

Delegated Decision Sign off Sheet

Case Number:	O/19/01951/FUL	Case Officer:	Kayleigh Taylor
Proposal:	Erection of 143 dwellings, with associated access, parking, public open space, landscaping, extension to residential curtilages of existing properties along Oving Road and other associated works.		
Site:	Land At The Corner Of Oving Road And A27 , Chichester, PO20 2AG,		
Applicant/Agent:	Agent Details : Mr David Hutchison Pegasus House ,Querns Business Centre,Whitworth Road Cirencester ,GL71RT ,		
Application Type:	Full Application		
Site Visit:	9 July 2019		
Map Ref:	(E) 488007	(N) 104890	
Parish:	Oving	Ward:	North Mundham And Tangmere

Red Card?	N	Stat. Consultee Objections?	N	Parish Objection	N
Third Party Representations?	2	Overall Publicity Expiry Date:	16 April 2020	CIL Liable	N/A
Legal Agreement?	N	Extension of Time?		17 April 2020	
Recommendation:	REFUSE		Expiry Date:	18 December 2019	
Decided Plan(s):					
Recommendation Date:	11 June 2020				
Recommendation By:	Kayleigh Taylor				
Signed Off by:	Jeremy Bushell				

1. Site Description, Proposal and History

The Site and Surroundings

The application site is located at the corner of the junction of Oving Road (to the north) and the A27 (to the west), to the south and east there is agricultural land. There are 8 existing dwellings and a Jehovah's witness hall adjoining the northern boundary, fronting Oving Road. Oving Road leads into Shopwhyke Road to the east, to the north of Shopwhyke Road is the Shopwhyke strategic development site subject to Policy 16 of the CLP, which has been partially developed with residential properties fronting Shopwhyke Road.

The application site comprises an agricultural field with scrub and a small number of trees on the boundaries.

The Proposal

The proposal seeks full planning permission for the erection of 143 dwellings with associated access, parking, outdoor space, landscaping and infrastructure.

In terms of housing provision, the application proposes the following housing mix;

43 affordable dwellings

Equating to 30% of the proposed dwellings, of which there would be 30 affordable rent and 13 shared ownership units.

6no. 1 bedroom (14%)

17no. 2 bedroom (40%)

16no. 3 bedroom (37%)

4no. 4 bedroom (9%)

100 market dwellings

36no. 2 bed houses (36%)

47no. 3 bed houses (47%)

17no. 4 bed houses (17%)

The dwellings would be predominantly two storey in height and arranged as a mix of detached, semi-detached and small terraces. There would be one block of three storey flats in the south-western corner of the site. The overall density of the development is 35.3dph.

The proposal also comprises;

- Estate roads with a principal street leading to secondary streets and a series of cul-de-sacs and private drives.
- 71 garages (57 detached and 14 integral).
- Allocated and visitor parking spaces
- Cycle sheds for plots without garages
- Public open space to the centre of the site with an area of equipped play space (470sqm LEAP and approximately 2,000sqm of open space).
- Public open space to the south-west of the site, measuring approximately 300sqm.
- A network of footpaths around the site perimeter,
- Hard and soft landscaping including boundary treatments and planting
- Underground pumping station and electricity substation

Planning History

16/02254/OUT - Outline application for the development of the site to provide 100 no. dwellings (use class C3), with an associated access, parking, outdoor space, landscaping and infrastructure. STATUS: Non- determined 2nd February 2017, granted at appeal 18th August 2017 (ref: APP/L3815/W/16/3165228

16/00271/EIA - To provide 99 dwellings (Use Class C3), with associated access, parking, outdoor space landscaping and infrastructure. STATUS: EIA Not Required 2nd July 2018

19/00629/ADV - 1 no. non-illuminated stack sign and 2 no. non-illuminated flags on aluminium poles. STATUS: Permit 9th May 2019

19/00873/ADV - 5 no. flags on aluminium poles. STATUS: Permit 16th May 2019

19/02075/DOC - Discharge of condition 7 from planning permission O/16/02254/OUT. STATUS: Refuse 9th October 2019

19/01416/REM - Reserved Matters application for all matters except Access - Erection of 100 dwellings and associated works in relation to outline planning permission ref: O/16/02254/OUT. STATUS: Permit 23rd December 2019

19/02719/FUL - Construction of temporary access, parking, landscaping and cabin, for use as a sales area. 19/02901/DOC - Discharge of conditions 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, 19 and 20 from planning permission O/16/02254/OUT. STATUS: Permit 24th January 2020

19/02901/DOC - Discharge of conditions 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, 19 and 20 from planning permission O/16/02254/OUT. STATUS: Split decision 22nd January 2020

19/02954/DOC - Discharge of Condition 7 of outline permission O/16/02254/OUT (APP/L3815/W/16/3165228) - Construction Environmental Management Plan. STATUS: Permit 22nd January 2020

19/03026/DOC Discharge of condition 12, 14 and 17 from planning permission 16/02254/OUT (Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/W/16/3165228). STATUS: Permit 19th February 2020

20/00076/DOC - Discharge of Condition 9 of Planning Permission O/16/02254/OUT (APP/L3815/W/16/3165228) land contamination Phase 2 intrusive investigation report. STATUS: Permit 05th March 2020

20/00670/DOC - Discharge of condition 4 to permission 19/01416/REM. STATUS: Refuse 30th April 2020

20/00935/DOC - Discharge of condition 20 from reserved matters approval O/19/01416/REM. STATUS: Permit 11th May 2020

2. Representations and Consultations

Consultations and Representations

Oving Parish Council

Comments received 19/05/2020

Oving Parish Council has met to re-consider its previous decision, dated 25th October 2019, to OBJECT to this application. The Parish Council would like it noted that they unanimously agreed to SUPPORT this application with the following comments:

We would like a condition added to this application requiring that a scheme for the disposal of foul water is submitted and approved by Chichester District Council prior to occupation. The Parish Council would like a second condition for the installation of electric charging points next to visitor parking bays.

Comments received 25/10/2019

Oving Parish Council's planning committee met last night to discuss planning application O/19/01951/FUL and would like it noted that they unanimously agreed to OBJECT to this application with the following comments.

The committee consider plots 73 & 78 to be too close to existing properties on Shopwhyke Road that back onto this site and request that these be removed or relocated elsewhere on the proposed plan.

Planting along the western edge appears to be sparse and should be intensified to increase absorption of road noise from the A27 and provide better screening of the acoustic fencing for the residents of the site.

Consideration should be given to establishing an access point on the southern boundary towards the south eastern corner to enable future access to facilities of the proposed AL3 site of the Chichester Local Plan Review.

Officer note: Clarification was sought about the plot numbers referenced in paragraph 2 as the plots referenced appear to be some distance from the site boundary. However no answer was received from the Parish

Environment Agency- summarised by officer

On the basis that foul drainage from the site will be directed to Tangmere Wastewater Treatment Works once the pipeline connecting Chichester city to the works is complete then we have no objection to the planning application. A condition is recommended to secure a foul drainage scheme.

We expect that this development would drain to the Tangmere Wastewater Treatment Works via the new sewer pipeline connection once operational. We would wish to see a foul drainage scheme confirm this and that the timing and phasing of this connection is set out in discussions with Southern Water.

Southern Water - summarised by officer

Southern Water has undertaken a desk study of the impact that the additional foul sewerage flows from the proposed development will have on the existing public sewer network. This initial study indicates that there is an increased risk of flooding unless any required network reinforcement is provided by Southern Water. Any such network reinforcement will be part funded through the New Infrastructure Charge with the remainder funded through Southern Water's Capital Works programme. Southern Water and the Developer will need to work together in order to review if the delivery of our network reinforcement aligns with the proposed occupation of the development, as it will take time to design and deliver any such reinforcement.

The planning application form makes reference to drainage using Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS). Under current legislation and guidance SUDS rely upon facilities which are not adoptable by sewerage undertakers. Therefore, the applicant will need to ensure that arrangements exist for the long term maintenance of the SUDS facilities.

It is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.

Land uses such as general hardstanding that may be subject to oil/petrol spillages should be drained by means of oil trap gullies or petrol/oil interceptors. The design of drainage should ensure that no land drainage or ground water is to enter public sewers network.

Due to the vibration, noise and potential odour generated by sewage pumping stations, no habitable rooms should be located closer than 15 metres to the boundary of a proposed pumping station site.

Conditions are requested.

Highways England

Comments received 21/04/2020 - summarised by officer

Recommend that conditions (and informatives) should be attached to any planning permission that may be granted.

1) The application does not demonstrate a Design Manual for Roads and Bridges compliant pedestrian/cyclist footway between the site and the wider network, and in particular in the vicinity of the proposed turning head at the A27/Oving Road crossroads.

If the Council wishes to permit the development, this matter (particularly at the current time when it is not possible to carry out fully compliant Stage 1 or 2 Road Safety Audits) can be dealt with by way of a Condition.

2) The applicant should make a relevant contribution to the A27 Local Plan mitigations in line with Chichester District Council's SPD "Approach for securing development contributions to mitigate additional traffic impacts on the A27 Chichester Bypass".

In view of the likely impacts on the A27 Chichester Bypass, a contribution in line with the "Other Chichester City" development zone would appear to be the most appropriate. This would equate to a total of £373,945 (143 dwellings x £2,615/dwelling).

