



From: Robin Reay [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 September 2017 16:37
To: Simon Davis
Subject: PLANNING APPLICATION REF. Y/40/17/OUT - BONHAMS, HOE LANE, FLANSHAM

Simon,

Having seen the consultee comments from your Greenspace colleague Sue Howell, can I respond to her comments in terms of the amount and layout of the open space within the proposed development. As we have discussed previously it needs to be born in mind that the application is for outline permission with layout a reserved matter; the submitted layout is therefore indicative rather than final.

Please find attached a copy of the indicative site layout for the Bonhams application, annotated to show the areas of open space with a table showing their respective areas and the total area. The total of 2257 square metres of open space shown on the layout exceeds the requirement calculated in accordance with the formula set out in Section 5 of the Arun DC Open Space and Recreation Standards SPD. That formula gives an overall requirement of 1968 square metres of open space for a development of 34 dwellings ((34 dwgs x 2.4 persons) x 24 square metres per person). Given that the development proposes more than 15 dwellings the SPD requires play equipment to be incorporated on site; this would be achievable by the provision of a LAP within one of the open space areas. (Sue Howell in her consultation response uses a figure of 32 square metres of open space per person, though I'm not sure where that figure comes from. The SPD appears to be current and I couldn't see any indication in that or on the ADC website that the open space figure has increased).

The attached layout also shows the existing sewer easement that runs east – west across the site. The need to keep the easement clear of buildings has suggested the provision of the open space in several parcels, rather than one large area, in order to make efficient use of the those parts of the site within the easement. The distribution of the open space into several spaces makes it more accessible to residents in different parts of the site and, in any event, all of the central areas of open space are of useable size and any would be large enough to accommodate a LAP. The indicative layout demonstrates that an appropriate area of open space can be accommodated on the site; ultimately the actual distribution will be determined at the reserved matters stage.

The Greenspace comments also refer to trees within the site. The attached drawing shows the root protection areas for the existing trees to be retained. A report on the inspection of trees and a tree constraints plan were submitted as part of the application documentation and the indicative layout is careful to avoid impinging on the RPAs of existing trees to be retained. There is only one instance where any building impinges on a RPA; that is a very small area for the garage to plot 04, which could be easily resolved by the use of a special foundation for that part of the building.

I am hoping that the above responds adequately to Sue Howell's concerns but in order to discuss this, if necessary, and other matters concerning the application can I suggest that it would be helpful to meet up, perhaps including Sue Howell. Ideally we would like to meet on site but a meeting at the ADC offices would be OK if that helps. Could you suggest possible dates and times please.

Robin.

Robin Reay MRTPI
Luken Beck MDP Ltd,
30 Carlton Crescent,
Southampton SO15 2EW



Development ♦ Management ♦ Planning