirms that all dwellings would be provided with active EV charging which would help reduce impacts on air quality through vehicular emissions. The Travel Plan identified within the Highways section also promotes bus vouchers to residents which would support sustainable modes of transport. Therefore, subject to planning conditions and obligations to secure the EV charging details, cycling storage, and Travel Plan, the proposal would provide adequate mitigation for air quality impacts associated with the development and as such would comply with Policy QE SP1 and QE DM3 of the ALP.

SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE

Condition 29 of the outline planning permission requires the development to be drained in accordance with the established overarching principles identified within the Drainage Technical Note (ref: C85228-JNP-92-XX-RP-C-1004 dated 9 July 2021), as below:

"Prior to the commencement of each phase of development (excluding demolition, site survey and site investigation works) as identified within the Phasing Strategy under Condition 5 full details of the proposed surface water drainage scheme for that phase, in accordance with the principles set out in the Drainage Technical Note (ref: C85228-JNP-92-XX-RP-C-1004) dated 9 July 2021 and the requirements of the Design Code secured under Condition 7, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The design should follow the hierarchy of preference for different types of surface water drainage disposal systems as set out in Approved Document H of the Building Regulations, and the recommendations of the SuDS Manual produced by CIRIA. Winter groundwater monitoring to establish highest annual ground water levels and winter Percolation testing to BRE 365, or similar approved, will be required to support the design of any Infiltration drainage. No building shall be occupied until the complete surface water drainage system serving the property has been implemented in accordance with the agreed details and the details so agreed shall be maintained in good working order in perpetuity."

The outline drainage strategy sets out that it utilises attenuation basins in the south of the site, but importantly it was identified that an infiltration-based system could be implemented in the north of the site.

This application seeks approval of the scale, layout, appearance and landscaping of the associated surface water drainage infrastructure as follows:

- Swale features throughout the application site leading to the attenuation basins within the infrastructure reserved matters under F/14/24/RES.

The Lead Local Flood Authority (WSCC) have advised that they have no objection to the proposed drainage scheme. However, the Council's Drainage Engineers reviewed the application and raised an

objection on 13 May 2025. The response from the Council's Drainage Engineers confirmed that the level of testing of groundwater levels has sufficiently demonstrated that infiltration can be ruled out, and therefore the proposed strategy to attenuate water within drainage basins (within Ryebank Park POS), proposed within the infrastructure reserved matters application (F/14/24/RES), is accepted in principle. However, concerns over the calculations and modelling submitted in support of this application remain, and therefore the Council's Engineers have advised that they cannot support the layout at this time.

Officers have sought legal advice in relation to the consideration which should be given to the drainage design through the determination of this application, given the concerns raised by the Council's Drainage Engineers. The legal advice confirmed that the Council should not be considering any aspects of surface water drainage design as part of this application owing to the principles established and conditions imposed through the determination of the outline permission granted. Therefore, considerations of this application should be limited solely to the reserved matters, namely layout, scale, appearance and landscaping.

The concerns raised by the Council's Drainage Engineers have been reiterated to the applicant, and it has been made clear that Officers maintain concerns as to the ability of the applicants to adequately address these concerns within the constraints of the proposed layout. However, it is ultimately the applicant's responsibility to ensure that the layout as proposed can accommodate a suitable drainage scheme which accords with relevant development plan policies and complies with the overarching principles set out within the condition. Therefore, all matters pertaining to surface water drainage will be considered as part of the discharge of condition application. Should the applicants have difficulty discharging the condition due to the layout proposed, then they will need to apply to amend the reserved matters details within the defined timescales of the outline.

EXTERNAL LIGHTING

ALP Policy QE DM2 states outdoor lighting should not have an adverse impact on neighbouring uses or the wider rural landscape, particularly in relation to the rural environments and ecology. FNDP2 policy EH8 also supports sensitive lighting and requires that where practicable all new roads within development proposals should not feature street lighting.

The outline planning permission contains a condition requiring the submission of full lighting details prior to the commencement of each phase of development. However, a review by consultees and officers to ensure that street lighting can be provided without severely impacting upon soft landscaping or visibility splays has been undertaken as part of the reserved matters assessment.

