

**WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT CONSULTATION**

DATE: 21st August 2008

**FROM: Ian Gledhill TO: Arun District Council
FAO: Brian Banister**

SUBJECT: LU/517/04 - Mixed use development with part retail use to ground floor and 37no. one bedroom flats and 25no. two bedroom flats to part of ground/upper floors with public & private hard & soft landscape areas.

Former Littlehampton Indoor Market, 26-30, Surrey Street, Littlehampton, West Sussex

CONSULTATION DATE: 23rd July 2008

RECOMMENDATION:

**Advice
Objection**

**Modification
No Objection**

X

**More Information
Refusal**

**Education: £11,126
Libraries: £6,664
Fire and Rescue: £758**

This response comprises of the views of West Sussex County Council. The highways, archaeological, and strategic/infrastructure requirements implications of this proposal have been considered and these views are incorporated within this response.

Comments have been issued previously regarding the highway implications of this proposal and no objection has previously been raised. It would seem that over time the overall mix and number of units has altered, and progressively the retail floor area has decreased. The most recent response details 32 one bed units and 29 two bed units. The current application details 37 one bed units and 25 two bed units, which in essence only signifies an increase of a single unit. Therefore in principle, the current application does not detract from that which has been accepted previously by WSCC Highways.

It is noted that a nil car parking provision is to be proposed. Again, this is understood to have been previously agreed and a car parking survey has been undertaken in the immediate area to demonstrate that there is satisfactory on-street parking capacity. Nevertheless, the site is located close to existing facilities and passenger transport infrastructure which should reduce the need to travel in accordance with policy DEV4 of the WSCC Structure Plan. The Planning Authority may wish to consider the impacts of this proposal on on-street car parking.

The cycle parking provision does need to be increased to accord with the WSCC minimum cycle parking standards. Cycle parking should be secured via condition.

Access arrangements are not to change from that previously agreed. A weight restriction for vehicles entering the site is to be secured as part of the S106 Agreement. Any existing vehicular accesses not to be retained should be closed and this should be secured via condition.

Requirements for contributions towards the provision of additional County Council service infrastructure, other than highways and public transport that would arise in relation to the proposed development.

The basis for this advice is contained in the County Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance document "The Provision of Service Infrastructure Related to New Development in West

Sussex – Part 1”, and further details are included in the report to the 16th June 1999 meeting of the Strategic Planning and Environment Committee. The Committee approved all the recommendations of the report.

The advice is as follows:

Please also see the attached worksheet dated 19 August 2008 for details of the following calculation(s), where applicable.

School Infrastructure

Primary School

The Director for Children and Young People’s Services advises that primary schools within the Littlehampton locality of the development are oversubscribed and would not be able to accommodate the additional pupils projected to come from the proposed development. In the circumstances, a financial contribution would be required from the proposed development towards the costs of providing the necessary additional primary school places.

Secondary and Further Secondary Schools

The designated Secondary schools for the area are currently capable of accommodating the extra children that would arise from the proposed development. Accordingly no contribution will be sought for secondary education. Sixth form places would also not be required as the schools are capable of accommodating the extra pupils projected to attend.

Financial Contribution

The financial contributions would be based on: the additional population of the proposed development; its child product; and the Department for Children, Schools and Families school building costs per pupil place. On that basis the amount of the contribution may be estimated as follows:

Estimated Additional Population (Education):

Adjusted population increase = 24.7

Child Product = 0.12

Financial Contribution Towards Additional Primary School Places:

7 year groups (aged 4 to 11) x 0.12 children per year of age = 0.86 children.

Therefore, 0.86 pupil places @ £12,870 ① = £11,126

Note:

DfCSF PRIMARY school building costs per pupil place (for pupils aged 4 to 11) as at 2008/2009, updated by Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors Building Cost Information Service All-In Tender Price Index – but see also 5 c) & d) below.

Library Infrastructure

2.1 The County Librarian advises that the proposed development would be within the area served by Littlehampton Library and that the library would not be able to adequately serve the additional needs that the development would generate.

However, a scheme is approved to provide additional floorspace at the library. In the circumstances, a financial contribution towards the approved scheme would be required in respect of the extra demands for library services that would be generated by the proposed development.

