



Land west of Pagham Road, Pagham

Reserved Matters application
(P/114/24/RES)

Bargate responses to comments made by consultees

February 2025

Statutory Consultee	Summary of key points	Response
Highways	WSSC preference would be to continue the footway across the frontage of plots 70 to 75.	As shown on the updated Site Layout (drawing reference SL.01 Rev E), an additional section of footway has been incorporated into the proposals. The proposals now show a continuous segregated footway along the southern side of the road. This has been achieved by moving the road northwards.
	Shared surface area should be built in contrasting material to areas of segregated footway and carriageways -	Noted and accepted. Some sections of road on the original Coloured Site Layout (drawing reference SL.01 Rev A) did not distinguish between the surfacing treatment for shared surfaces and the surfacing treatment for segregated footways / carriageways. This was purely an oversight and inconsistency between plans, as the different surfacing treatment can be observed on the original Colour Landscape Masterplan (drawing reference D3322-FAB-00-XX-DR-L-5000 Rev PL02).
	Contradicting information between 'Colour Landscape Masterplan' (CLM) and 'Site Layout' – needs to be consistent.	The need for consistency is noted and has been addressed.

Statutory Consultee	Summary of key points	Response
	<p>Recommends narrowing is removed in front of plots 71 and 72.</p>	<p>Road narrowing removed from in front of plots 71 and 72.</p>
	<p>Exact nature of the area proposed on opposite side of the access to plots 39 and 40 is unclear – WSCC preference would be for this area to be of typical footway construction – WSCC would flag this as the introduction of non-standard features.</p>	<p>In reviewing the layout it was noted that insufficient car parking had been provided for plots 39-40. Additional spaces have since been provided as shown on the Site Layout (drawing reference SL.01 Rev E).</p> <p>The intention for the land opposite plots 39-40 is shown on the original Colour Landscape Masterplan (drawing reference D3322-FAB-00-XX-DR-L-5000 Rev PL02) and Outline Play Area Proposals (drawing reference D3322-FAB-00-XX-DR-L-2000 Rev PL02). However, in light of the comments received from the Leisure and Landscape Officer, this part of the site has now been reviewed and updated, as can be seen from the updated Site Layout (drawing number SL.01 Rev E).</p>
	<p>WSCC strongly recommend the fencing on the CLM that extends all around the perimeter of the landscaped area is setback and position a minimum of 450mm back from carriageway edge. Any gates within fencing should provide a waiting area for pedestrians.</p>	<p>As shown on the updated Site Layout (drawing reference SL.01 Rev E), all fences have been offset 0.5m from the back of road / shared surface / private drive. This has required a minor adjustment to the path</p>

Statutory Consultee	Summary of key points	Response
		alignment behind the visitor spaces opposite plot 52.
	Visitor parking bays opposite plots 69 and 88 should be 6 metres long.	Confirmed that the bays opposite 69 and 88 are 6m long.
	Highway alignment north of plot 75 is severe and not ideal – desirable for alignment to be altered.	This has been reviewed and we can confirm that the highway alignment to the north of plot 75 has been tracked and is considered to be acceptable.
	Detailed breakdown of the parking provision complying with the adopted Arun District Council parking standards is required. Confirmation required regarding the number of visitor parking spaces.	<p>Please find enclosed a Parking Matrix for the development, which confirms compliance with the adopted Parking Standards.</p> <p>The updated Site Layout (drawing reference SL.01 Rev E) shows a total of 19 visitor parking spaces (the previous layout only showed 15 spaces). This is in line with the Parking Standards SPD, which requires that 0.2 visitor spaces are provided per unit. $95 \times 0.2 = 19$ spaces.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Summary of key points	Response
Conservation	Proposal can be described as causing less than substantial harm in accordance with paragraph 208 of NPPF.	Noted.
Environment Agency	Further information is required to demonstrate how the flood risk issues have been resolved in order for the objection to be removed. EA preference would be for all properties to be situated outside the design flood outline, or failing that, any properties that fall within the design flood event should have a FFL of at least 300m above the design flood level	Detailed response sent to EA on 21 Jan confirming all properties are outside the design flood outline. We note that the EA has now confirmed no objection.
	Clarification sought on why the proposed location of the attenuation basins has changed since the outline permission was granted, clarification for this is required.	Detailed response sent to EA on 21 Jan explaining change was related to additional information that became available and design evolution. We note that the EA has now confirmed no objection.
Ecology	Planting species mix is fine but only 2 of the species recommended in the ecological assessment 2021 are included in the planting schedule	As a general point to note, at the start of 2025, Bargate Homes signed up to the Future Homes Hub “Homes for Nature” Initiative: https://www.futurehomes.org.uk/homes-for-nature . This underlines Bargate’s commitment to providing genuine homes for nature as part of all new developments. We are happy for the planting species to include more of the species originally suggested in the ecological assessment. That