3) The proposals include the construction of a 4.0m high acoustic fence on the boundary of the site with the A27. The submitted landscape and enclosure drawings do not include, as required the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, a Road Restraint Appraisal nor structural nor geotechnical details. This matter can be dealt with by way of a condition.

4) A Condition is required to ensure the integrity of the highway drainage systems.

5) A Condition is required to secure a travel plan.

Comments received 03/04/2020

Having reviewed the proposed layout, while Highways England does not object to the principle of the proposal, we have concerns with locating the crossing within the turning head and consider that it is not acceptable from a road safety perspective. As such, the location of the crossing will need to be reviewed and we would expect the alignment of the shared facility to avoid the turning head, which looks like it should be achievable with relocation of the turning head and adjustment of the position of the stop line to the signals.

Comments received 11/12/2019 - summarised by officer

Until we have received and accepted the outstanding information we will not be in a position to determine if the proposal will materially affect the safety, reliability and / or operation of the SRN (the tests set out in DfT C2/13, particularly paragraphs 9 & 10, and DCLG NPPF, particularly paragraph 109).

Comments received 17/10/2019 - summarised by officer

Highways England will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact on the safe and efficient operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN), in this case, the A27.

There is a footpath proposed leaving the site at the northwest corner, however, there does not appear to be any infrastructure beyond the site boundary to link this to the existing/proposed pedestrian/cycle infrastructure and this should be provided. Therefore, a plan is required from the applicant to show what is proposed in this respect.

Accordingly, until such time as the information requested has been provided to enable Highways England to obtain a clear view of the impacts of this proposed development on the SRN (the tests set out in DfT C2/13 para 10 and DCLG NPPF para 32), our informal advice is that you should not approve this application because of the potential for harm to the Strategic Road Network.

Natural England

Comments received 01/05/2020 - regarding the appropriate assessment *Summarised by Officer*

Natural England advises that the specific measures previously identified and analysed by your Authority to prevent harmful effects on coastal European Sites from increased recreational pressure should be applied to this proposed development at appropriate assessment. Natural England is of the view that if these measures, including contributions to them, are implemented, they will be effective and reliable in preventing harmful effects on the European Site(s) for the duration of the proposed development.

Providing that the appropriate assessment concludes that these measures must be secured as planning conditions or obligations by your authority to ensure their strict implementation for the full duration of the development, and providing that there are no other adverse impacts identified by your authority's appropriate assessment, Natural England is satisfied that this appropriate assessment can ascertain that there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of the European Site in view of its conservation objectives.

Comments received 16/10/2019 - Summarised by Officer

Since this application will result in a net increase in residential accommodation, impacts to the coastal Special Protection Area(s) and Ramsar Site(s) may result from increased recreational disturbance. An appropriate assessment is required.

The proposal comprises new housing development and has inevitable waste water implications. It is Natural England's view that if this proposal were to connect to a waste water treatment works (WwTW) that discharges to Chichester Harbour, then the impact of that discharge must be included in the Habitats Regulations Assessment. However, if the development were to connect to Tangmere WwTW, this would remove any likely significant effect from waste water, as this works does not discharge to any European site.

Chichester Harbour Conservancy - Summarised by officer

No objection, subject to first negotiating an increase in the number of bird and bat boxes. Then securing additional SRMP mitigation contribution and imposing planning conditions to require a proportionate amount of public open space within the development and ensuring foul and surface water drainage is properly provided.

Even with the introduction of 2 x 3 storey blocks of (6) apartments facing the western boundary, the majority of the dwellings are two storey and there would be no impact to the setting of the Chichester Harbour AONB.

The A27 represents a huge barrier, so issues of integration and connectivity to day to day services/employment in Chichester only seem to favour the vehicle user, which does not seem very sustainable, in terms of Policies 1 and 33 of the Local Plan. There is currently no footway on the southern side of Oving Road, so one needs to cross to the north side if one is cross the large signalised junction with the A27. Even if one uses the internal proposed footway leading to the north-west corner of the site, there is only grassed highway verge to the side of the A27, which one would have to walk over to reach the junction with Oving Road.

There is no circular route per se around the whole site, but reasonable opportunities to walk a dog and not need to visit Chichester Harbour's shoreline to do that.

The overall quantum of open space to serve the development has been squeezed.

Police

Comments received: 08/04/2020 *Summarised by Officer*

Reference made to SBD Homes 2019 Chapter 10 Dwelling Boundaries 10:1 - 10:3, Chapter 17 Planting in new developments 17:1 -17:3.

From a crime prevention perspective I note that P18 - 1586 12 REV D substitute plan 10/3/20 enclosure plan shows a shared access/secure gate keys to be provided to 2 residents. This access abuts plots 74 and 75. This type of right of way has the potential to be abused as neighbours could block the shared access path. Keys can be lost or passed on and this type of access depends on both neighbours respecting both each other and the mutual shared space. Natural surveillance is key as this area is to the rear of the garden space and will not be readily overlooked. Open fencing to a height of 1.8 meters with 300mm of trellis topping would be advised in this instance.

Comments received: 16/10/2019 *Summarised by Officer*

I refer to a previous planning applications (O/16/02254/OUT and our letter PE/CHI/16/02A dated 29th July 2016) and planning application (O/19/01416/REM and our letters NW/CHI/19/13B dated 22nd July 2019 and letter NW/CHI/16/13C dated 19th September 2019) to which in the main, all matters remain extant.

Advice given on door entry systems, mail delivery, lightweight wall systems, lighting specifications for the blocks of flats.

Noted that collapsible bollards are now indicated within the plans to deter unauthorised access through the emergency access point on the east side of the development.

Advice given on footpath safety and Lighting and reference to Secured by Design Homes 2019.

WSCC Highways

Comments received 17/04/2020 - *summarised by officer*

The LPA has advised the CHA that the applicants have confirmed that they will not be providing responses to the points previously raised. Therefore, the LPA has requested further comments from the CHA in response to the information provided so far.

Reviewing the comments made in both previous sets of highways comments and based on the information provided so far, it is the CHA's view that the majority of the points raised could be secured by planning condition (albeit that some might need some minor amendments prior to final build - the detail of which could be built-into the wording of said conditions) - save one which is the proposal for a non-motorised route in the north-eastern corner of the site leading to/from the A27

and Oving crossroads. Given the lack of design and safety information in the form of a formal Design Check and Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and that some of it lies outside of the red boundary edging of the application site, this component of the proposal should be secured by S106 Agreement.

With regard to additional traffic impact of the development and suitability of the access to accommodate additional traffic movements, that provided as part of the 100-home development on the site would suffice. The access has gone through appropriate design and safety checks for the earlier 100 home scheme and the increase in traffic is only moderate. Therefore, that proposed could not, in the CHA's opinion, be considered to conflict with the NPPF on this occasion.

Should the LPA be minded to decide the application on the basis of the information provided so far, the CHA is not minded to object to the proposals subject to planning conditions to secure vehicular access (including visibility splays etc.); emergency access; internal estate road layout and associated visibility requirements at junctions and accesses; off-street parking; visitor parking; (including EV parking for both); cycle parking and construction management plan.

A S106 should secure: Travel Plan; non-motorised connection to/from the A27 and, in-turn, to Oving crossroads; real time passenger bus information and new bus stops on Shopwhyke Road (the latter if not already secured from other developments).

Comments received 15/04/2020 - summarised by officer

Additional information still required.

Regarding the footpath/cycleway link to the north-west of the site, an indicative design has now been provided. The CHA will require a design commentary and Stage 1 Road Safety Audit to accompany the proposal.

Path around the boundary of the site now appears to be shown 3m in width.

Comments received 09/10/2019 - summarised by officer

Additional information required including

- Updated Road Safety Audit
- Up to date personal injury accident report should be added to the Transport Assessment
- Clarification of roads to be offered for adoption under S38
- Visibility splays to be shown
- Evidence that latest (August 2019) WSCC parking guidance has been used to inform overall parking provision.
- Amendments to plans requested including length of driveways, increase in visitor parking and more evening distributed, positioning of footways, footpath widths, tactile paving at junctions to be provided, details of speed controlling features at key junctions, rumble strips, gate to electricity sub-station and underground pumping station, access arrangements for fire tender/appliance
- Further details of path that appears to emerge to the A27 on the western-side of the development close to Oving traffic lights and any design and Road Safety Audit assessments/considerations - including off-site infrastructure on the public highway. At present, there is no footway or cycleway on land outside of the site adjacent to Oving traffic lights. Any path would need to demonstrate connections reflecting both the current road layout and that proposed as part of the nearby Shopwhyke Lakes proposals.
- Travel plan to be updated in-line with current WSCC guidance.
- Provision of EV charging points within the development layout

The TA update sets-out the additional impact of a further 43 dwellings compared to 100 previously approved in outline. Using the trip rates for the approved 100 home development for the additional 43 homes, this shows the following:

AM peak period (08:00-09:00) - 9 arrivals and 19 departures
PM peak period (17:00-18:00) - 18 arrivals and 11 departures

WSCC Lead Local Flood Authority

Current surface water flood risk based on 30year and 100year events - Low Risk
Current surface water mapping shows that the majority of the proposed site is at low risk from surface water flooding although some higher risk does exist along the southern boundary of the site in association with the watercourse.