Financial Contribution

The financial contribution sought by the County Council would be based on: the estimated additional population reduced to reflect any affordable dwellings for occupation by persons already residing in the fire service provision area; the County Council’s adopted floorspace

standard for library provision; and the estimated costs of providing additional library floorspace. On that basis the amount of the financial contribution may be estimated to be as follows:

Estimated Additional Population (Library):

Adjusted increase in population = 58.3 persons

Provision to the adopted standard:

58.3 persons x NUMBER 30 sq metres per 1,000 population = 0.86 sq metres

Financial Contribution:

0.86 sq metres @ £3,810 @per sq metre = £11,126

Note:

The County Council's estimated costs of providing relatively small additions to the floorspace of existing library buildings is £3,810 per square metre as at 2008/2009 – but see also 5 c) & e) below.

Fire & Rescue Service Infrastructure

The County Fire Officer advises that the development should include suitable access for fire brigade vehicles and equipment.

Fire Stations

The County Fire Officer advises that a financial contribution from the proposed development towards the cost of fire and rescue infrastructure, principally fire stations and services serving the area within which the proposal stands, would be required. This is necessary due to proposed development in the Southern division and the resultant need to improve service provision across the area. The proposed development should proportionately contribute towards the cost of necessary infrastructure needed to support development.

Financial Contribution (excluding provision of fire hydrants)

The financial contribution sought by the County Council would be based on: the estimated additional population that would be generated by the proposed development, reduced to reflect any affordable dwellings for occupation by persons already residing in the fire service provision area; the County Council's adopted standards of fire service cover provision; and the estimated costs of providing additional fire stations. On that basis the amount of the financial contribution might be estimated as follows:

Estimated Additional Adjusted Population (Fire):

Adjusted increase in population = 58.3 persons

Cost of Fire and Rescue Multiplier for Division:

Proposed development stands in Southern division = £13^③

Financial Contribution:

58.3 persons x £13 ^③ = £758

Note:

③ The County Council's estimated costs of providing relatively small additions to the floorspace of existing fire station buildings is £4,160 per square metre as at 2008/2009, the cost multiplier is based on extensions to fire stations in the area of the development – but see also 5 (f) below.

Wastes Management Services

The Head of Wastes Management advises that the proposed development would not be required to contribute towards waste and recycling facilities in the area.

Deed of Planning Obligations

As a deed of planning obligations would be required to ensure payment of the necessary financial contribution, the County Council would require the proposed development to reimburse its

reasonable legal fees incurred in the preparation of the deed. The deed would provide for payment of the financial contribution upon commencement of the development.

In order to reflect the changing costs, the deed would include arrangements for review of the financial contributions at the date the payment is made if the relevant date falls after 31st March 2009.

Review of the contributions towards school building costs should be by reference to the DfCSF adopted Primary school building costs applicable at the date of payment of the contribution and where this has not been published in the financial year in which the contribution has been made then the contribution should be index linked to the DfCSF cost multiplier and relevant increase in the RICS BCIS All-In TPI. This figure is subject to annual review.

Review of the contribution towards the provision of additional library floorspace should be by reference to an appropriate index, preferably RICS BCIS All-In TPI. This figure is subject to annual review.

Review of the contribution towards the provision of fire service infrastructure (fire stations) should be by reference to an appropriate index, preferably RICS BCIS All-In TPI. This figure is subject to annual review.

Recent experience suggests that where a change in contributions required in relation to a development or the necessity for indexation of financial contributions from the proposed development towards the costs of providing service infrastructure such as libraries is not specifically set out within recommendations approved by committee, applicants are unlikely to agree to such provisions being included in the deed itself. Therefore, it is important that your report and recommendations should cover a possible change in requirements and the need for appropriate indexation arrangements in relation to financial contributions.

Please ensure that applicants and their agents are advised that any alteration to the housing mix, size, nature or tenure, may generate a different population and thus require re-assessment of contributions. Such re-assessment should be sought as soon as the housing mix is known and not be left until signing of the section 106 Agreement is imminent.

It should be noted that the figures quoted in this letter are based on current information and will be adhered to for 3 months. Thereafter, if they are not consolidated in a signed S106 agreement they will be subject to revision as necessary to reflect the latest information as to cost and need.

Should you require further information or assistance in relation to the requirements for contributions towards the provision of County Council service infrastructure please contact, in the first instance, the Planning Applications Team officer, named above.

In regards of the strategic and archaeological implications of this proposal, I would direct you to the WSCC response dated the 22nd January 2007 from Steve Brown, which are still applicable to the current application.

No objection would be raised to this proposal, subject to the securing of the above mentioned financial contributions and the application of any previously requested conditions by WSCC to the current application.

Ian Gledhill
Development Planning