Statutory Consultee	Summary of key points	Response
		<p>said, the proposals have considered planting species at a much more thorough level than the ecological appraisal, so it may be that a middle ground can be achieved. Updated plans will be prepared and submitted for review. It is noted that an agreement has been reached with the Leisure and Landscape Officer regarding the level of landscaping detail that is required at the RM stage alongside the level of detail that can be reserved for a subsequent discharge of condition application.</p>
	<p>Recommend reducing the number of trees in the meadow grass.</p>	<p>The primary purpose of the tree planting group to the north of the site entrance is to take the opportunity to create a cluster of trees and help soften the street scene in this location. While we would rather continue with this approach, we are happy to reduce the number of trees if preferred. Confirmation is sought from the Leisure and Landscape Officer.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Summary of key points	Response
	A mixture of bird boxes should be installed within <u>retained habitats</u> . Recommendations include larger next boxes with 45mm hole, multiple single-holed 32mm boxes, small open fronted next boxes.	We are currently reviewing this comment and will provide a response shortly.
	From details provided is unclear how many of the recommended ecological enhancement features are being delivered.	We will shortly be submitting an Ecology Addendum, alongside an updated Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), which will include a Proposed Ecological Features Plan. This will clarify the proposed ecological enhancements.
	1 insect mound and 1 reptile hibernacula being proposed – Neither have specification of size and construction. For site of this size it seems inadequate number.	Owing to only a peak count of 1 grass snake during surveys, the poor quality habitats currently present on site and the habitat enhancement that will be delivered by the scheme, we believe 1 reptile hibernacula and 1 insect mound is sufficient as it clearly improves the site for reptiles and invertebrates, However, Bargate are happy to increase the number of insect mounds and reptile hibernacula to two of each. The LEMP will be updated to provide details of the reptile hibernacula and insect mound, including a Proposed Ecological Features Plan identifying their location.

Statutory Consultee	Summary of key points	Response
	The numbers of bat and bird boxes do not meet best practice and should be increased to 1:2 for both bat tubes and swift bricks for all dwellings. More specialised nest boxes should be placed on retained trees and new buildings, particularly on edge of residential areas and should include boxes suitable for stock dove, kestrel, swallow and swift.	In accordance with the Future Homes Hub “Homes for Nature” Initiative, Bargate commit to installing at least one ecology enhancement feature (bat/bird box) per home in all new developments. The LEMP will be updated to confirm this, while Bargate would be happy to accept a suitably worded condition to secure the precise details.
	There is no reference to hedgehog highways or small mammal gaps in fencing.	At least one hedgehog highway or small mammal gap will be included per property boundary to ensure there is a continuous corridor of movement for hedgehogs across the site. The LEMP will be updated to confirm this, while Bargate would be happy to accept a suitably worded condition to secure the precise details.
	GT1 and GT3 do not meet the meadow grasses mix listed in the planting schedule	This will be addressed in the updated plans and LEMP.
	Wildflower Grass Maintenance is listed as identical to that for seeded areas. This would be an incorrect specification for wildflowers.	This will be addressed in the updated plans and LEMP.

Statutory Consultee	Summary of key points	Response
	Clarification of the pond's specification in relation to sides and depth required. Ideal side of a pond for wildlife is 1:5 but drainage info shows 1:3	The Drainage Strategy confirms that the basins will be 1:3, which is necessary to suitably drain the site. However, the basins will be planted and managed as areas of wetland vegetation, which will provide foraging opportunities a range of species.
	AQM1. The planting schedule does not include aquatic or marginal plants	This will be addressed in the updated plans and LEMP.
	Recommend less intrusive management approach for Native Shrub Area	This will be addressed in the updated plans and LEMP.
	There is no provision for the monitoring and maintenance of the ecological enhancements. Who will maintain the features?	An Ecology Addendum will be submitted focusing on the maintenance of ecological features for fauna, with the updated LEMP focusing on habitats.
LLFA	No objection	Noted.
Environmental Health	No objections	Noted.
	No objection but raised several points:	Noted – response to individual points below.

Statutory Consultee	Summary of key points	Response
Pagham Parish Council	Felt there are further measures that could be taken in relation to climate change.	Bargate are happy to commit to placing water butts in every garden. In addition, all homes will have an air source heat pump and solar panels, while the Proposed Drainage Strategy (drawing SL/BHPAGHAM.10.10 Rev P3) shows the proposed location and extent of permeable paving.
	Would like confirmation there will be fencing around the toddler play area next to attenuation pond	Yes, this is agreed. The affected plans will be updated accordingly.
	Would like confirmation there will be barrier at pedestrian entrance to the site to ensure no access for motorbikes	As above.
	Concerned about potential land raising impacting in terms of flooding on neighbouring properties which are mobile homes	Please refer to the submitted note pursuant to the discharge of conditions 11, 12, 13 and 14. The drainage strategy has been designed to ensure that there is no additional flood risk off-site.
	Suggest entrance is re-configured to allow for left turn lane	The access proposal was approved as part of the Outline planning permission and it is therefore not possible to revisit this through the current reserved matters application. The proposals have been designed in accordance with the approved access.

