

From: Nicola Spencer on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 08 April 2022 15:47
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Planning Application Ref: Y/10/22/
Attachments: Yapton application Y.10.22.PL objection.pdf

Nicola Spencer
Technical Support Manager,
Planning Services



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: Peter Newma [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 April 2022 14:16
To: Simon Davis [REDACTED]
Cc: Planning.Responses [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning Application Ref: Y/10/22/

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Mr Davis,

I have tried to submit my comments on the above planning application without success. It tells me there are too many characters and there does not appear any way to upload a document.

I hope you don't mind, but I thought it best to send my comments direct to you as the case officer – please see attached.

I'd be grateful if these can be uploaded onto the system and have regard had to my comments when the application is considered.

Many thanks,
Yours Sincerely,

Peter Newman

I object to application Y/10/22/PL for the following reasons:-

1. The original consent for "no more than 100 dwellings" on this site was achieved at appeal after several previous failed applications and bitter opposition from the Local Authority and Parish Council. One of the main concerns was the impact of the new scheme on the Yapton Conservation area and the grade 1 listed St Mary's Church. This concern was recognized by the applicant and the scheme was designed with the bulk of the housing positioned towards the east and northern parts of the site and a buffer of public open space created at the southern boundary together with a green corridor running north to south along the eastern boundary. This provision of open space to protect the views of the Conservation area was one of the key reasons that the detailed application was finally approved. The planning inspector at the first appeal (Y/60/14) accepted in para 11.36 *that the houses would stand well beyond the conservation area, separated by open space and landscaping*. This current application to build a further 15 new homes on the green buffer will fundamentally compromise the agreed design for the site as a whole and impact detrimentally on the Church Lane Conservation Area. It should be seen for what it is - an opportunistic attempt to squeeze extra profit out of the site, with no consideration for the previously agreed holistic design.

2. It also raises the questionable issue that any consented scheme in the area will be prone to additional applications. This will set a precedent for builders to build on designated "public open space" that was accepted by the planning authority as such when granting the original consent. The need for further housing is acknowledged but only subject to design standards, that this proposal does not meet. This proposal is a "bolt on" which detracts rather than enhances the current approval scheme.

3. Redrow in their "Design Response" document for the scheme of 100 homes states they *"prepare all layouts to achieve the highest design quality"* and confirmed the original design with 2.2ha of public open space and a green corridor of 1.1ha met those requirements. The importance of this green buffer was reinforced by Redrow's Heritage advisors (Terence O'Rourke) who wrote on 22nd June 2020 to Craige Burden (head of planning at Redrow - a listed document on application Y/82/20/RES) that *"the (original) detailed proposals as presented in the reserved matters application preserve the qualities of the site that are of value to the designated heritage assets to the south on the edge of the historic centre of Yapton. For St Mary's Church, the appreciation of the church in its rural setting on the edge of the modern village is preserved as part of the framework of landscaped open spaces within the development"*. The new proposal is at clear odds with this earlier promise.

4. The NPPF explains that a core planning principle of sustainable development involves seeking *"positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment and recognizing the intrinsic beauty and character of the countryside"*. This application would achieve the opposite of this aim.

The proposal is also contrary to NPPF para 126 that requires the local planning authority *"to recognize heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and to conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance"*. The setting of the heritage assets is important, and it is clearly established that the views into and from these assets are equally important. The addition proposed houses would impinge on the views of the Grade 1 listed church and surrounding conservation area providing a far more crowded visual setting when viewed from the north.

5. Church Farm House and its garden forms the northern edge of the Yapton Church Road conservation area and sits at a lower level (1 – 1.5 m) to the subject site. The level difference can be clearly seen by reference to the new housing currently being built. The proposed additional housing

will be much closer, and due to their raised height, very imposing/ intrusive (looking directly towards the conservation area) as a result. Church Farm House is orientated west/northwest directly at the proposed houses and with the heightened rooflines, the proposed housing would dominate views looking out from this part of the conservation area.

The site level difference was acknowledged in the previous application. The only building permitted within the 85m buffer zone to the rear boundary of the houses in Church Lane, was a small single storey pumping station, but this was required to be built at a lower level to reduce its visual impact.

6. This proposal would significantly reduce the public open space/green buffer between the existing edges of the village that is currently consented. Part of the proposed POS area will be a LEAP and large portion of the remaining space will be an attenuation pond, which causes two issues: a) from a health & safety aspect, it must be dangerous to have an attenuation pond immediately adjacent to a kids play area and b) the remaining natural POS in this section of the site is significantly reduced.

I ask that the application is refused.