Modelled groundwater flood hazard classification - High Risk

Ordinary Watercourses nearby? - Yes

Records of any historic flooding within the site? - No

The Flood Risk Assessment included with this application states that ponds/swales system, with a restricted discharge to the watercourse, would be used to control the surface water runoff from the site. As per the District Drainage Engineer's comments, full infiltration/winter groundwater monitoring should be undertaken to ensure how and where infiltration might be incorporated into the drainage designs.

Conditions to secure a SUDs scheme and its maintenance and management are recommended.

CDC Housing Enabling Officer

Comments received 03/04/2020 - summarised by officer

The numbers and the affordable mix are acceptable and compliant with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment recommendations.

The units however are generally very small often not meeting the Department of Communities And Local Government Technical Housing standards - nationally described space standards. While the council has not yet adopted these as policy, it is disappointing to see these minima not being met. The benefits of having larger sized family units are somewhat reduced by providing single bedrooms.

Still unacceptable pepper-potting, policy which requires no more than 10 affordable units together on a non-strategic site.

The affordable units must be externally indistinguishable to the market housing and handed over to an approved registered provider, preferably one of the council's developing partners, on completion. Attention is drawn to the council's s106 requirement to approve a registered provider and the timescales in which this must take place.

Market Housing (100 units)

The SHMA recommendations compared to the proposals (in brackets) are:

1&2b	35%	35 no.	(36%	36 no.)
3b	50%	50 no.	(47%	47 no.)
4b	15%	15 no.	(17%	17 no.)

This market mix is a considerable improvement on the previous one. While it has two more 4b units than the SHMA recommendations, it has an extra 2b one and so I am satisfied with the market mix.

Comments received 11/12/2019 - summarised by officer

The proposals have too many market 4b houses and too few 2b ones, and need adjusting accordingly.

CDC Archaeology Officer

Report requested.

CDC Drainage Engineer

Comments received 07/04/2020

We have reviewed the updated plans and found that the surface water drainage scheme involves no significant change from what we have already commented on.

Comments received 02/10/2020 - summarised by officer

A surface water drainage strategy has been submitted that demonstrates that there is adequate room for surface water drainage. Infiltration tests were completed very deep and groundwater monitoring did not cover the winter period. We would encourage shallow winter infiltration tests to be completed to determine if infiltrating permeable paving is viable. Ground water monitoring must be completed over the winter to ascertain if lining of basins will be required, and if so what measures will be required to resist floatation.

Conditions are recommended to ensure that the development is adequately drained and does not increase flood risk elsewhere.

CDC Environmental Health Officer - noise

Comments received 08/06/2020) - summarised by officer

Reference is made to the latest Environmental Noise Assessment from Noise.co.uk Ltd (Prepared 2nd March 2020, Ref: 19424B-1-R1), herein referred to as the Noise Assessment.

The noise mitigation proposals outlined in the Noise Assessment are accepted. It is now evident that the Noise Assessment has been based on the latest relevant layout design plans for the proposed development, namely plans P18-1586 01 REV AG and P18-1586 02 REV AG.

As was previously the case for 19/01416/REM (Redrow Homes 18.12.2019), the applicant shall be required to produce a "Statement of Scheme of Noise Protection", to confirm the mitigation measures that shall be implemented as part of the development. This should be secured by condition and shall include:

- o Glazing and ventilators used in the development shall meet the minimum performance levels and sound insulation specifications.
- o The acoustic fencing shall meet minimum performance levels. It is recognised that a 4m high fencing structure is high and potentially imposing. It may be an option to place a smaller fence on to an earth bund to create the desired 4m height and maintain the same acoustic performance.
- o The garden fencing for the whole development shall be at least 1.8m high and meet the specifications detailed in Section 10.4.6 of the Noise Assessment.
- o Validation testing

Comments received 31/03/2020) - summarised by officer

It is noted that substitute site layout plans have been submitted, dated 10th March 2020, namely plans P18-1586 01 REV AG and P18-1586 02 REV AG. These plans propose a 4m high acoustic

fence to the west and south west boundaries of the application site. Clarification is sought as to the intended noise mitigation measures and the noise impact at the proposed dwellings. The noise assessment should be updated to account for the newly submitted plans and sent to our department for further comment.

Comments received 11/10/2019) - summarised by officer

Our department has no objection to the principle for residential dwellings at site. It is evident however, that a finalised scheme of noise protection still has to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. It is recognised that Noise.co.uk's Environmental Noise Assessment (Ref: 19424-1-R1, dated 23/7/2019) can form the basis for the finalised scheme of noise protection.

o The environmental sound survey took place over a very limited 24 hour period from Thursday 8th November to Friday 9th November 2018. An extended survey to include a weekend period would have been expected. Fortunately, the survey took place when there was a south west prevailing wind, providing a positive wind vector from the A27 to the application site. For this reason only, it is not considered that a further survey shall be required.

o Figure 10 demonstrates that extensive areas of outdoor amenity shall be exposed to unacceptable noise levels, namely above 55dB LAeq,16hrs (07.00-23.00) even with the acoustic fencing in place. It is therefore evident that good quality garden fencing, 1.8m high, shall be a requirement to attain acceptable noise levels within the proposed garden areas.

o It is noted that even with the recommended acoustic fencing that facades to the western boundary namely flats 112 117, 82 87 and 72 77 are to be exposed to noise levels of up to 67dB LAeq,daytime and up to 63dB LAeq,night-time. It is considered that more consideration should be given to the orientation of rooms with in the submitted plans to orientate sensitive rooms, such as bedrooms, away from the major A27 noise source. Such measures as placing sensitive rooms away from noise sources would be considered good acoustic design to be included in a scheme of noise protection.

CDC Environmental Health Officer - Contaminated Land - summarised by officer

A number of documents have been submitted in relation to land contamination. These documents are detailed in the Eastwood and Partners Remediation Implementation Plan dated October 2019 section 2. Phase 1 and phase 2 investigations were undertaken and a gas risk assessment during the period 2015 - 2019. The Remediation Implementation Plan gives details of the proposed mitigation measures and the objectives are detailed in section 3 of the report. The report also highlights that there may be unexpected areas of contamination at the site and if these are encountered, a procedure is detailed in section 7 of the report to ensure such areas are dealt with appropriately. Conditions are recommended to ensure that the remediation required is carried out at the development and is verified on completion.

A gas risk assessment has been submitted produced by Eastwood and Partners dated August 2019. This report has been undertaken in accordance with accepted guidance and includes sampling results and a risk assessment. The report concludes in section 5 that gas protective measures are required at the site, consistent with Amber 2 of the NHBC guidance. We agree with the conclusions of the report and conditions should be put in place to require the measures in section 5 to be put in place and verification on completion.

CDC Environmental Health Officer - Air quality - summarised by officer

AQ assessment Aug 2019, refers to a previous air quality assessment completed in 2016 which considered the potential impact of a proposed development of up to 100 dwellings. The 2019

assessment presents the findings of the potential air quality impacts of the proposed development during both the construction and operational phases.

The conclusions of the new assessment confirm that residual effects of the construction phase on air quality will be negligible providing suitable mitigation measures are put in place. Based on the proposed increase in traffic flows due to the increased number of dwellings, an assessment has been made of pollutant concentrations and no significant increases in NO₂, PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} are predicted and no exceedances of the relevant statutory air quality objectives would occur at assessment receptors. Concentrations of pollutants at new receptors at the application site were predicted to be well below the relevant statutory air quality objectives. We agree with the conclusions of the report and recommend that the mitigation measures are secured by condition.

Recommend a condition is put in place to ensure cabling for electric vehicle charging is available at all properties.

CDC Environmental Strategy Officer - Sustainable design and construction

Comments received 08/06/2020 - Summarised by officer

We are disappointed to see that within the Sustainability Statement (June 2020) the previously proposed PV which was included within the Sustainability Statement (March 2020) has now been omitted and a fabric first approach only has now been proposed. This will result in a reduction in CO₂ emissions by 5.32%. As part of Policy 40 we require that renewable technologies are incorporated into the scheme and a reduction in CO₂ emissions of around 19% is achieved for the site through fabric first and renewable technologies. Currently the Sustainability Statement (June 2020) does not meet these requirements.

Comments received 25/03/2020 - Summarised by Officer

These updated comments are based on the Sustainability Statement prepared by JSP Ltd and dated March 2020. We are pleased to see the commitment by the applicant to implement measures to achieve a reduction in CO₂ emissions of 19%. This will be achieved with a fabric first approach and through installing PV on new units on site. Please can we have confirmation on how many units will have PV panels on it.

Comments received 30/09/2019 - Summarised by Officer

These comments are based on the Sustainability Statement prepared by JSP Ltd and dated July 2019.

Table 3 sets out the calculation to demonstrate an internal water consumption design calculation of 101.44l/p/d. This exceeds the standards required. A condition must be attached to any permission to require the optional Part G standard of 110l/p/d to apply as this will then allow whichever body is enforcing the building regulations for the development to enforce the requirement.

The use of material that are mostly rated A or A+ by the BRE green guide is to be welcomed this is in line with the policy expectations. However no specific data is provided on the embodied carbon of the materials (or a total for the development). Also there is no information on what proportion, if any, of the materials are recycled. I must assume that no recycled or reclaimed materials are to be used. Without further information my view is that the policy requirements of this paragraph are only partially met.

This is the main area of concern about the proposals. Although the building materials specified are clearly an improvement on the 2013 Building regulation standards, the overall improvement in CO₂ emissions is only 5.47%. This clearly does not constitute a minimisation, even within current market conditions of large greenfield development. Other recent developments in the District of

similar scale on greenfield site shave easily achieved reductions within the 12-19% range. No reference is made to the se of passive solar design and the layout confirms this.

