

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Simon Davis  
**Sent:** 02 June 2020 12:35  
**To:** Zoe Knott [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Yapton SD7 Design Code Submission refs Y/40/20/DOC & Y/41/20/DOC

Hi Zoe,

I agree with you re the plans in the Code. I can see that they are all labelled as indicative and I am happy with this.

On point 9, we are looking for some more detailed parameters of where village street verges will be narrow and where they will be wider – and what the total width might be. You state on page 20 that “2m min verge width on both sides of carriageway where appropriate to setting.” Can you be more specific what you mean by setting.

Kind Regards

**Simon J Davis MRTPI**  
Principal Planning Officer  
Directorate of Place

**T:** 01903 737674  
**E:** [simon.davis@arun.gov.uk](mailto:simon.davis@arun.gov.uk)



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF  
[www.arun.gov.uk](http://www.arun.gov.uk)

Arun is a CIL Charging Authority, for more information go to [www.arun.gov.uk/cil](http://www.arun.gov.uk/cil)

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



---

**From:** Zoe Knott [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 29 May 2020 14:49  
**To:** Simon Davis <[Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk](mailto:Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk)>  
[REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Yapton SD7 Design Code Submission refs Y/40/20/DOC & Y/41/20/DOC

Hi Simon,

Thank you for providing the comments below on the Design Code Masterplan which we have now had a chance to consider and can provide the following response (see blue text in the below).

On point 9 please can you provide clarity on what you are looking for here as the access and movement section of the Design Code Masterplan does provide clear reference to footways etc.

Finally the Design Code Masterplan has been based on the outline application as this was recommended by Neil Crowther during our meeting and therefore we do not consider the layouts will need to be updated as part of this work. All the plans are for indicative purposes only. If we have misunderstood this approach please can you provide clarity at the earliest opportunity.

If you have any questions please let Jess and I know.

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  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Thames Tower  
Station Road  
Reading  
Berkshire RG1 1LX

[REDACTED]

Interchange Place  
151-165 Edmund Street  
Birmingham B3 2TA

[REDACTED]

[nexusplanning.co.uk](http://nexusplanning.co.uk)



---

**From:** Simon Davis <[Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk](mailto:Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** 19 May 2020 13:20

**To:** Sparkes, Jessica [REDACTED] Zoe Knott [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Yapton SD7 Design Code Submission refs Y/40/20/DOC & Y/41/20/DOC

Dear Zoe and Jessica,

As I previously said, I think the Code is a vast improvement and certainly meets much of what he had asked for. However, we have the following comments and requested amendments:

- (1) Our Design Adviser had previously recommended that the Code *“establish particular typologies or components that can be adapted across the site – for instance, a corner unit, set-back, edge treatment, bay window, porch or garage/ bin store design.”* And *“standardising specific aspects such as roof pitch, ridge line, materials and fenestration”*. I cannot see evidence of this approach in the code and we feel that this would help to integrate the development together and therefore should be included. Also, whilst we are not looking for the code to specify building elevations across the site, it would help to guide the appearance of dwellings across the site.  
We will update the Design Code Masterplan to provide additional detail on this element.
- (2) We think it would be useful to have pedestrian link across the open space and through the existing tree belt between Loveys Field and Drove Field (pages 32-35). If a formal arrangement is not possible due to the retained trees, then perhaps an informal pedestrian only path (essentially a cut through the trees). Or you could take a path along the boundary from Loveys Field to link to the existing PROW on the other side of the trees. This would add further connectivity between these two areas.  
We are reviewing the existing trees and will aim to provide an additional path through.
- (3) It's not clear if existing PROW's are being upgraded.  
While this is still under review we are intending to leave the PROW as they are currently are/ tidied up where possible.
- (4) We don't think that the cycleway through the site follows a clear route and would be better if it was a segregated route as per the section through the central green.  
We will update the key to include reference to the cycleway.
- (5) Also the cycleway route is not clearly shown on the plan on P.16. It does not make it clear that it is alongside the road and also not clear if there are more cycle routes. It might be worth having a separate cycle path plan.  
We will update the plan.
- (6) We have concerns regarding the block sizes being too small on the Barratts side. If they were the same size as those on the Hyde side then there would be less interlinking roads through.  
Both sites have a primary route off which a secondary route flows. The 'blocks' (which are not dissimilar) are surrounded by lanes and driveways to aid connectivity/accessibility.
- (7) We feel that it would be beneficial to extend the tree belt across the site. What I mean is that you have the (existing) tree/hedge belt within the green link extending SE from the central green and would ask if there could be similar extent of new tree planting on the green link which extends NW from the central green.  
It is intended that the proposals will have adequate new tree planting to mitigate any loss and open space to accord with necessary policies. There will be a net gain in tree cover without the requirement to add a new tree belt across the development in a place where there are currently no trees.
- (8) We don't consider frontage parking to be appropriate on the main village street.  
We will update the plans to remove frontage parking.
- (9) The Code says that verges either side of the main village street will be 2m on both sides but 'as appropriate to setting'. This creates ambiguity. It would be better to add to this to clarify where verged will be wider or narrower whatever the case may be. It is also noted that the Outline D&A referred to 6-10m verges in these areas.

Please also ensure that where plans indicate the layout underneath the text in the Code, these should be updated to accord with any amended layouts that follow.

Please can you consider amending the Code to include these suggestions. As ever, I am happy to discuss further.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, [Arun District Council](#) |  
Location: Planning, First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF  
Internal: 37874 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737874 | E-mail: [simon.davis@arun.gov.uk](mailto:simon.davis@arun.gov.uk)

Arun is a CIL Charging Authority, for more information go to [www.arun.gov.uk/cil](http://www.arun.gov.uk/cil)

Visit Arun's web site at [www.arun.gov.uk](http://www.arun.gov.uk)



Save the environment - think before you print.