Statutory Consultee	Summary of key points	Response
	Urge applicant to work with Parish and WSCC to implement a reduction of the speed limit in area.	Technical approval as part of the S278 Agreement for the proposed access arrangements has been received from the County for a reduction in the speed limit to 30mph along the part of the Pagham Road that fronts the site.
Landscape	Tree details provided but all other landscape detail does not show required detail of species, choice, quantities, planting densities and size at time of planting at each location. This needs to be plotted in plan and list form. Details are required to ensure appropriate screening is provided and the proposals fit within the area and increase biodiversity and wildlife habitat.	The affected plans will be updated accordingly. It is noted that an agreement has been reached with the Leisure and Landscape Officer regarding the level of landscaping detail that is required at the RM stage alongside the level of detail that can be reserved for a subsequent discharge of condition application.
	Submitted landscaping documents are indicative planting schedule and fails to provide quantities which will be needed	As above.
	Without detail in soft landscaping plans it is not possible to comment on suitability of boundary treatments	As above.
Tree Officer	Scheme recommended for approval but several areas for improvement identified:	Noted.

Statutory Consultee	Summary of key points	Response
	Plot 42 – relationship with G5 (hybrid black poplar). Supports tree removal or reconfiguration of plot layout to accommodate mature impacts	In light of this feedback, the Arboricultural Assessment & Method Statement, Tree Retention Plan and Tree Protection Plan will be updated to confirm the removal of G5.
	Absence of 2m buffer zone around RPA of retained trees is unfortunate	This has been avoided across the site, with the exception of the trees to the north of plots 70-75, where minor intrusion into the Root Protection Area of T2 and T3 (Category C trees) is necessary. This responds to a request from the Local Highways Authority to provide a continuous footway to the north of plots 70-75.
Planning Officer	Require 5% of spaces to be suitable to serve M4(3) dwellings. Would need 14 spaces. None shown for Plots 28 & 29 and would also expect some to be for visitors.	The site layout has been amended to accommodate the required M4(2) and M4(3) compliant parking spaces. There are now 14 M4(3) compliant parking spaces, which includes 10 visitor spaces.
	<p>Interface distances/relationships issues to be resolved through obscure glazing:</p> <p>Rear of plot 29 (rear FF bath/bed windows) to rear of 33/34 (FF landing window) is 13m (21m) – will be ok provided 34's landing window is O/G.</p> <p>- Rear of plots 33/34 (FF landing window) to rear of 30 (2 FF bed windows) is only 12.3m (21m) – will be ok provided 34's landing window is O/G.</p>	<p>Obscure glazing has been provided as requested. Please refer to the following updated plans and explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HT.2x1M.p1 Rev C and HT.2x1M.e1 Rev C, which show the introduction of an obscure glazed first floor window

Statutory Consultee	Summary of key points	Response
	<p>- Rear of plot 35 FOG (has an FF bathroom window) to rear of 26/27 (2 FF bed windows) is only 12.1-13.1m (21m) – will be ok provided 35’s bathroom window is O/G.</p> <p>- Rear of plots 36/37 (has FF rear landing window) to rear of 25 (FF 2 x bed, 1 bath windows) is only 16-16.6m (21m) – will be ok provided 37’s landing window is O/G.</p> <p>- Rear of plot 8 (2 x FF bed windows) to rear of plot 13 (FF bath window) is only 13.2m (21m) – will be ok provided 13’s bath window is O/G.</p>	<p>in the landing <u>and fixed obscured glazed window in the living room</u> of plot 34.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HT.2BFOG-2.p Rev C and HT.2BFOG-2.e Rev C, which continues to show an obscure glazed first floor window in the bathroom, <u>alongside the introduction of a fixed obscured glazed window in the living room</u> of plot 35. HT.2x1M.p2 Rev B and HT.2x1M.e2 Rev B, which show the introduction of an obscure glazed first floor window in the landing <u>and fixed obscured glazed window in the living room</u> of plot 37. HT.2BFOG-1.p Rev C and HT.2BFOG-1.e Rev C, which show the introduction of an obscure glazed first floor window in the bathroom of plot 13.