In addition no use of renewable energy sources is proposed. The purpose of the policy is twofold to reduce carbon emission and to make renewable energy installation a normal part of new development. Solar hot water, solar PV, air source heat pumps, ground source heat pumps and even small scale biomass boilers would all be suitable for a site such as this. District heating and CHP based schemes may also be viable at this scale. Consideration of these technologies and reason for their use or their rejection should normally form part of a sustainability statement.

The policy overall makes reference to flexibility provision, but only on the basis of quantitative financial evidence. Unless site specific abnormal costs exist or there are other pieces of financial evidence that have not yet been submitted then it is difficult to conclude that the policy requirements have been met in regard to this paragraph.

The layouts give little evidence of consideration of adaptation measures, other than provision of sustainable drainage system, this aspect is not covered in the sustainability statement.

Again this is not mentioned in the statement. The provision of minimum of 20% E charging points and ducting for the preparation of the remaining 80% is confirmed in a separate e-mail from Redrow of 17 September 2019 and this would meet the policy requirements as well as WSCC requirements.

CDC Environmental Strategy Officer - Ecology

Comments received 25/03/2020 - Summarised by Officer

A number of enhancements have been included within the updated Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement plan (March 2020). We require a number of further updates as follows.

- o Currently it has been proposed that 4 bat boxes will be installed on site within mature trees. However we require that bat boxes /tiles/bricks are integrated into the fabric of the new buildings, with at least 15% if new properties having bat boxes. This equates to 21 bat boxes/tiles/bricks.
- o Currently it has been proposed that there will be 10 bird boxes installed onsite, with two boxes installed within the trees onsite and 8 within the new units. As detailed within our previous comments we require that more bird boxes are installed onsite with at least 15% of new units having bird boxes either on a the building or tree. This would equate to 21 bird boxes across the site in total.
- o More information provided on the environmental precautions which will be put in place during the construction period to ensure protected species and habitats are not harmed and / or disturbed from the works.

Comments received 30/09/2019 - Summarised by Officer

The hedgerows on site are used by bats for commuting and foraging and will need to be retained and enhanced for bats. This will include having a buffer strip around the hedgerows (5m) and during construction fencing should be used to ensure this area is undisturbed. Any gaps should also be filled in using native hedge species to improve connectivity. Conditions should be used to ensure this.

The lighting scheme for the site will need to take into consideration the presence of bats in the local area and the scheme should minimise potential impacts to any bats using the trees, hedgerows and buildings by avoiding unnecessary artificial light spill through the use of directional light sources and shielding.

Following submission of the Updated Ecological Impact Assessment (July 2019) we are happy that the mitigation proposed would be suitable. A condition should be used to ensure this takes place.

Prior to start on site a badger survey should be undertaken to ensure badgers are not using the site. If a badger sett is found onsite, Natural England should be consulted and a mitigation strategy produced.

Any works to the trees or vegetation clearance on the site should only be undertaken outside of the bird breeding season which takes place between 1st March 1st October. If works are required within this time an ecologist will need to check the site before any works take place (with 24 hours of any work).

A number of enhancements have been included within the Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement plan (Sept 2019) there are a number of changes we require including provision of bird and bat boxes and precautions during construction.

For this application we are satisfied that the only HRA issue is recreational disturbance and as long as the applicant is willing to provide a contribution to the Bird Aware scheme.

CDC Contract Services (Waste)

Comments received 15/04/2020

I have looked at the amended plans and have no concerns, or further comments.

Comments received 15/10/2019- Summarised by Officer

Refer to waste storage and collection service guide.

Individual properties would require one waste and one recycling bin. These come in two different sizes 140 litre or 240 litre, the general rule is for up to two persons in a household we would recommend 140 litre bins for up to four persons 240 litre bins.

In the instances of communal apartments there are two options available, either individual bins as above or bulk communal bins. If bulk communal bins are preferred then the number of bins required depends on how many apartments they serve. Generally bulk bins have a capacity of 1100 litres, the number of bins required can be calculated by taking the numbers of apartments in the block and multiplying it by 240 (litres), then divide is by 1100 (litres).

I would ask that attention is paid to the size, weight and turning circle of our freighters. Our freighter should not have to reverse over excessive distances and all turning areas should be sufficient in size to cater for our large refuse freighters.

I note in most areas a bin collection point has been made available, preventing the need for our refuse freighter to enter dead end/mews. However I note plots 32-41 is accessed via a blocked paved road, please confirm if this surface is suitable to take the weight of the vehicle. I would also like to see the confirmation that the turning heads on site are sufficient in size to cater for our vehicle.

In areas where the refuse freighter is required to service a small mews/dead end road. If there is insufficient room for a turning area to be incorporated into a mews/dead end road we would require a communal collection point for bins at the entrance to the road. Which I note the developer has provided in most instances on this site.

All road surfaces should be constructed in a material suitably strong enough to take the weight of a 26 tonne vehicle. I would discourage the use of concrete block paving unless it is of a highway standard, as these tend to move under the weight of our vehicles.

To prevent access issues please may I insist that either parking restrictions are put in place, or adequate visitor parking is provided to prevent visitors from parking at the side of the road. Failure to address this issue at this stage may result in our refuse crew not being able to carry out their collections.

Generally the collection point should be outside the front of the property just inside the property boundary, at the closest point to the public highway. However in the instances of shared driveways the bins would be required to be presented at the entrance of the driveway, or bin collection points if made available.

All communal bin storage areas should be sufficient in size to enable our collection crews to manoeuvre the bins out for emptying without the need to move other bins first.

CDC Design and Conservation Officer

Comments received 14/04/2020 - Summarised by officer

The close that comprises plots 66-71 (plot numbers have been altered following previous comments) has been slightly altered due to other layout changes however the layout remains compromised with the siting of plots 67-68 facing the side of plot 66. The plots formerly positioned like back land development have been removed and the layout reconfigured which is considered more successful.

The 4m height of the proposed acoustic screen is likely to appear very dominant and unsightly particularly from within the development. Is the proposed height increase due to the closer proximity of the housing?

The layout of plots 104-108 (formerly plots 88-90) appears uncomfortable.

The proposed path to the rear of the existing houses on Shopwyke Road is now open to the development. Whilst non-obscure first floor windows would not be appropriate due to overlooking consideration should be given to the provision of ground floor windows overlooking the path from plots 81 and 75 as the path currently has very little passive surveillance.

There remain long lengths / large expanses of car parking. Whilst there has been some additional soft landscaping added the layout alterations have led to there be a greater number of parking spaces positioned in rows in front of the houses dominating the street scene particularly to the east and west of the site.

The arrangement of the parking for plots 122-125 (formerly 78-81) and the flat block 113-121 (formerly 72-77) has been altered and additional parking. This has further reduced the amount of soft landscaping. It remains considered that the layout in this part of the proposed development is compromised and the relationship of the housing with the street is uncomfortable. It is considered that this should be improved and if necessary fewer units proposed to reduce the parking space demand and enable a more satisfactory layout.

Comments on corner turners and elevations with high visibility.

Comments received 13/12/2019 - Summarised by officer

Materials - It is considered there is a good amount of variation within the proposed material palette. The green space to the centre of the site is surrounded by all slate grey tiles. Is there scope to add some variety to the roof materials in this area?

Character - based on traditional character on the whole well detailed to front elevations. Most side and rear elevations are lacking in detail however this is not of concern unless they are highly visible.

Connections - There is limited opportunity for connection on to Shopwyke Road so this is a good as it can be. Within the site there is one spine road and a series of dead end roads and closes so the development is relatively fragmented. This is slightly overcome through the pedestrian connections.

The close that comprises plots 133-136 and 12-13 is considered to have a compromised layout due to the siting of the houses with plots 12-13 addressing the side of plot 135. It is considered this layout could be improved. Plots 129 and 130 appear like back land development located to the rear of a number of plots. It is considered given that this area of the site is not so restricted that this is the only viable layout. It is considered that this layout could be improved. Is there any scope to improve/secure the possibility of future connections to link with potential future developments or for land to be retained to make this possible if needed at the time?

Working with the site and its context - How the development addresses Shopwyke Road is not consistent with the pattern of development established by the existing housing. Whilst from previous discussions it is understood this is to remove the new housing from being in a close proximity to the road it is considered there is potentially scope for improvement to the current design. The new development fronts the existing road at an angle, if the neighbouring field is to be developed this has the potential to create a random pattern of development along this part of Shopwyke Road.

The site layout has been designed to provide a barrier with the A27. The green space located between the housing and the A27 is reduced within this scheme however it is still considered that a sufficient amount of open space is provided within the development.

Well Defined Streets and Spaces -The entrance to the site and the spine road lacks variation in corner turning properties. There are currently proposed a number of situations where either blank facades or very plain facades front the street scene, this needs to be reconsidered and addressed.

The open spaces all benefit from passive surveillance with dwellings situated to face over the green spaces. The play area is situated centrally within the development in a location with good levels of overlooking, whilst retaining some distance to neighbouring properties. It is considered adding fenestration to the side elevation of plot 53 would improve the current lack of passive surveillance along this part of the site boundary.