As such, the applicants have advised that in order to provide a sensitive lighting treatment, lighting will be provided along primary and secondary roads, and key pedestrian routes, such as towards the railway station. Bollard lighting is also proposed within the apartment parking courts for additional security. Further individual sensor lighting for properties may also be incorporated as part of the development. This approach is consistent with the policy EH8 of the FNDP2 which seeks to minimise street lighting. As such, the approach set out by the applicant is acceptable and would accord with policy QE DM2 of the ALP and EH8 of FNDP2.

ODOUR

Policies QE SP1, H SP2c and WM DM1 of the ALP, and policies W2 and W10 of the WLP, and Policy EE3 of the FNDP2 seek to ensure that new development is not significantly impacted by odour, or that it would prejudice the operation of existing waste sites.

Odour was addressed as part of the outline application which sought to map potential odour conflicts in

order to prevent the proposed residential development prejudicing the operation of the nearby Ford Wastewater Treatment Works. As such, Condition 35 was imposed on the outline planning permission requiring further odour assessments on any sensitive uses located within the identified impact odour zone.

Southern Water and the Council's Environmental Health Officer have objected to this application on the basis that they wish to see a more generous odour zone to protect the future operation of the Ford Waste Water Treatment Works. However, odour was assessed at the outline application stage, hence the imposition of this condition, and the conclusions on odour from outline stage cannot be revisited as part of this application.

The applicant has provided an overlay of the odour zone with this reserved matters, and whilst the red line of the application is within the odour zone stated as part of the condition, the residential buildings and any private amenity space are located outside of the odour zone and as such there is no need for further odour assessments.

As this application does not propose any sensitive uses or development within the odour zone defined by condition 35, and therefore is compliant with the outline planning permission.

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK

The South Downs National Park (SDNP) is located approximately 2.84km to the north of this application. This site has little intervisibility with the South Downs National Park, however there are some limited long distance views of the SDNP from this location.

Given the limited intervisibility between the site and the SDNP there are not considered to be any adverse impacts on the purposes of the SDNP.

SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Policy ECC SP1 seeks to ensure that development adapts to climate change impacts through use of shading, ventilation, and SUDs. Policy ECC SP2 also requires major development to produce and supply at least 10% of the total predicted energy demands through renewable energy.

Condition 26 of the outline planning permission has a condition requiring details of the renewable energy to be submitted alongside any reserved matters. It requires 10% of the energy supply to be secured from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy sources

The Energy and Sustainability Statement (June 2025, By AES Sustainability Consultants Ltd), proposes a Fabric First approach to buildings, ensuring ventilation, insulation and air leakage are secured to minimise energy consumption. In addition, each dwelling is proposed to have a ground source heat pump.

Tree planting has been proposed along streets, which will contribute to passive shading and surface water designs will be required to be designed to provide sufficient capacity to deal with climate change impacts to flooding frequency and volumes.

The dwellings would be subject to a condition to require the Ground Source Heat Pumps to be provided prior to occupation, the proposed development would comply with policy ECC SP1 and ECC SP2 of the ALP.

WATER SUPPLY

Policy W DM1 seeks to ensure that developments are provided with adequate water supplies and that the use of these water supplies is efficient.

No concerns have been raised about impacts on water abstraction sites as a result of this development. In addition, a suitably worded planning condition would ensure dwellings would provide measures to meet the optional building control standard of 110 L/person/day.

Therefore, subject to a planning condition, the proposal would be in accordance with the Policy W DM1 of the ALP.

CONCLUSION

The principle of development has already been established through the granting of outline permission for the erection of up to 1,500 dwellings on the site and associated infrastructure and open space under reference F/4/20/OUT.

The proposed development would provide an appropriate legible and safe layout for both non-motorised and motorised users, and would be sufficiently varied in treatment to provide elements of interest. The density would be acceptable, and there would be no unacceptably adverse overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking impacts on existing or future occupiers. The scale of the development would be appropriate to the site, and suitable landscaping would be provided throughout.

