

Sandra Edwards

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 24 August 2018 15:47
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Land East of North End Road, Yapton: Y/49/18/PL
Attachments: Parish Council Response 1.pdf

Simon J Davis MRTPI | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council |
Location: Planning, First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltrovers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Ellie White [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 August 2018 15:38
To: Simon Davis
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Land East of North End Road, Yapton: Y/49/18/PL

Hi Simon,

Please see our response to the Parish objection attached.

Have a nice weekend,
Ellie

Ellie White MRTPI CHCM
Planning Director



The McLaren Clark Consultancy
4 Park Farm, Chichester Road, Arundel, West Sussex BN18 0AG

Email Disclaimer:

This message is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is private and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, employee or agent for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication and its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication and its attachments in error please notify us immediately by telephone. Please also destroy and delete the message from your computer.

MCC Development Consultancy Ltd (Company No. 08398518) and MCC Planning Ltd (Company No. 07628988) are divisions of the McLaren Clark Consultancy and wholly owned subsidiaries of Sussex Estates Ltd (Company No. 02269325). Registered in England & Wales. Registered Office: 2nd Floor Stanford Gate, South Road, Brighton BN1 6SB. VAT No. 125444725.

○ Development Consultancy

○ Land

○ Planning



FAO Mr S Davis, Principal Planning Officer

Planning Department
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

BY EMAIL ONLY

24th August 2018

Dear Mr Davis,

Applicant Response to Parish Council Objection

Application reference: Y/49/18/PL Land east of North End Road, Yapton

Following the Parish Council objection that was uploaded onto the website on the 17th August 2018, the applicant has now had the chance to consider all matters raised and would like to issue a response to address the Parish Council concerns.

Location and Character

We would agree that the site is not currently located within the Yapton Built Up Area Boundary as defined by the Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 (ALP) and this is clearly noted within the Planning Design and Access Statement submitted to support the application.

According to the ALP Proposals Maps (18 July 2018), the site is sandwiched between the settlement boundary which runs along the northern boundary and to the southern boundary of the site. A now redundant nursery is located to the south, an industrial park to the east and a consented/committed scheme is located to the north and east of the site. The site is therefore surrounded by either existing or committed development and thus Officers will be required to consider whether there would be significant harm derived from the development as opposed to refusing on countryside policies alone.

The site does not currently form part of the business park, it is undeveloped and thus, development would not result in the loss of a *'key economic contributor to the village'*, as stated in the Parish objection. The Site is not used as employment land nor is it safeguarded as such. This is specifically stated within the pre-application response; *'It is not considered that the site is currently part of the adjacent business park and indeed it is not allocated as either safeguarded or future economic land'* (November 2017). The pre-application response can be located within Appendix C of the Planning Design and Access Statement.

The redevelopment of this land for residential development would not be contrary to the ALP Employment Land Policy EMP DM1.

Community Engagement

Both the Applicant and Agent have attempted, on numerous occasions, to liaise with the Parish to which they have had little or no response. Meetings have been requested and presentations for discussion have been offered, the site layout plans were also sent over to the Parish Council prior to the submission of the application to encourage further dialogue. Whilst read receipts were received, the Parish Council declined to respond. We are more than happy to provide this dialogue to demonstrate we have attempted to work closely with the Parish Council.

In terms of adjoining neighbours and those most affected, these would be the business park and the owners of the redundant nursery to the south. The applicant has liaised with both parties and neither have raised any objection. For a minor scheme such as this, we would question how the Parish Council expects the applicant to consult when the Parish refuses to respond to numerous requests for such consultation. Further, the consultation period has now come to an end and 5 local resident objections have been lodged.

The ALP quotes referenced under the objection Section 3 'Planning' do not relate to community consultation on the applicants part and instead, how the Council is required to liaise with parishes when devising the Site Allocations Document. Thus, we are not clear as to how we have acted contrary to the ALP.

Planning

Arun Local Plan (ALP) 2011-2031 (2018)

The Parish have chosen to quote ALP Policy EMP DM1 Employment Land: Development Management. The application site is not an '*existing employment site*'. It is not allocated for employment purposes nor is it safeguarded for future economic development. This was confirmed by Planning Officers within the pre-application response as attached in Appendix C of the Planning Design and Access Statement. Whilst the site adjoins a business park and economic development, it should not be expected that all adjoining land be considered under this Policy purely on the basis it is adjoining such uses.

The application is not contrary to the ALP on economic grounds.

Yapton Neighbourhood Plan (YNP) (2014)

The applicant received the pre-application response in November 2017. The response stated that the Parish Council '*have no intention of updating the YNP to identify additional sites.*' As previously mentioned, the applicant has sought to liaise with the Parish on numerous occasions and we have not received any reply to notify us that the site will need to be progressed through the Neighbourhood Plan process.

YNP Policy H1 has flexibility to allow any shortfall in housing supply to be met. This policy considers meeting future district wide needs for housing development outside settlement boundaries, where '*the emerging Arun Local Plan requires more housing to be provided at Yapton*'. The ALP, specifically Table 12.1 '*Housing Supply*', requires 1,250 dwellings to be delivered on smaller '*non-strategic sites*'. The application would be contributing to the 1,250 dwellings needed to meet the districts minimum housing requirements and in such circumstances, the YNP allows such sites to be developed outside its settlement policy boundary. The application therefore, would not be in conflict with Policy H1 or Policy BB1.