The positioning of plots 88-90 appears uncomfortable. The placing of houses here does not seem to work well as there is always going to be issues with the boundaries of the gardens having high visibility in either the street scene or from the green open space / path. Given the constraints flats are likely to be a more successful form of development in that there does not need to be defined boundary treatments. This would also allow for improved passive surveillance of the pathway and green area.

The positioning of plot 91 does not relate well to the building lines within this part of the development. It is considered this could be improved.

Plots 110,110 and 139 are all situated adjacent to each other and are the same house type (with render on 110). The street scene A-A2 is otherwise relatively varied so the repetition of the house type three times in a row appears at odds with the rest of the street scene.

On the whole it is considered most of the issues with layout could be resolved through a slight reduction in density and or reconsidering the house types proposed.

Street surfaces - The street surfaces show some variation in surface finish which should encourage reduced vehicle speeds particularly in shared surface areas.

Footways and paths - On the whole these are located in positions where they are overlooked by homes which enables passive surveillance and should encourage users to feel more secure (this is considered the case except in the areas previously noted as needing improvement). It is not clear from the site layout if the path to the rear of the existing houses along Shopwyke Road is still proposed as part of the development. If it is this is likely to lack passive surveillance therefore it should be ensured there are measures in place to prevent unwanted access to this path.

Car Parking - There are different approaches to car parking throughout the site. This is most successful where private driveways are proposed as part of a landscaped frontage. Where smaller semi-detached or terrace properties are proposed the parking arrangements are currently not as successful and have the potential to dominate the street scene. Within the current layout all the car parking is location in situations where it is overlooked.

There are long lengths / large expanses of car parking which is relatively uninterrupted by planting or other features within the street scene, it is considered this could be better addressed plots 30-41 / 46-49 / 94-92 / 188-124 . Plots 123-128 and plots 103-106 are currently situated on a street that would be visually dominated by parking both sides of the road. Reconsidering the mix of house types in this area could assist with over coming this by allowing some houses to have driveways with parking to the side rather than to the front of the house.

The arrangement of the parking for plots 78-81 and the flat block 72-77 appears cramped and squeezed in to the space resulting in a compromised and visually unsatisfactory layout . It is considered that this could be improved and if necessary fewer units proposed to reduce the parking space demand and enable a more satisfactory layout.

Comments on corner turners and elevations with high visibility, requiring constancy of detailing on facades and increased fenestration. Comments on the design details of the proposed flat blocks including detailing and design of the front elevations.

Third Party Representations

One letter of objection has been received concerning;

- Bulk of affordable/social housing adjacent A27 with noise and air pollution - marginalising the most vulnerable in the community.
- Poor design
- No renewables
- Inaccuracies in travel plan
- 1km from SDNP - landscape views should be protected
- Insufficient infrastructure
- Southern Water has concerns
- Insufficient gap has been left between existing properties on Shopwhyke Road and the units marked 118/119.
- Once the Oving traffic lights are fully closed, all traffic from this development (and the development for UMA House) will be routed through the Shopwyke Lakes spine road.
- Traffic and highway safety issues - concerns for children
- Increasing numbers of cyclists are using the path along Shopwhyke Road (the road itself is simply too dangerous for cycling, given a lack of adherence to the 30 mile an hour speed limit, and cars parked in the road).
- There is a possibility that there will be no public bus service running through the Oving traffic lights
- Only one pedestrian bridge over A27

- There is pavement along one side of Shopwyke Road only, used by pedestrians, cyclists and parked cars. Anyone with a pushchair is forced into the road.

One letter of general observation has been received on the following grounds:

- There are no gates shown on boundary of land to be transferred as agreed between existing properties and Redrow.
- security concerns with a deadend small dark alleyway being created behind existing properties
- The close proximity of plot DART 118 to neighbouring boundary would result in loss of privacy and green outlook.
- No issue with the extra 43 dwellings

3. Relevant Planning Policy

The principal policies and neighbourhood plans relevant to the consideration of this application are as follows:

Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029:

Policy 1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Dev

Policy 2 Dev Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy

Policy 4 Housing Provision

Policy 8 Transport and Accessibility

Policy 9 Development and Infrastructure

Policy 33 New Residential Development

Policy 34 Affordable Housing

Policy 39 Transport, Accessibility and Parking

Policy 40 Carbon Reduction Policy

Policy 42 Flood Risk

Policy 45 Development in the Countryside

Policy 47 Heritage

Policy 48 Natural Environment

Policy 49 Biodiversity

Policy 50 Dev and Dist of Birds in CC and Lgst Hbr

Policy 52 Green Infrastructure

Policy 54 Open Space, Sport and Recreation

Draft Local Plan Review 2035: Preferred Approach - December 2018

Chichester District Council adopted the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014- 2029 on 14 July 2015. The Council is currently reviewing and updating its Local Plan as required by Regulation 10A of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, to provide up to date planning policies which are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019. The Council consulted on the Local Plan Review 2016-2035 Preferred Approach (LPR) document between December 2018 and February 2019 under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Council anticipates that the LPR will be published for consultation under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 in Spring 2021, and that following this the Plan will be submitted to the Secretary of State for Independent Examination.

Policy S2 Settlement Hierarchy

Policy S6 Affordable Housing

Policy S12 Infrastructure Provision

Policy S20 Design

Policy S23 Transport and Accessibility

Policy S26 Natural Environment

Policy S31 Wastewater Management and Water Quality
Policy S32 Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites
Policy AL2 Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)

Policy DM8 Transport, Accessibility and Parking
Policy DM16 Sustainable Design and Construction
Policy DM18 Flood Risk and Water Management
Policy DM19 Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
Policy DM28 Natural Environment
Policy DM34 Open Space, Sport and Recreation including Indoor Sports Facilities and Playing Pitches

Draft Interim Policy Statement for Housing Development May 2020

From the 15 July 2020, the relevant housing policies contained within the adopted Local Plan will be deemed to be 'out of date', however the Chichester District Council adopted the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014- 2029 will remain part of the statutory development plan (until the LPR is adopted) and will continue to provide the basis for the consideration of planning applications for development within the Plan area.

Until the LPR is adopted, the Council must continue to judge planning applications on their own individual merits with reference to the adopted Development Plan and national planning policy including the NPPF. The Council has approved a Draft Interim Policy Statement for Housing Development, which will apply until the Council considers it has a five year supply of housing in line with Government guidance.

The Council recognises the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and its application where the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. While the presumption applies, the Council will seek to ensure that planning applications for good quality housing developments of an appropriate scale and in accessible locations are supported.

The Draft Interim Policy Statement for Housing Development was approved by the Planning Committee on 3rd June 2020. This statement sets out criteria set of what the Council considers good quality development in the Chichester Local Plan area, with reference to adopted and emerging Local Plan policy and evidence.

National Policy and Guidance

NPPF 2019

Section 2. Achieving sustainable development
Section 4. Decision-making
Section 5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
Section 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities
Section 9. Promoting sustainable transport
Section 11. Making effective use of land
Section 12. Achieving well-designed places
Section 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
Section 15. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Other Local Policy and Guidance

Consideration has also been given to:

- o Surface Water and Foul Drainage SPD
- o Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD
- o CDC PGN3: Design Guidelines for Alterations to Dwellings and Extensions
- o CDC Waste Storage and Collection Guidance

4. Planning Considerations

The main issues arising from this proposal are:

- i. Principle of development
- ii. Housing Mix and Affordable Housing Provision
- iii. Layout of the development, scale and detailed design
- iv. Highways and parking provision
- v. Impact on residential amenity
- vi. Standard of accommodation
- vii. Pollution
- viii. Flood risk and foul drainage
- ix. Ecology
- x. Habitat Regulations
- xi. Sustainability
- xii. Trees and landscaping
- xiii. Other matters
- xiv. Planning Obligations
- xv. CIL

i. Principle of Development

The site is located in the countryside, outside the settlement boundary for Chichester and therefore the proposed development is contrary to Policy 45 of the current Local Plan. The site forms part of the 'Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish) strategic site allocation subject to Policy AL2 if the CLP Review Preferred Approach. This draft policy identifies the site together with land to the immediate east and land to the north of Oving Road/ Shopwyke Road to provide approximately 585 dwellings, employment space and associated infrastructure. Given that the preferred approach has not yet reached examination stage, only very limited weight can be applied to this emerging policy in the assessment of the current application.

However, the principle of developing this site for residential use was established in the granting of outline planning permission at appeal in 2017 for 100 dwellings (reference 16/02254/OUT). Reserved matters were subsequently approved on 23/12/2019 (19/01416/REM). This permission remains extant with outstanding pre-commencement conditions that need to be satisfied.

Furthermore, the Council's Draft Interim Policy Statement for Housing Development supports housing development on sites where the site boundary is contiguous with an identified settlement boundary and where the scale of the development proposed is appropriate having regard to the settlement's location in the settlement hierarchy. Development proposals should make best and most efficient use of the land, whilst respecting the character and appearance of the settlement. The Council will encourage planned higher densities in sustainable locations where appropriate.

The current proposal seeks to uplift the numbers of dwellings on the site by 43 from that previously permitted by the outline and reserved matters permissions. As such, having regard to the Council's Draft Interim Policy Statement for Housing Development and paragraph 122 of the NPPF, an increase in residential units is acceptable in principle, subject to considerations set out in the following sections of this report.