Therefore, subject to conditions, and resolution of the noise mitigation for the dwellings, the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions as proposed.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

The recommendation is for the Planning Committee to delegate to the Group Head of Planning authority to grant reserved matters planning permission subject to conditions and confirmation from the Environmental Health officers that the proposed noise mitigation is acceptable; and should any minor changes be required that this is undertaken in consultation with the vice or vice chair of the Planning Committee.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

FOR APPROVAL

Human Rights Act:

The Council in making a decision should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority such as Arun District Council to act in a manner, which is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights.

Consideration has been specifically given to Article 8 (right to respect private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). It is not considered that the recommendation for approval of the grant of permission in this case interferes unreasonably with any local residents' right to respect for their private and family life and home, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest and the recommendation for approval is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.

FOR REFUSAL**Human Rights Act:**

The Council in making a decision, should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority such as Arun District Council to act in a manner, which is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights.

Consideration has been specifically given to Article 8 (Right to respect private and family life), Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). It is not considered that the recommendation for refusal of permission in this case interferes with applicant's right to respect for their private and family life and their home, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of neighbours). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest and the recommendation for refusal is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.

DUTY UNDER THE EQUALITIES ACT 2010**Duty under the Equalities Act 2010**

In assessing this proposal the following impacts have been identified upon those people with the following protected characteristics (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation).

The proposal would have a neutral impact on the protected characteristics.

COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 106 DETAILS

It has been noted that there are more play areas than originally set in the Section 106 agreement, and thus a requirement to manage just three play parks has been stipulated. This has been acknowledged by the applicant and will be part of a future Deed of Variation. It is not a requirement to deal with this as part of the reserved matters, as the details of any management obligation will not be approved until the deed of variation has taken place and all play parks are managed under the same management body.

CIL DETAILS

This application is not CIL liable, therefore, developer contributions towards infrastructure will be required (dependent on any exemptions or relief that may apply).

RECOMMENDATION**APPROVE CONDITIONALLY**

- 1 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Phase 4 Existing Site Location Plan 22.1706.0001 Rev C
 Phase 4 Block Plan 22.1706.100 Rev D
 Phase 4 Proposed Site Layout 22.1706.1000 Rev AD
 Phase 4 Proposed Site Layout (Coloured) 22.1706.1000 Rev AD
 Phase 4 Proposed Site Layout - A 22.1706.1001 Rev AD
 Phase 4 Proposed Site Layout - B 22.1706.1002AD

Proposed Parking Layout Plan - A22.1706.2000 Rev I
 Proposed Storey Heights Plan (A) 22.1706.2010 Rev F
 Proposed Materials Plan (A) 22.1706.2030 Rev K
 Proposed Garden Depths & Areas Plan (A) 22.1706.2040 Rev G
 Proposed Refuse Strategy Plan (A) 22.1706.2050 Rev F
 Proposed Housing Distribution Plan (A) 22.1706.2070 Rev F
 Road Hierarchy & SBD Plan - A 22.1706.2100 Rev F
 Density Plan - A 22.1706.2120 Rev F
 Part M Compliance Plan - A 22.1706.2200 Rev H
 Proposed Housing Tenure Plan (A) 22.1706.2060 Rev F
 Accommodation Schedule 22.1706.SOA Rev N

Proposed Street Scene A - A (1 of 2) 22.1706.3000 Rev D
 Proposed Street Scene A - A (2 of 2) 22.1706.3001 Rev C
 Proposed Street Scene B - B (1 of 2) 22.1706.3002 Rev C
 Proposed Street Scene B - B (2 of 2) 22.1706.3003 Rev C
 Proposed Street Scene C - C 22.1706.3004 Rev C
 Proposed Street Scene D - D 22.1706.3005 Rev C

Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 242 Variant V1 22.1706.4100 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 242 Variant V2 22.1706.4101 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 242 Variant V5 22.1706.4104 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 242 Variant V6 22.1706.4105 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 242 Variant V7 22.1706.4106 Rev A
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 242 Variant V8 22.1706.4107 Rev A
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 242 Variant V9 22.1706.4108 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 242 Variant V11 22.1706.4110 Rev A
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 242 Variant V12 22.1706.4111
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 352 Variant V1 22.1706.4150 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 352 Variant V2 22.1706.4151 Rev A
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 352 Variant V5 22.1706.4155 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 352 Variant V7 22.1706.4157 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 452 Variant V1 22.1706.4200 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 241 Variant V1 22.1706.4250 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 241 Variant V2 22.1706.4251 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 241 Variant V4 22.1706.4253 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 241 Variant V5 22.1706.4254 Rev A
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 234 Variant V1 22.1706.4300 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 234 Variant V1 22.1706.4301 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 234 Variant V2 22.1706.4302 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 234 Variant V2 22.1706.4303 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 234 Variant V3 22.1706.4304
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 234 Variant V3 22.1706.4305
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 236 Variant V1 22.1706.4350 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 236 Variant V2 22.1706.4351 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 236 Variant V3 22.1706.4352 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 236 Variant V4 22.1706.4353 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 236 Variant V6 22.1706.4355 Rev D
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 236 Variant V7 22.1706.4356
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 236 Variant V7 22.1706.4357
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 236 Variant V8 22.1706.4358
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 236 Variant V8 22.1706.4359

Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 236 Variant V9 22.1706.4360
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 236 Variant V9 22.1706.4361
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 236 Variant V10 22.1706.4362
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 236 Variant V10 22.1706.4363
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 236 Variant V11 22.1706.4364
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 341 Variant V2 22.1706.4401 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 341 Variant V4 22.1706.4403
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 341 Variant V5 22.1706.4404
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 343 Variant V1 22.1706.4450 Rev A
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 351 Variant V2 22.1706.4501 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 351 Variant V3 22.1706.4502 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 351 Variant V3 22.1706.4503 Rev D
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 351 Variant V5 22.1706.4505 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 351 Variant V5 22.1706.4506 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 351 Variant V7 22.1706.4509
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 354 Variant V4 22.1706.4556 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 354 Variant V4 22.1706.4557 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 354 Variant V5 22.1706.4558 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 354 Variant V5 22.1706.4559 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 354 Variant V7 22.1706.4562 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 354 Variant V7 22.1706.4563 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 354 Variant V8 22.1706.4564 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 354 Variant V8 22.1706.4565 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 354 Variant V9 22.1706.4566 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 354 Variant V9 22.1706.4567 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 354 Variant V11 22.1706.4570 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 354 Variant V11 22.1706.4571 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 354 Variant V14 22.1706.4576 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 354 Variant V14 22.1706.4577 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 354 Variant V15 22.1706.4578 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 355 Variant V1 22.1706.4600 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 355 Variant V1 22.1706.4601 Rev D
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 355 Variant V2 22.1706.4602 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 355 Variant V2 22.1706.4603 Rev D
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 355 Variant V3 22.1706.4604 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 355 Variant V3 22.1706.4605 Rev D
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 355 Variant V4 22.1706.4606 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 355 Variant V4 22.1706.4607 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 355 Variant V5 22.1706.4608 Rev D
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 355 Variant V5 22.1706.4609 Rev E
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 355 Variant V6 22.1706.4610 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 355 Variant V6 22.1706.4611 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 355 Variant V7 22.1706.4612 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 355 Variant V7 22.1706.4613 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 355 Variant V8 22.1706.4614 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 355 Variant V8 22.1706.4615 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 355 Variant V9 22.1706.4616 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 355 Variant V9 22.1706.4617 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 355 Variant V10 22.1706.4618 Rev A
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 355 Variant V10 22.1706.4619 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 355 Variant V11 22.1706.4620
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 355 Variant V11 22.1706.4621

Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 355 Variant V12 22.1706.4622 Rev A
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 355 Variant V1222.1706.4623 Rev B
Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 356 Variant V1 22.1706.4650 Rev C
Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 356 Variant V2 22.1706.4651 Rev C
Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 356 Variant V3 22.1706.4652 Rev C
Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 356 Variant V4 22.1706.4653 Rev B
Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 356 Variant V6 22.1706.4655
Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 356 Variant V7 22.1706.4656
Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 356 Variant V8 22.1706.4657
Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 361 Variant V1 22.1706.4700 Rev C
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 361 Variant V2 22.1706.4701 Rev A
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 361 Variant V2 22.1706.4702 Rev B
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 361 Variant V3 22.1706.4703 Rev B
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 361 Variant V3 22.1706.4704 Rev B
Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 361 Variant V4 22.1706.4705 Rev C
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 361 Variant V5 22.1706.4706 Rev B
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 361 Variant V5 22.1706.4707 Rev B
Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 361 Variant V6 22.1706.4708 Rev A
Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 361 Variant V7 22.1706.4709 Rev A
Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 361 Variant V8 22.1706.4710 Rev B
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 361 Variant V1022.1706.4713
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 361 Variant V1022.1706.4714
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 364 Variant V1 22.1706.4750 Rev A
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 364 Variant V1 22.1706.4751 Rev A
Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 451 Variant V2 22.1706.4802 Rev A
Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 451 Variant V3 22.1706.4803 Rev A
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 451 Variant V4 22.1706.4804 Rev A
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 451 Variant V4 22.1706.4805 Rev A
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 461 Variant V1 22.1706.4850 Rev B
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 461 Variant V1 22.1706.4851 Rev C
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 461 Variant V2 22.1706.4852 Rev B
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 461 Variant V2 22.1706.4853 Rev C
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 461 Variant V3 22.1706.4854 Rev C
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 461 Variant V3 22.1706.4855 Rev C
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 461 Variant V4 22.1706.4856 Rev B
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 461 Variant V4 22.1706.4857 Rev B
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 461 Variant V5 22.1706.4858 Rev C
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 461 Variant V5 22.1706.4859 Rev C
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 461 Variant V6 22.1706.4860
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 461 Variant V6 22.1706.4861
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 461 Variant V7 22.1706.4862
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 461 Variant V722.1706.4863
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 462 Variant V1 22.1706.4900 Rev B
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 462 Variant V1 22.1706.4901 Rev C
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 462 Variant V2 22.1706.4902 Rev B
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 462 Variant V2 22.1706.4903 Rev C
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 462 Variant V3 22.1706.4904 Rev A
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 462 Variant V3 22.1706.4905 Rev A
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 462 Variant V4 22.1706.4906 Rev A
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 462 Variant V4 22.1706.4907 Rev A
Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 462 Variant V5 22.1706.4908
Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 462 Variant V5 22.1706.4909

Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 464 Variant V1 22.1706.4950 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans and Elevations HT - 464 Variant V3 22.1706.4952
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 466 Variant V2 22.1706.5002 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 466 Variant V2 22.1706.5003 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 466 Variant V3 22.1706.5004 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 466 Variant V3 22.1706.5005 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 466 Variant V4 22.1706.5006 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 466 Variant V4 22.1706.5007 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 466 Variant V6 22.1706.5010 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 466 Variant V6 22.1706.5011 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 466 Variant V7 22.1706.5012-
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 466 Variant V7 22.1706.5013-
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 467 Variant V1 22.1706.5050 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 467 Variant V1 22.1706.5051 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 467 Variant V2 22.1706.5052 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 467 Variant V2 22.1706.5053 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 467 Variant V3 22.1706.5054 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 467 Variant V3 22.1706.5055 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 467 Variant V4 22.1706.5056 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 467 Variant V4 22.1706.5057 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 467 Variant V5 22.1706.5058 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 467 Variant V5 22.1706.5059 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 467 Variant V6 22.1706.5060 Rev A
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 467 Variant V6 22.1706.5061 Rev A
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 468 Variant V1 22.1706.5100 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 468 Variant V1 22.1706.5101 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 473 Variant V1 22.1706.5200 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 473 Variant V1 22.1706.5201 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 474 Variant V1 22.1706.5250 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 474 Variant V1 22.1706.5251 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 481 Variant V2 22.1706.5302 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 481 Variant V2 22.1706.5303 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 481 Variant V3 22.1706.5304 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 481 Variant V3 22.1706.5305 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 481 Variant V4 22.1706.5306-
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 481 Variant V4 22.1706.5307-
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 581 Variant V1 22.1706.5350 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 581 Variant V1 22.1706.5351 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 581 Variant V2 22.1706.5352 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 581 Variant V2 22.1706.5353 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 581 Variant V3 22.1706.5354 Rev A
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 581 Variant V3 22.1706.5355 Rev A
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 581 Variant V4 22.1706.5356 Rev B
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 581 Variant V4 22.1706.5357 Rev C
 Proposed Housetype Plans HT - 581 Variant V5 22.1706.5358 Rev A
 Proposed Housetype Elevations HT - 581 Variant V5 22.1706.5359 Rev A