The YNP Section 6 '*Site Allocations*' allocated '*Land north of Yapton CE Primary School*' for approximately 35 dwellings. An application for 38 dwellings (Y/93/14/OUT) was approved on 5th August 2015. Condition 1 clearly states that;

'The permission hereby granted is an outline permission under Article 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 and an application for the approval of the Local Planning Authority to the following matters must be made not later than the expiration of 3 years beginning with the date of this permission:-

- (a) Layout;*
- (b) Scale;*
- (c) Appearance;*
- and (d) Landscaping.'*

A reserved matters application does not appear to have been submitted to address Condition 1 and thus the outline application should no longer be valid. We would therefore question the deliverability of this site and its potential contribution towards the YNP housing requirements.

HEELA (2017)

The HELAA is not a Policy Document, it does not allocate or safeguard land and is only to be used as part of the evidence base to support The Local Development Framework.

The site is not identified within the HELAA Report (August 2017) as being an existing employment site or as having potential as an employment site in the future (Appendix 4.1 and 4.2 respectively). The site is coloured on the interactive map as reference 'FD1'. However, the applicant has liaised verbally with Martyn White in the Policy Department and we understand that the application site will not be included as part of the Orchard Business Park employment use as soon as the document is updated.

The pre-application response (November 2017) clearly states that *'It is not considered that the site is currently part of the adjacent business park and indeed it is not allocated as either safeguarded or future economic land'*. Planning Officers clearly accept that the site is not used for economic purposes nor has it ever been safeguarded as such. Whilst the site adjoins a business park and economic development, it should not be expected that all adjoining land be considered under this Policy purely on the basis it is adjoining such uses.

If the Parish have concerns regarding the HELAA, it may also be important to note that the site was considered as being *'deliverable'* and thus potentially suitable for residential development. Assessment Reference 17Y1 clearly states that *'The site is considered suitable in principle for future housing potential, because of its accessibility to facilities, job opportunities and public transport, and because there are no insurmountable constraints. The site could contribute to the creation of a sustainable, mixed community.'*

The Statutory Consultation period has now ended, and it is clear that there are no insurmountable constraints to development.

Housing Need

Section 4 of the Parish objection notes that there is a strategic allocation for 500 dwellings (ALP site SD7) which is south of the village. This along with a further 450+ residential units that have been granted outline permission within the Parish, totalling 950+ units.

As mentioned in the YNP section above, application Y/93/14/OUT now appears to have lapsed which would point to it being undeliverable for some reason. Further to this, the application for 70 dwellings on land at Stakers Farm Y/44/17/OUT, appears to require access through application Y/93/14/OUT. If the latter application has lapsed and is in fact undeliverable, how will Stakers Farm be delivered. Stakers Farm did not formally receive a decision prior to the adoption of the ALP and thus is due to return to committee later in the year; there is no guarantee that this major application will in fact be approved now the ALP has been adopted. We would therefore question whether the figure of 450+ dwellings is in fact accurate.

Layout

In terms of development in the northern area of the village, the majority of development off North End Road is located to the east. This includes a mixture of older properties within the Conservation Area and a number of more recent cul-de-sacs. We are unsure as to how this could be classified as Ribbon Development, when Ribbon Development is defined within the Planning Portal online directory as *'Development, usually residential, extending along one or both sides of a road but not extended in depth.'*

The density of the proposal is 25dph. This is not dissimilar to surrounding densities and would make an efficient use of land.

The proposal does not incorporate open space due to the proximity of existing open space and play facilities within walking distance of the site. This has not been disputed by officers.

Transport/Sustainable Links

As previously mentioned, Y/93/14/OUT appears to have lapsed and we would therefore question the deliverability of Stakers Farm, should it be once again approved by committee later in the year. Should we be correct in our assumptions, then we would question how many dwellings are to be served via access points from North End Road; it currently appears to be one which would be land to the south of Ford Lane and east of North End Road (Y/80/16/OUT).

A Transport Statement and Stage 1 Safety Audit have been submitted in support of the application, the applicant liaised with West Sussex County Council as the highways authority prior to submission and thus they have not raised an objection. Access and traffic cumulation cannot be used as a reason for refusal in this instance.

In terms of links to adjoining land, the site does not directly join any pedestrian access points or public footpaths within surrounding land. However, there are a number of footpaths within close proximity to the site that provide access to the wider footpath network for example, paths 329 and 326 access from North End Road, paths 357, 358 and 369 accessed from either Church Lane to the south or Ford Lane to the north. Footpath 362 also provides a short cut from North End Road down to Church Road and the recreation ground and community centre beyond.

The site is in a highly accessible location with residents being able to walk or cycle to access local facilities and services. A number of facilities including, primary school, pharmacy and doctors surgery, post office with store, public house, church and two sets of bus stops are all located within an 800m walk down lit pathways. The village hall, fish and chip shop, butchers and convenience store are all located less than a 1000m walk from the site entrance. The scheme therefore scores highly in environmental sustainability terms.

Water Treatment Capacity

Unfortunately, Southern Water capacity is an issue throughout the District. It would not be possible to put a hold on all planning decisions. The applicant has met with Southern Water recently. Southern Water are using a tariff based system to address capacity issues and this site specifically, has been recorded with them.

In conclusion, the ALP requires additional non-strategic sites to meet its minimum housing requirements. In such circumstances, the YNP allows sites to be developed outside its settlement boundary. The site is within a sustainable location, within walking distance of a number of local services and facilities, and does not appear incongruous when considering development to the north, east and south of the site. The site is sandwich by the Yapton settlement boundary and thus whilst not within, it should not be viewed as a typical countryside location. The site is not allocated or safeguarded for employment uses and residential development would not have any detrimental impact on the commercial uses to the rear of the site.

Whilst the site is not allocated for development, it is clear that due to the sites location, benefits of providing housing for the district alongside the lack of statutory objections, residential development on this site would not cause significant harm to the area and we hope that it would be viewed favourably by officers.

We hope the above addresses the Parish Council concerns, but should you require any further information then please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely,

Ellie White MRTPI
Planning Director