The application site is considered to be in a sustainable location for residential development. It is to the east of the city and adjacent to the A27 Chichester By-pass. There are bus services close to the site. The site is approximately 2km from the city centre and is within 1km to 1.5km from retail parks and the local hospital, university and theatre.

ii. Housing Mix and Affordable Housing Provision

Policy 33 of the CLP identifies the need to provide an appropriate mix of dwellings and policy 34 of the CLP requires a 30% affordable housing contribution onsite for residential developments of 11 or more dwellings.

The proposal seeks 100 market dwellings and 43 affordable dwellings (equating to 30% of the number of dwellings proposed). The Council's Housing Enabling Officer has confirmed that the proposed mix is in accordance with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) recommendations for both affordable and market housing. However, has commented that the sizes of the affordable units do not meet the Department of Communities And Local Government Technical Housing standards - nationally described space standards and therefore the benefits of having larger sized family units are somewhat reduced by providing single bedrooms.

The affordable housing provision would be provided as a group of 19 units to the west, a block of 9 flats in the south-western corner and 15 units to the east of the site. The Council's Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD 2016 states that 'affordable units should be appropriately clustered in dispersed small groups, no more than 15 units on strategic sites as identified in the local plan and no more than 10 units on all other sites'. Whilst this site is currently being considered as part of the strategic site (policy AL2) in the Local Plan Review, it is not form part of a strategic site in the current local plan.

The 15 units to the east of the site would have the same layout as that permitted under 19/01416/REM. This was considered acceptable on balance in the determination of this extant permission given the requirements of the legal agreement associated with the outline planning permission and that there would be a mix of 6 affordable rent units and 9 intermediate units. Having regard to this fall-back position the 15 units to the east are considered acceptable.

However the western side of the application site would be dominated by affordable housing. The group of 19 affordable houses would be well in excess of 10 units stated in the Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD 2016. This would result in a segregated, unbalanced and unsustainable community and therefore would be contrary to paragraph 17.20 in the supporting text for policy 34 of the CLP and the Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD 2016.

iii. Layout of the development, scale and detailed design

Policy 33 of the CLP states that new residential development should meet the highest standards of design and provide a high quality living environment in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. It should provide an appropriate density of development and should respect and where possible enhance the character of the surrounding area and the site, in terms of its proportion, scale, form, massing and layout.

Layout

The applicant proposes a net density of 35.3dph, this only modestly exceeds the suggested density of 35dph in Paragraph 17.6 of the supporting text in the CLP and is therefore acceptable.

The open space in the centre of the site would provide a focal point for the development. The Council's Open Space Calculator requires 457sqm of equipped play space and 1,524sqm of amenity open space. An area measuring 470sqm is shown on the site plan to provide a LEAP, surrounding this there would be approximately 2,000sqm of open space. Further to this, there would be a triangular parcel of open space land in the south-western corner of the site which measures approximately 300sqm. The proposed development would therefore provide an adequate level of open space. This open space would have adequate overlooking of windows to promote natural surveillance.

Around the perimeter of the site there would be swales and a soft landscaping buffer with a footpath/cycle path. This would provide an appropriate transition to the open countryside to the east and south of the site and provide good pedestrian permeability within the site.

Criterion 10 of the Draft Interim Policy Statement for Housing states that 'Development should be sustainably located in accessibility terms, and include vehicular, pedestrian and cycle links to the adjoining settlement and networks and, where appropriate, provide opportunities to upgrade existing linkages.

The plans show a footpath to the north-western corner of the site leading towards the A27 and Oving Road crossroads. Such a link is considered necessary to provide a link to the City Centre and encourage sustainable transport modes such as walking and cycling in-line with the Draft Interim Policy Statement for Housing and policies 8, 13 and 39 of the CLP. The proposed development comprises housing only and as such there would be no onsite services. The A27 currently results in a barrier between the proposed development site and the City of Chichester. Without a pedestrian/cycle link in the north-western corner of the site future occupiers would need to leave the site through the vehicular access which is to the north-east of the site. There is currently no footway on the southern side of Oving Road, so they would then need to cross the road (in a location where there are no pedestrian crossing facilities), before walking west along Oving Road to the A27 junction where there is infrastructure to allow pedestrian crossing of the A27. For plot 81, this would mean a walk/cycle of approximately 640m to the crossroads if the link in the north-western corner of the site is not provided, opposed to a 100m route if it is provided. Without this pedestrian and cycle link, the proposed development would inherently favour the car for access to the city centre for services and employment. This would be unsustainable and would be at odds with commitments made by the Council in declaring a Climate Change Emergency in July 2019. Whilst it acknowledged that the Planning Inspector did not require such a link for the 100 dwelling scheme (16/02254/OUT), the current proposal seeks an uplift in the number of dwellings by 43%, furthermore, the proposed dwellings would be sited closer to the western boundary of the site. The applicant has refused to enter into a S106 to deliver the required off-site highway works to enable this link, as such, the proposal would be contrary to policies 8, 13 and 39 of the CLP and the Draft Interim Policy Statement for Housing.

The proposed layout results in a large number of junctions throughout the site to provide access to individual cul-de-sacs. The hierarchy of road widths with secondary streets leading to private drives serving small groups of properties will aid the legibility of the development. The principle street would have a turning head that would abut the eastern site boundary. This could provide an opportunity for the proposed development to connect to future development to the east, should the draft policy AL2 of the local plan review be adopted by the Council. Further to this the applicant has addressed the Parish's comments by providing a footpath up-to the southern boundary of the site.

The Council's Contract Services team are satisfied that the layout of the development would allow adequate access and turning for refuse vehicles as well as sufficient bin storage and collection points.

There are different approaches to car parking throughout the site. To the west of the site, the majority of parking spaces would be provided in the form of parking bays. This is a by-product of the large grouping of affordable units. This results in continuous lengths of hard standing with little relief. This form of parking would dominate the streetscene and result in harm to visual amenity.

To allow access to the gardens, the garages across the site would typically be set back from the rear elevation of the dwelling. In some cases the garage set back in combination with the large front garden area would result in particularly long driveways measuring upto 19m as in the case of plot 136. Whilst this would result in an increase in hardstanding on balance this is considered acceptable as the set back of the garages would help to prevent a terracing effect. Furthermore, the generous areas of soft landscaping to the front of the properties would help to soften the appearance of the built form in these areas of the site.

In the south-western corner of the site there would be a compromised layout owing to the quantum of units proposed in this corner. There would be juxtaposition between a three storey block of flats (units 113-121) and a row of terraced properties (units 122-125). This would result in an uncomfortable relationship between the housing, parking and the street. Furthermore, this would result in amenity issues for future occupiers discussed in detail later in this report.

Having regard to the above, whilst parts of the site would function well, the overall layout is considered unacceptable. There would be insufficient permeability due to the lack of commitment of the developer to deliver the footpath/cycle link and the associated off-site highway works to the north-west of the site. There would be an uncomfortable juxtaposition between built forms in the south-western corner of the site due to the number of units squeezed into this corner and the excessive expanses of hard standing for parking provision derived from the large grouping of affordable units. The Local Planning Authority have sought to work proactively with the applicant and have suggested amendments to overcome these issues, however, the applicant wishes for the application to be determined in its current form and as such, the poor layout forms a refusal reason.

Scale and detailed design

The application seeks predominantly two storey dwellings with single storey garages. There are 14 dwelling styles proposed, 1 type of maisonettes and 2 blocks of flats, one of which would be three storeys in height. The Chichester Harbour Conservancy have commented on the proposed development and are satisfied that the scale of the proposed development would not result in harm to the setting of the AONB.

The proposed properties would be of a traditional design with detailing such as tile hanging, porches, string courses, bay windows, brick detailing on elevations and around windows, windows with mullions and transoms and diamond and circular windows on some plots. There would be a mix of hipped and gable roof designs providing a varied and interesting roof scape.

Most side and rear elevations are lacking in detail, although not ideal officers are satisfied that the lack of detail on elevations that are not highly visible in the public domain would not result in material harm to the visual amenity of the site. The applicant has addressed some corner turner properties by providing dual aspect fenestration and appropriate detailing. However, the Council's Design and Conservation Officer notes that there are still corner plots that have not been adequately addressed. These include plots 122, 125, 135, which are all located on prominent corners. The side elevations have no fenestration and therefore they fail to provide adequate detail for principle elevations within the street scene. Furthermore, particularly in the case of plots 122 and 125 the lack of side fenestration prevents natural surveillance of the adjoining open space and parking provision.

Whilst a single three storey block of flats is not unacceptable in principle, the Council's Design and Conservation Officer has commented that the gables proposed on Block C appear overly narrow for the height of the building. This results in over emphasising the vertical height of the flat blocks. The eaves height of the entrance gable is also above the eaves for the rest of the building which visually appears out of keeping.

The rear elevations of both blocks of flats (Block A and Block C) lack detail. All the elevations of the proposed flat blocks would have a high level of visibility in the street scene and therefore the lack of detail fails to provide appropriate interest.

It is noted that the surrounding area comprises an eclectic mix of materials. The proposed materials would comprise three brick types, white render and red, brown and slate tiles, this is an appropriate variety of materials that would reflect the character of the area. However, the Council's Design and Conservation Officer has commented that during the course of the application render has been removed in a number of locations rather than continued the full extent of visible

elevations. This approach is considered detrimental particularly as this is likely to visually heighten the repetition in the house types used on corner turning plots such as the Amberley house type.

The affordable units would have different house types to the market dwellings. However, officers are satisfied that the level of detailing and variety of materials proposed would mean that the development would appear tenure blind in accordance with the Council's Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD.