Flat Block 135-142 - Plans 22.1706.5500 Rev D
 Flat Block 135-142 - Plans 22.1706.5501 Rev C
 Flat Block 135-142 - Elevation 22.1706.5502 Rev E
 Flat Block 162-170 - Plans 22.1706.5550 Rev C
 Flat Block 162-170 - Plans 22.1706.5551 Rev C

Flat Block 162-170 - Elevations 22.1706.5552 Rev D
Proposed Flat Block Plans Plots 191-198 22.1706.5600 Rev C
Proposed Flat Block Plans Plots 191-198 22.1706.5601 Rev C
Proposed Flat Block Elevations Plots 191-198 22.1706.5602 Rev D
Proposed Flat Block Plans Plots 213-220 22.1706.5650 Rev D
Proposed Flat Block Plans Plots 213-220 22.1706.5651 Rev C
Proposed Flat Block Elevations Plots 213-220 22.1706.5652 Rev D
Proposed Garage Plans & Elevations 22.1706.7000 Rev C

Landscape Key Plan RM4-XX-DR-L-P-001 Rev D
Hardworks and Boundaries 1 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-002 Rev D
Hardworks and Boundaries 2 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-003 Rev D
Hardworks and Boundaries 3 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-004 Rev D
Hardworks and Boundaries 4 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-005 Rev D
Hardworks and Boundaries 5 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-006 Rev D
Hardworks and Boundaries 6 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-007 Rev D
Hardworks and Boundaries 7 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-008 Rev D
Hardworks and Boundaries 8 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-009 Rev D
Hardworks and Boundaries 9 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-010 Rev D
Hardworks and Boundaries 10 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-011 Rev D
Softworks 1 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-012 Rev D
Softworks 2 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-013 Rev D
Softworks 3 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-014 Rev D
Softworks 4 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-015 Rev D
Softworks 5 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-016 Rev D
Softworks 6 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-017 Rev D
Softworks 7 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-018 Rev D
Softworks 8 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-019 Rev D
Softworks 9 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-020 Rev D
Softworks 10 of 10 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-021 Rev D

Runway Park 1 of 4 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-022 Rev D
Runway Park 2 of 4 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-023 Rev D
Runway Park 3 of 4 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-024 Rev D
Runway Park 4 of 4 RM4-XX-DR-L-P-025 Rev D
POS Climping Edge RM4-XX-DR-L-P-026 Rev E

Planting schedules RM4-XX-DR-L-P-028 Rev D
Climping Edge Transect RM4-XX-DR-L-P-029 Rev D

Composite Landscape Masterplan RM1, RM4 and RM Infrastructure RM4-XX-DR-L-P-030 Rev H

RM4 - Levels Strategy (Sheet 1 of 2) 2205771-162 Rev E
RM4 - Levels Strategy (Sheet 2 of 2) 2205771-163 Rev E
RM4 - Site Sections (Sheet 1) 2205771-D190 Rev B
RM4 - Site Sections (Sheet 2) 2205771-D191 Rev B

Vehicle Tracking and Visibility Plan (Sheet 1 of 2) 2205771-D004 Rev E
Vehicle Tracking and Visibility Plan (Sheet 2 of 2) 2205771-D005 Rev E

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 2 Prior to slab level, and notwithstanding the approved plans, full details of all on-plot planting details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall be carried out in strict accordance with these details.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and biodiversity in accordance with policies D DM1.

- 3 Prior to the commencement of the development, full details of tree pits within verges shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These shall be implemented at the point of street tree planting, and shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the necessary infrastructure to support the trees growth and safeguard any underground infrastructure and drainage assets. This is necessary to be a pre-commencement requirement as the infrastructure will be required to be finalised prior to installation.

- 4 Full details of cycle parking for each dwelling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details approved shall be implemented in full for each dwelling prior to the occupation of each individual dwelling.

Reason: In the interests of providing alternative sustainable methods of transport in accordance with policy T DM1 of the Arun Local Plan.