Statutory Consultee	Summary of key points	Response
	<p>Interface distances/relationships to be resolved:</p> <p>I visited Mill Farm yesterday. You will note I raised concerns at our meeting with 4 particular interface relationships to off-site dwellings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Southern elevation of plots 36/37 (FF bed, bath, kitchen windows) to rear of 22 Mill View Close is only 13.8m (ADG requires 16/21m – nb the ADG does not specify a front-to-rear specific distance). - Flank of 21 (FF Landing/bath window) to rear of 23 Mill Close is 12.8m (14.5m) - Front of plots 33/34 (FF bed, bath, kitchen windows) to the rear of 7 Old Barn Close is 15.7m or 12.6m to its conservatory (need 16-21m). - Rear of plots 14/15 (2 x FF bed windows) to rear of 8 Mill View Close is 16-17.2m (14.5m to edge of conservatory) (need 21m). <p>Having visited the site, I observed a high hedge protecting the amenities of 22 and 23 Mill View Close and I note this is being retained. On this basis, I consider their amenities to be protected. However, I retain concerns (which my Team Leader agrees with) concerning the impact on 7 Old Barn Close and 8 Mill View Close which both have conservatories and do not have the benefit of hedge protection (no 7 does have some but there is gap where the conservatory is). I acknowledge that it is proposed to fill in any gaps, but this may take time to grow, and, in the meantime, these two park homes will be subjected to overlooking at close quarters. You will note that we raised these same issues at the pre-app stage. I</p>	<p>Please refer to the following updated plans and explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HT.2x1M.p1 Rev C and HT.2x1M.e1 Rev C (plots 33/34, at first floor level) have been updated as follows, providing an acceptable relationship with the rear of 7 Old Barn Close: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removal of the southern bedroom window. - Introduction of western bedroom windows. - Introduction of obscure glazing on the kitchen window (southern elevation). • HT.4.1(2blk).p Rev C and HT.4.1(2blk).e Rev B (plots 14/15, at first floor level) have been updated as follows, providing an acceptable relationship with the rear of 8 Mill View Close: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roof line has been dropped. - Introduction of velux windows on the southern elevation.

Statutory Consultee	Summary of key points	Response
	would not feel comfortable approving a layout which conflicts with the ADG in respect of the relationship to these two existing homes.	<p>While not flagged as a concern, other changes that have been made to the house types proposed along the site's southern boundary – to further assist in ensuring an acceptable relationship with the existing dwellings to the south (and proposed dwellings to the north) – include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HT.2x1M.p2 Rev B and HT.2x1M.e2 Rev B (plots 36-37, at first floor level) have been updated as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removal of the southern bedroom window. - Introduction of western bedroom windows. - Introduction of obscure glazing on the kitchen window (southern elevation). • HT.B(3blk).p Rev C and HT.B(3blk).e Rev C (plots 16-18, at first floor level) have been updated as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roof line has been dropped. - Introduction of dormer windows on the northern elevation.

Statutory Consultee	Summary of key points	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HT.2BFOG-2.p Rev C and HT.2BFOG-2.e Rev C (plot 35, at first floor level) have been updated as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of the velux window along the northern elevation. Replacement with a standard window but with obscured glazing and fixed.
	It is s unclear from the submission where the plans (elevations) are of the proposed cycle sheds.	Please refer to the submitted Garden Shed / Cycle Store Plan and Elevations, drawing number SHED.01.pe Rev A.

Key points from third parties	Response
<p>Shared boundary is in the middle of the watercourse, but this is not accurate and can be proved through the legal titles and covenants.</p> <p>Sole riparian owners of the watercourse to the north-west of the site and do not consent to any discharge to this watercourse nor have they agreed to any maintenance and management plan.</p>	<p>The application plans have been checked and are correct. We have advised the neighbouring landowner that the post and rail fence is the boundary and as such everything north of this (including the ditch) is under the ownership of the neighbouring landowner.</p>
<p>Lack of infills to gaps in hedgerows increasing significant risk of trespassers</p>	<p>Hedgerows are being reinforced as part of the landscaping and ecological plans.</p>
<p>Inappropriate location of site 45 – the garage is 3.5m from the shared boundary which has an established mix of hedgerow and field maple trees which is not shown in the Arboriculture report – suggests the field maples have a root protection..</p>	<p>The original Tree Retention Plan (drawing number 9831-T-04 Rev A) – contained within the Arboricultural Assessment & Method Statement – identifies the boundary hedgerow as H2 (C-category). The Tree Retention Plan indicates the hedgerow's Root Protection Area and confirms that no development is proposed within it. There will therefore be no impact on this hedgerow, which is being retained as part of the proposals.</p>
<p>Rookery Farm are the sole riparian owners of the watercourse to the NW of the site. Do not consent to any drainage to this watercourse nor agreed to any maintenance and management plan.</p>	<p>The outfall for the proposed development is via the western ditch (within our ownership), not the northern ditch (owned by others).</p>