The proposal also seeks a 4m high acoustic fence along the western site boundary. Views of this would be achieved from within the application site and from the A27. Owing to its height this would appear overly dominant and would be unsightly. However, it is noted that the Council's Environmental Protection Officer has stated that it may be an option to place a smaller fence on to an earth bund to create the desired 4m height and maintain the same acoustic performance. As such, appropriate engineering and soft landscaping could mitigate the harm to visual amenity.

The proposed plans show that along the site frontage on the northern boundary of the site, there would be a 1.8m high acoustic fence. This would appear utilitarian and would result in the unattractive enclosure of the development and would prevent the creation of an active frontage along Oving Road. However, it is noted that in the submitted noise assessment by noise.co.uk Ltd dated 2nd March 2020, this fence would only extend the length of the shared boundary with the Jehovah's witness hall and as such, it is considered that this is a drafting error on the plans and could be remedied through a planning condition.

In light of the above, the proposal fails to provide an appropriate layout and high quality design. The proposal would therefore result in material harm to visual amenity and would be contrary to Policy 33 of the CLP.

iv. Highways and parking provision

There would be 71 private garages for market dwellings. The proposed detached garages are considered to be appropriately located adjacent to the host dwellings. Given that the garages are in addition to the required parking provision, it is considered that the level of tandem parking is acceptable. All properties would have appropriate bike storage, either through the garage or a bike store in a rear garden. All gardens have side access, as such, future occupiers can easily access bikes without need to go through the property.

The County Highway Authority has assessed the application and has requested further information during the course of the application. Whilst the applicant has not submitted this requested information, the County Highway Authority is in agreement with officers that these issues could be adequately overcome through the use of planning conditions. Conditions could secure vehicular access (including visibility splays etc.), emergency access, internal estate road layout and associated visibility requirements at junctions and accesses, off-street parking and visitor parking (including EV parking for both), cycle parking and a construction management plan.

The submitted plans show a footpath/cycleway leading to the north-western corner of the site. As stated in the layout section of this report, officers consider the delivery of this is necessary to provide permeability and promote sustainable transport. Highways England has reviewed the indicative plan submitted for the off-site highway works required to achieve this link. Highways England does not object to the principle of providing this link to the existing pedestrian and cycle network, however note that the location of the crossing would need to be reviewed with the alignment of the shared facility to avoid the turning head. Highways England is satisfied that this could be achievable with relocation of the turning head and adjustment of the position of the stop line to the signals. The County Highway Authority require the submission design and safety information in the form of a formal Design Check and Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and recommend that the works outside the red site line be secured by a S106 Agreement. The applicant has refused to enter into a S106 agreement to deliver this and has not provided the design

amendments and supporting road safety audit, as such the proposal would be contrary to policies 8, 13 and 39 of the CLP and the Draft Interim Policy Statement for Housing.

v. Impact on residential amenity

The proposed layout would not result in material harm to existing neighbouring occupiers. The site plan shows that some land to the north-west of the site would be transferred in ownership to the adjoining properties along Oving Road. The Parish Council raised concern about plots being too close to existing properties on Shopwhyke Road. The applicant has submitted amended plans during the course of the application, these show that the closest plots would be approximately 6m to the new boundary. This is considered sufficient to prevent an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties. Third parties have raised concern that the proposal would result in the loss of a view however this is not a material planning consideration.

There would be no windows in the side elevation of plot 81, whilst there would be first floor windows in the side elevations of plots 74 and 75 these would serve stairways and a bathroom, as such it would be reasonable to impose a planning condition to require these to be obscure glazed to prevent a loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers.

In light of the above, the proposal would not result in material harm to neighbouring properties.

vi. Standard of accommodation

As previously discussed the contrived design of the south-western corner of the site would result in an awkward juxtaposition between Block 3 and the row of terraced properties 122-125. Block 3 is three storeys in height and would be 1m from the boundary with plots 124-125. Owing to the height and mass of Block 3, this would likely result in an overbearing impact on the future occupiers of plots 124 and 125. Furthermore, there would be first and second floor windows serving open plan kitchen areas. There would be a 12m separation distance between these windows and the windows on the rear elevation of plots 124 and 125. This significantly falls short of the Council's Design Guidelines for Alterations to Dwellings & Extensions guidance which states that 'to retain space and privacy, a distance of 21 metres minimum is normally required between the first floor habitable rooms of houses in a back to back situation or 30 metres where a full three storey development is proposed'... 'In situations where the proposed rear extension backs onto an existing side elevation, the normal requirement is 10 metres for rear to side elevations in the case of new two storey development and 15 metres for three storey development'. The proposal would therefore result in insufficient privacy to the future occupiers of plots 124 and 125.

In light of the above, the proposal fails to provide an adequate standard of accommodation and high quality living environment and therefore is contrary to Policy 33 of the CLP.

vii. Pollution

The western site boundary adjoins the A27 which is a source of noise. The Council's Environmental Protection Officer has assessed the proposal and has raised no objection to the principle for residential dwellings at this site. The revised plans submitted with the application shows that there would be a 4m high acoustic fence along the western boundary of the site, the submitted noise impact assessment prepared by Noise.co.uk has been updated accordingly. The Council's Environmental Protection Officer is satisfied with the proposal, subject to conditions to secure a Statement of Scheme of Noise Protection to confirm the mitigation measures and verification testing.

With regards to air pollution the applicant has submitted an air quality report dated August 2019. Which considers the potential air quality impacts of the proposed development during both the construction and operational phases. The Council's Environmental Protection Officer agrees with the conclusions of the report that residual effects of the construction phase on air quality will be

negligible providing suitable mitigation measures are put in place. This could be secured by condition.

The Council's Environmental Protection Officer has reviewed the submitted information regarding land contamination. Conditions would be required to ensure that appropriate remediation and verification is carried out.

viii. Flood risk and foul drainage

Surface Water Drainage

The application site is entirely within Flood Zone 1, where there is a low probability of river or sea flooding.

As part of the application documents the applicant has submitted a surface water drainage strategy, the Council's Drainage Engineer demonstrates that there is adequate room for surface water drainage. The submitted plans show that there would be space to accommodate swales around the perimeter of the site.

The Council's drainage engineer notes that infiltration tests were completed very deep and groundwater monitoring did not cover the winter period. Therefore if planning permission were to be granted a condition would be required to ensure winter infiltration tests to be completed to determine if infiltrating permeable paving is viable. Ground water monitoring must be completed over the winter to ascertain if lining of basins will be required, and if so what measures will be required to resist floatation.

Subject to conditions to ensure that the development is adequately drained and does not increase flood risk elsewhere the proposal would accord with Policy 42 of the CLP.

Foul Drainage

The submitted Flood Risk Assessment Addendum by Cole Easdon states that the site would connect to the Tangmere WwTW via an onsite pumping station and a rising main running beneath Shopwyke Road/Tangmere Road. Southern Water have been consulted on the application and state that occupation of the development would need to be phased and implemented to align with the delivery by Southern Water of any sewerage network reinforcement required to ensure that adequate waste water network capacity is available to adequately drain the development. The Environment Agency has requested a foul drainage scheme, this could be secured by planning condition.

The submitted plans show the proposed pumping station in the north-eastern corner of the site. Southern Water has stated in their representation that habitable rooms should be no closer than 15m to the boundary of the proposed pumping station. Adequate separation distance from the pumping station to plots 7 and 8 has been provided. If planning permission were to be granted it would be reasonable to restrict permitted development rights to these properties to ensure that this separation distance is retained.

ix. Ecology

The applicant has submitted an updated Ecological Impact Assessment undertaken by ECOSA and dated 17th July 2019. The Council's Environmental Strategy Officer has suggested conditions to require enhancement to hedgerows and sensitive lighting scheme to safeguard bats. They have also suggested that a buffer strip should be provided around existing hedgerows, the applicant has provided a buffer of approximately 2m between the existing hedgerow on the western boundary and the proposed acoustic fence. Whilst this falls short of the 5m recommended by the Council's

Environmental Strategy Officer, on balance this was considered acceptable in the consideration of application 19/01416/REM.

Further to this, conditions are required to ensure that the proposed reptile mitigation is secured and that a badger survey is undertaken prior to the commencement of development. The Council's Environmental Strategy Officer requires the submitted Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement plan (Sept 2019) to be updated to include an increase in bird and bat nesting boxes and further information on precautions during construction, this could be secured by condition.

x. Habitat Regulations

The site is located within 5.6km buffer zone of the Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area.

The European Court of Justice (CECJ) ruling in April 2018 disbars planning and other competent authorities when screening a plan or project for Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) from taking account of any measures intended to avoid or reduce the harmful effects on such a site.

This means that projects which previously would not have been subject to a full HRA are now required to undertake an appropriate assessment. Under Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive an appropriate assessment is required where a plan or project is likely to have a significant effect upon a European site.

Within the Chichester Local Plan Area, any net increase in dwellings within the zone of influence would require an appropriate assessment to be carried out by the Council and consultations carried out with Natural England as the appropriate nature conservation body.

The LPA has screened the proposal, undertaken an appropriate assessment as required, and concluded that provided a contribution is towards the Bird Aware Solent scheme is secured (currently £88,220 for this development) the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the Integrity of the European protected site.

