

[REDACTED]

From: Zoe Knott [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 April 2021 16:50
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Y/152/20/RES - ADC Comments

Hi Simon,

Thank you for your email, it is unfortunate we have got to this position as we have been proactively trying to work with the Council.

On behalf of my client Hyde Housing please take this email as confirmation to withdraw the reserved matters application Y/152/20/RES.

In order to move forward please can we organise a meeting with the Council to discuss the points raised in your email?

Many thanks,

Zoe

Zoe Knott
Associate

[REDACTED]

Nexus Planning is thrilled to have been awarded RTPI Planning Consultancy of the Year 2020





Nexus Planning - Reading
5th Floor
Thames Tower
Station Road
Reading
Berkshire RG1 1LX

Interchange Place
151-165 Edmund Street
Birmingham B3 2TA

nexusplanning.co.uk



From: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>

Sent: 21 April 2021 10:51

To: Zoe Knott

Subject: Y/152/20/RES - ADC Comments

Dear Zoe,

I am now able to write to you with our comments on the scheme as submitted. I am sorry it has taken some time to provide these. I honestly don't know where the time went.

Consultation Comments

Our Landscape Officer requests minor revisions/confirmation of three points including the omission of planting adjacent 14 Gladstone Rd. Please the response on our website dated 10/03/21.

WSCC Highways require further details. Please the response on our website dated 23/03/21.

I am still awaiting responses from our Tree Officer and Drainage Engineers. Both have been chased.

Representation Comments

I noted in particular that 14 Gladstone Road are concerned that their side/rear extensions are not shown on the plans. I suspect this is because the OS base layer is not correct. The same may be true of other adjoining properties with recent extensions. However, I have no concerns with amenity impacts at this particular property and it is up to you whether you rectify this.

As you have already acknowledged, there is a comment regarding the need for maintenance access to the rears of 29-35 Tack Lee Road. I understand that housing officers are currently considering the proposal to provide a gate from the parking court adjacent 25 Tack Lee Road onto a maintenance 'alleyway'. Once

this is agreed, the plans can be amended to provide a maintenance 'alleyway' that serves say 25-39 Tack Lee Road. Alternatively, you could just maintain any existing gates onto the alleyway / allow those affected residents to create new ones and thus avoid the need for a gate from the parking court and thus minimise the security issues.

Yapton Parish Council (16/02/21) state support but conditional on various amendments. Please consider these and advise whether you agree or not. We may then need to seek a further view from YPC to determine whether their conditions are met by your changes/comments. I have the following comments on their points:

- (1) ADC can impose a condition removing PD rights for garages to be converted.
- (2) I don't consider it reasonable to require all parking to be in Core Grass/similar but are you able to specify this for any spaces that adjoin/are adjacent to grassed areas?
- (3) Streetlighting is subject to the separate Discharge of Conditions Application.
- (4) Can you comment on the DDA accessibility/footpath margins.
- (5) Is it possible to provide additional links onto the existing adjoining residential development? I wonder whether it is possible to provide extra links onto Tack Lee Road, Loveys Road, Cobham Close by not having hard boundaries in these locations?
- (6) This is something that YPC are very keen on and is reflected by their emerging NP. However, I acknowledge that this was not raised at the Outline or when the Design Code was approved.
- (7) I am happy that sufficient POS/Play is provided and that the SuDS features are excluded from the POS calculation. However, this comment is also reflective of discussions at the first AG Meeting – that the SuDS features should be secured to prevent children from entering. I am not sure fences would be appropriate from a design standpoint but you could consider hedges or a combination of hedge and same height fence on the inside with access gates.

Comments/Issues/Concerns

- (A) Please can you liaise with BDW and ensure/confirm that the layout treatment & road hierarchy of the plots immediately adjacent to the boundary with BDW's site reflect/match those on your site so that there is continuity for people travelling along the Main Street
- (B) I note that plots 32, 34, 42 & 58 are side on to the Main Street with screening seemingly limited to the occasional roadside tree. Our preference is for no dwellings to be side on to the Main Street however we can accept this if additional street trees are proposed in these locations.
- (C) We previously advised at pre-application stage that the Central Green needs to be larger in area so it becomes more of a feature. This does not appear to be any larger than before.
- (D) As per the Design Code, the Central Green should have trees lining the edge adjacent to the Main Street. This is not as apparent on the submitted plans as it was on BDW's scheme.
- (E) We previously raised concerns regarding rear garden depths. From my assessment, it would appear that:

