

Claire Potts

From: Claire Potts
Sent: 20 June 2017 13:35
To: 'Graham, Laura'
Cc: Michael Eastham
Subject: RE: Comments on Development Framework Document

Laura,

Thank you for the update. Please could you also circulate it to the Steering Group membership and I will make sure it is on the agenda for discussion on the 13th.

Kind regards

Claire

Claire Potts BSc MSc MRTPI | Strategic Development Team Leader, Strategic Development, Arun District Council | First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37698 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737698 E-mail: claire.potts@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Graham, Laura [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 June 2017 13:04
To: Claire Potts
Cc: Michael Eastham; Neil Crowther; Johnson, Kamila
Subject: RE: Comments on Development Framework Document

Hello Claire

Thanks for these comments. We have been working on the document for a couple of weeks now so will make sure that these comments are taken on board.

I am aiming to re-circulate the document to you early next week.

From: Claire Potts [mailto:Claire.Potts@arun.gov.uk]
Sent: 20 June 2017 12:10

To: Graham, Laura
Cc: Michael Eastham; Neil Crowther
Subject: Comments on Development Framework Document

Laura,

My comments on the DFD are set out below:

There needs to be a revised Indicative Phasing Plan – this is important as it shows the delivery of key infrastructure and play areas, open space, school etc and how it fits with the overall scheme. We don't just want all the housing delivered without any supporting infrastructure for future residents.

P12 – B6 was originally 2 storey – need to justify how 4 storey will work on this parcel.

P19 – the strategic focal points at the roundabout 'gateway' have been missed. The building fronting the roundabout should draw people into the space for the retail and leisure uses. The detailed rationale and urban design principles for the Local Centre need to be re-instated in order to describe the why and how it will work and provide a sense of place and meet the needs of all users.

P19 – the rationalisation of the character areas had resulted in the loss of areas which were due to have a different character – which was based on defining principles. For example, the 'natural edge fronting' and 'green space frontage' have been replaced by a single 'green edge' frontage. The Central Open space frontage was different from the green edge as it was based around the more formal nature of the man made park. This provided opportunities for giving a sense of grandeur using detached and semi-detached properties which appear as one detached house. The document also lacks any references to the existing local character and how elements from the local vernacular have been used in the design of new dwellings. What is the role of 'key gates' within the scheme and how will they be defined.

P20 - References to 'focal buildings' – only refers to height as their defining characteristic – should include materials, boundary treatments, setbacks, colour and or detailed design as all of these things can be used to define buildings.

P24 – Local Centre There is no justification for the layouts or any explanation as to why materials have been chosen. E.g. surface materials – why has black tarmac been chosen? Images – all of domestic properties rather than commercial/ mixed. No design principles and nothing to reference local character. What's a 'special treatment unit' mean in practice?

P26 – Main avenue – images don't really show much difference from the Local Centre appearance. The previous document had clear guidance on the key principles and features for the main avenue.

Gene – the details are just variations on a theme e.g. doors – all either black or white GRP but just in a different style. There should be an agreed palette of colours which can then be used across the site. The Rousillon Barracks development in Chichester is a good example of this as they have a variation of bricks, flint and other materials across the areas of the site but it all ties together. The same applies to doors – which are different colours but within a limited palette of colours.

P41 – images just included but no point of reference.

P34 – access – no minimum parking space size (was 2.4 x 4.8m). No details for Lyminster Bypass south – how do emerging plans compare with p60 of old document?

P36 – 37 – where does 'east' and 'west' areas start and end?

No detail of SUDS streets to incorporate swales – this also applies to C1 and B2.

Estate roads – should be 4.8m – 5.5m.

P39 Home zones (now shared surface roads) – 6m plus 2-6ms to plot boundary not 4.8m plus 1.2m and 2m verges.

'green lane' – has been lost from the typologies. This was important as it formed the boundaries of the site.

Central wetland open space – lost the layout plan. Need to add widths of the cycle paths.

Nothing on ecology in the document.

Illustrative masterplan – concerned that play areas next to A2 and road will be too small and constrained for a LEAP.

Useful information that is not in the DFD:

Drainage strategy – particularly how it all links together with the phasing for the site

Sustainability – nothing.

Overall, the document lacks the rigour of the earlier documents and does not provide enough detail on the principles, form and detailed urban design to allow ADC and others to have a clear understanding of what needs to be delivered through the reserved matters applications as they come forward (e.g. high quality, locally distinctive development that creates a sense of place at this key gateway location). Getting this document right will avoid future abortive work – on all elements of the scheme as they come forward.

Kind regards

Claire

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately, using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient please contact the sender and delete the message.

Persimmon Homes Limited is registered in England number 4108747, Charles Church Developments Limited is registered in England number 1182689 and Space4 Limited is registered in England number 3702606. These companies are wholly owned subsidiaries of Persimmon Plc registered in England number 1818486, the Registered Office of these four companies is Persimmon House, Fulford, York YO19 4FE.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