A S106 Agreement to secure the necessary mitigation has not been agreed by the applicant. Without a signed S106 legal agreement, the effect upon the SPA would not be mitigated and therefore proposal would be contrary to policies 49 and 50 of the Local Plan.

xi. Sustainability

During the course of the application the applicant has revoked the sustainability report by JSP Sustainability LTD dated March 2020 and replaced this with a report dated June 2020. This removes the provision of solar panels, as such no renewable energy technologies are proposed. The proposed development would therefore only deliver a reduction in CO2 emissions by 5.32% above Building Regulations. Policy 40 of the CLP states that energy supplied from renewable sources will be maximised. There has been no quantitative financial or other evidence submitted to the Council to demonstrate that it would be economically unviable to provide renewable energy technologies on the site. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy 40 of the CLP.

Furthermore, criterion 8 of the Draft Interim Policy Statement for Housing requires Sustainability Statements to include;

- o Achieving the higher building regulations water consumption standard of a maximum of 110 litres per person per day including external water use;
- o Minimising energy consumption to achieve at least a 19% improvement in the Dwelling Emission Rate (DER) over the Target Emission Rate (TER) calculated according to Part L of the Building Regulations 2013. This should be achieved through improvements to the fabric of the dwelling;

- o Maximising energy supplied from renewable resources to ensure that at least 10% of the predicted residual energy requirements of the development, after the improvements to the fabric explained above, is met through the incorporation of renewable energy; and
- o Incorporates electric vehicle charging infrastructure in accordance with West Sussex County Council's Car Parking Standards Guidance.

Whilst water consumption and electric vehicle charging points could be secured by planning condition, the proposed reduction in carbon emissions significantly falls short of the requirements set out in the Draft Interim Policy Statement for Housing. The proposed development would therefore fail to have a sustainable design and construction and would be contrary to Policy 40 of the CLP and the Draft Interim Policy Statement for Housing.

xii. Trees and soft landscaping

The site is currently undeveloped as such the proposal would result in a fundamental change in the character and appearance of the site, however, this degree of change has already been accepted as part of the extant permission.

The site is relatively clear of substantial vegetation, there is an oak tree and hedgerow adjacent Oving Road as well as hedgerow and scattered trees along the west and southern boundaries. The oak tree at the site frontage is considered to be of good amenity value and would be retained. The hedgerow and trees along the boundaries would mainly be retained with the exception of a section of the hedgerow adjacent to Oving Road to allow for the site access. Appropriate protection measures to safeguard the existing trees and hedgerow have been proposed in the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment by Treework Environmental Practice, these measures could be secured by condition.

The proposed soft landscaping comprises native shrubs and hedgerow as well as long mown grass along the southern, western and eastern boundaries. This would provide an appropriate buffer on the southern and eastern boundaries to the open countryside beyond. In light of the above, the proposal would accord with Policy 52 of the CLP.

xiii. Other Matters

Whilst the Council's Archaeology Officer has requested the submission of an archaeological report as part of this application, it is noted that a Pre -Construction Archaeology report, dated October 2018 was submitted pursuant to condition 5 of planning permission 16/02254/OUT. This concludes, that 'the evaluation revealed no archaeological deposits or features. All of the trenches revealed deposition sequences demonstrating highly mixed re-deposited natural geology to significant depths. The Site is known to have been used as a gravel extraction quarry during parts of the 20th century and owing to the sites previous use, it is unlikely that the site retains any archaeological potential.' The report was reviewed by the Council's Archaeology Officer whom considered the concluding points of this report were acceptable and did not consider it necessary to undertake further archaeological investigation on the site. As such it is considered the proposed development would not result in a risk to the historic environment.

xiv. Planning Obligations

Any permission for the development proposed will require the completion of a section 106 agreement. At the time of making this recommendation the applicant has not entered into a section 106 agreement.

The anticipated Head of Terms for any S.106 Agreement were the Council to approve the application are;

- 30% Affordable Housing (43 units) to the required SHMA mix
- Provision of off-site pedestrian/cycle link
- A27 Mitigation

- Open Space provision, management and on-going maintenance
- Chichester Harbour SPA recreational mitigation contribution
- Estate Road adoption clause
- Travel Plan
- Real time passenger bus information and new bus stops on Shopwhyke Road
- Monitoring fee

In the absence of any legal agreement at the point of determining this application, the failure to secure the necessary affordable housing and provide the supporting infrastructure is contrary to Policies 8, 9, 34, 50 and 54 CLP.

xv. CIL

The development would be CIL liable.

Conclusion

The proposal, by reason of its poor layout, lack of pepper-potting of affordable units, lack of pedestrian and cyclist permeability with the city and insufficient commitment to minimise carbon emissions, would be contrary to local and national planning policies and design guidance. Furthermore, the applicant has not entered into a legal agreement to secure necessary infrastructure provision and a financial contribution towards Chichester Harbour SPA recreational disturbance mitigation.

The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies 8, 9, 33, 34, 40, 50 and 54 of the Chichester Local Plan, paragraphs 56, 64, 91, 127 and 150 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The application cannot, therefore, be recommended for approval.

Human Rights

The Human Rights of all affected parties have been taken into account and the recommendation is considered justified and proportionate.

Officer Recommendation

REFUSE

Human Rights:

The Human Rights of all affected parties have been taken into account and the recommendation is considered justified and proportionate.

5. Recommendation

Officers Recommendation is to REFUSE the following: Erection of 143 dwellings, with associated access, parking, public open space, landscaping, extension to residential curtilages of existing properties along Oving Road and other associated works.
for the following reasons:-

1) The proposed development would result in individual isolated groups of affordable housing well in excess of the maximum 10 dwellings stated in the Council's Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD 2016. The concentration and segregation of affordable dwellings in this way would result in an unbalanced and unsustainable community contrary to the objectives of preventing social exclusion identified in paragraph 17.20 of the supporting text to Policy 34 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-

2029 and to the Council's Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2016.

2) The proposal fails to provide an appropriate layout and high quality design including insufficient permeability due to the lack of commitment of the developer to deliver the footpath/cycle link and the associated off-site highway works to the north-west corner of the site. There would be a harmful juxtaposition between the built forms in the south-western corner of the site due to the quantum of units squeezed into this corner. This would result in harm to visual amenity and a poor standard of accommodation for future occupiers. The excessive expanses of hard standing for parking provision arising from the large grouping of affordable units would result in an urbanising impact causing visual harm. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy 33 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 and paragraphs 91 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019).

3) The proposed development would fail to minimise energy consumption and maximise energy supplied from renewable sources. As such, the design and construction of the development would not achieve adequate sustainability levels as required by Policy 40 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 and the Draft Interim Policy Statement for Housing Development. The proposed development would be unsustainable in this regard and would be contrary to the objectives of the Council's Climate Change Emergency declaration and paragraph 150 of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019).

4) In the absence of a signed S106 legal agreement the application makes no provision for securing the affordable housing or necessary infrastructure obligations it generates, including the provision of an off-site pedestrian/cycle link in the north-east corner of the site to provide permeability and encourage sustainable travel options to the city centre. Furthermore there is no mechanism to secure the recreational disturbance mitigation for the Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area. In failing to secure the necessary affordable housing, infrastructure and mitigation requirements which a development of this size generates, the proposals are contrary to Paragraphs 56 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) and Policies 8, 9, 35 and 50 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029, the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017), the Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD and the Draft Interim Policy Statement for Housing.

INFORMATIVES

1) The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

2) The plans numbers which this decision relates are:

P18-1586_11, P18-1586_01 Sheet No. 02 Rev. AG, P18-1586_08 Rev. D, P18-1586_12 Rev. D, P18-1586_15 Rev. C, P18-1586_19 Sheet No. 01 Rev. C, P18-1586_19 Sheet No. 02 Rev. C, P18-1586_31 Rev. C, Housetype pack P18-1586_18C (dated March 2020, sheets Nos 47 Rev. A, 48 Rev. B, 16 Rev. B, 3 Rev. C, 4 Rev. C, 5 Rev. C, 7 Rev. C, 8 Rev. D, 9 Rev. C, 10 Rev. C, 58 Rev. B, 14 Rev. C, 58 Rev. B, 15 Rev. C, 69 Rev. A, 43 Rev. A, 17 Rev. A, 18 Rev. A, 19 Rev. A, 20 Rev. A, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55 Rev. A, 56 Rev. A, 57 Rev. A, 27

Rev. B, 28 Rev. C, 29 Rev. B, 30 Rev. C, 35 Rev. B, 36 Rev. C, 37 Rev. B, 38 Rev. C, 41 Rev. C, 50 Rev. A, 25 Rev. B, 26 Rev. C, 33 Rev. C, 44 Rev. B, 45, 46 Rev. A), P18-1586_34, P18-1586_32 Sheet No. 1 Rev A, P18-1586_32 Sheet No. 2 Rev A, P18-1586_33 Sheet No. 1 Rev A, P18-1586_33 Sheet No. 2 Rev A, P18-1586_33 Sheet No. 3 Rev A, P18-1586_33 Sheet No. 4 Rev A, P18-1586_33 Sheet No. 5 Rev A, 200304-4.1-ORA27CH-TPP-NC, 6549/70/01 Rev A, 6549/70/02 Rev A, 6549/70/03 Rev A, 6549/70/04 Rev A, 6549/70/05 Rev A, 6549/70/06 Rev A, 6549/70/07 Rev A, 6549/70/08 Rev A, 6549/70/09 Rev A.

Approved Plans

Details	Reference	Version	Date Received	Status
---------	-----------	---------	---------------	--------