- These plots are between 10 and 10.5m – 13, 23, 28, 30, 91, 92, 93, 107, 108, 110, 118, 122, 139, 140, 144, 145, 148, 149, 150, 174, 177, 179, 217, 229, 233, 234
- These plots are less than 10m – 29 (8.7m avg*), 61 (9.6m), 67 (9.3m), 85 (9.5m), 90 (9m avg), 121 (9.2m avg), 123 (9m), 124 (9m avg), 138 (9m), 160 (9.2m), 226 (9.6m)

* this is determined by adding the longest and shortest sides of the garden and then dividing by 2.

We can accept some instances of gardens not quite meeting the full 10.5m if at least 10m deep as the Design Guide allows for a flexible approach. However, we would not be able to support gardens of less than 10m.

- (F) The housing mix does not accord with that set out by YDNP policy H2 or that by the SHMAA referred to in policy H DM1 of the ALP.
- (G) Some of the house types are only in 1 tenure meaning that they will not be tenure blind. Of particular concern is the flats which are all affordable. It is considered that some of these should be switched for market units.
- (H) I note that several of the house types are not in accordance with the nationally described space standards. According to your schedule & plans, 49 of the 85 2B4P houses are undersized (around

71-72m2 vs the 79m2 requirement) and 29 of the 84 3B5P houses are around 88m2 vs the 93m2 requirement). This level of shortfall is not something we can sanction.

- (I) The interface distance between plot 192 to rear of 39 Tack Lee Road should be 21m but appears only 20-20.5m. I would rather this was at least 21m as it concerns an existing dwelling.
- (J) There are several instances of interface distances within the site not meeting the Design Guide parameters. These are:

182-185 F to 177-179 F only 15m (1m shortfall)
206 F to 193 F only 14m (2m shortfall)
167/168 F to 172/173 F – 14m (2m shortfall)
171 S to 212/213 F – 12m (2m shortfall)
170 F to 214 S – 12m (2m shortfall)
162 S to 163/164 R – 12m (2m shortfall)
138 R to 150 R – 20m (1m shortfall)
140 R to 149 R – 20m (1m shortfall)
143 S to 144 R – 12m (2m shortfall)
113 R to 121 R – 19.5m (1.5m shortfall)
92 R to 94 S – 13m (1m shortfall)
26/27 F to 16/17 F – 14m (2m shortfall)

(where S is Side, F is front, R is Rear)

- (K) Also, plot 90 overlooks 87 & 88's rear garden at only between 3 and 8m.
- (L) I have concerns with the front outlook of plots 9-12 (flatted building) & 13-15 which essentially face a row of parking spaces & car ports. I consider that this area (streetscene) should be subject to greater landscaping to break up the hard surfacing.
- (M) The parking provision as a whole is considered to exceed the requirements (592.5 vs 590) but within this, the visitor provision is a little light (50 requirement vs 46 provision). Is it possible to provide additional visitor spaces?
- (N) As per the Design Code, all 3 areas should have red/brown/grey roof tiles but the plans only show red/grey tiles in all 3 areas. In addition, the planning statement says that Loveys Field will have red/brown/grey tiles but that the other areas only red/grey.
- (O) The Design Code states that chimneys will only be provided in the Bilsham Street area but the layout also shows these in Drove Park.

Lastly, please note that the BDW scheme was refused partially due to concerns with the following and we need to ensure that there is consistency between decision making on the two sites:

- the size of private rear gardens afforded to certain residential dwellings
- the mix of housing sizes
- the relationship of new housing to existing residential properties
- the interface distances between proposed dwellings
- the size of the Central Green
- the failure to ensure that all dwellings are tenure blind
- insufficient information to demonstrate highway compliance

On the subject of consistency, you should note that we did not allow BDW to change their plans during the course of the application to overcome our concerns and we did not allow an Extension of Time. It is our intention to be consistent and determine the application as it is – in the next couple of weeks. You may alternatively withdraw and we can provide further assistance before a resubmission.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer
Directorate of Place

T: 01903 737874
E: simon.davis@arun.gov.uk



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

www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to

www.arun.gov.uk/planning

Arun is a CIL Charging Authority, for more information go to www.arun.gov.uk/cil

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)

