

Simon Davis

Arun District Council
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

Thames Valley
5th Floor,
Thames Tower,
Station Road,
Reading, RG1 1LX

nexusplanning.co.uk

4th February 2019

Our Ref: 33738

Your ref: Y/98/18/RES and Y/97/18/DOC

Dear Simon,

Land off Burndell Road, Yapton

On behalf of our client Bovis Homes ("the Applicant") please find enclosed supplementary/ updated information in response to comments received from Yapton Parish Council ("YPC") and consultees on the above applications.

Y/98/18/RES

A package of updated plans is enclosed alongside the latest drawing register, this is attached to this letter. Changes to the layout have been made in order to ensure technical standards are met and address the Parish Council's concerns. The amendments do not materially depart from the original submission. Below I provide a summary of the changes that are proposed:

Layout

- Detached garages and additional parking spaces have been introduced to plots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 21, 22, 23, 24, 39, 40, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55, 75, 76, 79, 80, 83, 84, 88, 103, 104 and 105. Additionally, plots 79 and 89 have been shifted forward by 1m in order to create the detached garages for these plots.
- Plots 6, 7 and 105 have been pulled back by 1m to stagger the frontage building line in response to the Parish Council's comments.
- The boundaries to plots 17, 28, 29, 31, 36, 77 and 78 have been rounded off and realigned in order to meet the Applicant's technical standards.

London

Birmingham

Manchester

Thames Valley

House types/design

- The secondary side windows to the living room and bedroom 1 have been removed from plots 47 and 87.
- Windows have been added to the ground floor toilet and first floor bathroom for plots 55 and 75. The side window to the hallway is now non-opening and obscure glazed.
- In response to the Parish Council's comment on the need for additional variety within the pallet of proposed external materials, flint has been introduced to dwellings on plots 53, 89 and 108 as well as tile hanging to front gable of dwellings on plots 18, 28, 46 and 86.

Landscape

- A full soft and hard landscaping plan has been produced for the site by the landscape architects, ACD Environmental, which includes adequate soft landscaping. The hard landscaping materials have been chosen for their appearance and durability and are in keeping with similar developments in the local area. We will therefore not be looking to amend the plans to include the use of core grass as requested by the Parish Council. Core grass tends to work best in areas which are only used occasionally so the grass has enough time and light to regenerate between uses. The parking areas are likely to be well used in this residential setting and therefore any planting within the core grass would likely fail. The northern boundary hedging will be retained and improved with post and rail stock proof fence erected along boundary hedging. The landscaping plans are currently being updated and will be submitted once available.

Planning Conditions

- The Applicant agrees to a condition being added to any permission requiring that garages are retained for car parking use.

The Applicant acknowledges that YPC are concerned over the drainage ditch and we are therefore proposing a 1.2m high post and rail fencing between the ditch and footpath to safeguard the public using the footpath. The landscaping plans are being updated and will be submitted in due course to show this.

We can confirm in response to the questions raised by the local residents that no rear dormer windows have been proposed to the northern units adjoining Fellows Gardens.

Y/97/18/DOC

The Surface Water Drainage Submission Checklist and accompanying documents have been submitted to the Council and the Applicant is awaiting further comments.

Condition 6 Foul Water Drainage

Odyssey have reviewed the comments made by Southern Water dated 15th January which sets out that they would not recommend the discharge of condition 6 relating to foul drainage due to an internal study which concluded that there is an increased risk of flooding unless any required network reinforcement work is provided by Southern Water. Odyssey have concluded that the wording of Condition 6 does not offer Southern Water the option to refuse the condition on the grounds of lack of capacity. Under the provisions of the Water Industry Act Southern Water has a duty to improve their system to cater for new development and therefore capacity should not be in question.


The approved outline application sets out the off-site improvement works required to Southern Water's foul water system to cater for the development (as advised by Southern Water at that point in time); therefore it has been common knowledge in the outline (and the appeal) that improvement works were required to cater for the development.

Odyssey Consult's view is that given the above, Southern Water should not refuse to discharge Condition 6 based on lack of capacity.

We trust you are in agreement that the amendments made would not materially depart from the original submission and are an improvement to the scheme. If you require any clarification or have further questions on any of the above please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

PP



Zoe Knott
Principal Planner