- 5 Each dwelling hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the relevant ecological feature (bat box, bird box, bee box etc) has been installed in accordance with the approved details under the Ecological Protection and Enhancement Plan - Reserved Matters Phase 4 (South) (25 July 2025_UES04099/22_V8). Features within the open spaces shall be installed according to the approved plans timeline. The ecological features shall thereafter be permanently retained in good working condition.

Reason: To conserve and enhance protected and priority species and habitats and allow the Local Planning Authority to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), s40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (Priority habitats and species) and Arun Local Plan ENV DM5.

- 6 Prior to occupation of any dwelling approved under the outline F/4/20/OUT, full details of the play areas (Local Areas of Play and Locally Equipped Areas of Play) and Trails (fitness, sensory and senior) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include specifications of equipment, surfacing, landscaping and a timeline for the delivery of each play area or fitness trail. The submission shall align with the approved Design Code (Condition 7 of F/4/20/OUT), unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details thereafter shall be provided in full accordance with the approved details and timelines.

Reason: To ensure that play provision is in place for residents on occupation in accordance with Arun Local Plan Policy OSR DM1 and supports the concepts and principles of the approved Design Code under Condition 7 of the outline.

- 7 No dwelling shall be occupied unless and until a certificate confirming the agreement from the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA) of any play area approved by this reserved matters application, is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submission shall include details of any physical changes, if necessary, for

approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and safety in accordance with policies D DM1 and OSR DM1 of the Arun Local Plan.

- 8 Prior to the occupation of any dwelling approved under F/4/20/OUT, full details of street furniture, including benches, bins, cycle stands, and bus stops, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include a timeline for their delivery, and the development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of amenity in accordance with policies D DM1 and OSR DM1 of the Arun Local Plan.

- 9 All landscaping (hard and soft) shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and with the timescales set out in Condition 5 of the outline planning permission. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and of the environment of the development in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies D DM1 and ENV DM4.

- 10 The dwellings identified within the plan titled Part M Compliance Plan - A 22.1706.2200 Rev H shall be erected to M4(2) Accessible and Adaptable Dwelling and the Optional Requirement M4(3) Wheelchair Users standard as defined in Approved Document M of the The Building Regulations 2010 (as amended).

Reason: To ensure an appropriate level of accessible and inclusive dwelling for a range of ages and abilities in accordance with policy D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan

- 11 No dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied until the means to ensure a maximum water consumption of 110 litres use per person per day, has been complied with for that dwelling and retained in perpetuity thereafter.

Reason: To improve the sustainability of the dwellings in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies ECC SP1 and W DM1.

- 12 Prior to the occupation of any individual dwelling, the dwelling shall be fitted with the low carbon measures in line with the approved Energy and Sustainability Statement (June 2025) V2.

Reason: To ensure the development complies with the outline requirements to deliver renewable and low carbon energy.

- 13 The proposed Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging points as shown on Proposed Parking Plan Phase 4 (A) 22.1706.2000 Rev G will be provided prior to the occupation of each relevant dwelling being which it serves. The electric vehicle charge points shall thereafter be retained and maintained in good working condition.

Reason: To mitigate against adverse impacts on local air quality and to promote sustainable travel, in accordance with Arun Local Plan policy QE DM3(c), the Arun Parking Standards SPD and the NPPF.

- 14 Prior to commencement of development, full details of the scale and appearance of any drainage culverts or headwalls shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local

Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and of the environment of the development in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies D DM1

- 15 Prior to development above slab level, sample materials and specifications for all external dwelling materials shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The samples and specifications shall be in accordance with the approved Proposed Materials Plan (A) 22.1706.2030 Rev K, and the dwellings shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and design in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies D DM1.

- 16 Prior to the occupation of each relevant dwelling, all noise mitigation (cavity walls, glazing, balustrades and ventilation etc) described within Technical Report 2205771-R42A (Dated 20/11/2025, By Ardent Consulting Engineers), and Reserved Matters RM4 (South) Noise Assessment 2205771-R04E (dated August 2025, By Ardent Consulting Engineers) shall be fully implemented and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and satisfactory living environment of occupiers in accordance with Policy QE DM1 of the Arun Local Plan.