

REPORT UPDATE

Application no: F/4/20/OUT
Page no: 101
Location: Land at Ford Airfield Ford
Description: Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for access) for the development of up to 1,500 dwellings (Use Class C3), 60-bed care home (Use Class C2), up to 9,000 sqm of employment floorspace (Use Classes B1), local centre of up to 2,350 sqm including up to 900 sqm retail / commercial (Use Classes A1-A5) and 1,450 sqm community / leisure floorspace (Use Classes D1-D2), land for a two-form entry primary school (Use Class D1), public open space, allotments, new sports pitches and associated facilities, drainage, parking and associated access, infrastructure, landscape, ancillary and site preparation works, including demolition of existing buildings and part removal of existing runway hardstanding. This application affects a Public Right of Way. This application is the subject of an Environmental Statement. This application may affect the setting of a Listed Building. This application falls within CIL Zone 1 - Zero Rated.

UPDATE DETAILS

Reason for Update/Changes:

1. Odour

The officer's recommendation report regarding odour identified that the Council would be appointing an independent contractor to review the odour assessment submitted in support of the application. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) appointed Phlorum who have undertaken an independent review of the Odour Assessment and provided the Council with their comments.

Phlorum have confirmed that the Odour Assessment submitted in support of the application was carried out in accordance with best practice guidance and adopted a methodology agreed with both Southern Water and Arun District Council's Environmental Health Team. However, the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) guidance states that:

"It should be emphasised that the result from a model should not be used to try to 'prove' the absence of an existing adverse odour effect (e.g., nuisance) when strong empirical evidence from complaints analysis, community response data, and sensory tests (by appropriately trained persons) show otherwise. To do so would be to mistake the model for the reality of the situation, rather than a simplified version of it."

The independent review of the Odour Assessment concludes that it has not brought together the results of the sensory tests and the dispersion modelling to discuss how the masterplan has been informed by both. As the only location where, robust observations have been made (i.e., to the north-east of the WwTW) is also a location where the dispersion model appears to under-predict, this suggests that the model might not be a suitable tool, on its own, for developing a constraints plan. As such, the current layout is understood to have not been developed using an appropriate weight of evidence, relying instead upon the dispersion model.

Therefore, it has been recommended that the applicant should explain why the odour contour extends further to the south rather than the north-east. This appears off as south-westerly winds are more common than winds from the north, which is corroborated by their ground-based observations (sniff tests).

It is also identified that it is important to understand how, if at all, the sniff tests have been used to inform the masterplan/whether the cordon sanitaire (100m buffer) around the WwTW has been defined solely based on the results of the dispersion model. Observational data should be given considerable weight in informing the masterplan, and it appears that this data might not have been fully discussed and integrated into conclusions.

Given when the review document was received from the independent contractors appointed by the Council the applicants have not had the opportunity to respond to the matters raised. Given these outstanding matters it is considered that a recommendation for approval cannot be made by Officers at this time. Therefore, the recommendation should be amended to read as follows:

It is recommended that the application is deferred to allow for the further review of the Odour Assessment and dispersion modelling.

2. Updated Consultation Response from the Conservation Officer.

An updated consultation response was submitted by the Conservation Officer on the 19th November 2021 which provides additional comments regarding the developments impact upon nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets. Regarding the nearby designated heritage assets, the setting and significance of these assets has been considered by the Conservation Officer and deemed as acceptable.

Comments have also been provided regarding the Canal and western arm of the former runway. In terms of the route of the canal the Conservation Officer has advised that:

"in order for the former canal route to be successfully incorporated into the public realm strategy (including provision of information boards explaining its former significance), that greater information will need to be provided as part of any reserved matters applications. This will need to ensure that the route is not simply an access road for houses, but a suitable marker of the historic route/asset. Previously I have noted reference to the use of the route elsewhere as a 'greenway' and would assume that this would form the basis of this section of the route as well. At present the level of information provided suggests that the proposal cannot be considered to be harmful."

Whilst, in relation to the runway it has been advised that:

"The additional information provided regarding the runway and its significance is helpful, and I believe that the retention of the north-south element that falls within the site, along with the removal of only part of the western arm helps to reduce its impact. Further, the use of part of the removed western arm as open space (albeit I note the width is reduced) will help to ensure that its former line will be preserved is a positive feature.

I also note the reference to the impracticality of retaining the runway surface due to its potentially friable nature and saturation with unsafe substances. As noted in the additional statement, retention of the runway surface would not enhance the proposals already set forward. However, I am of the opinion that the existing materials, characteristics of the surface and the appearance can be incorporated into a new surface treatment within the open space. Such detailed issues are a matter for the reserved matters application."

Therefore, the Conservation Officer has advised that the development will not impact the setting of the listed buildings and non-designated heritage assets, and as such, no harm to their overall significance has been identified.

3. Letter of objection from Grundon 22nd November 2021

Below is a summary of the comments raised in this representation full comments are available on the Arun District Council website.

- The applicant is an agent of change introducing a new land use that is likely to affect the continued operation of the strategic waste site and the applicant is therefore responsible for managing the impact of that change. As the application is proposing residential development it should be considered that there could be a significant adverse effect on future occupiers of that development from any nearby existing sources of potential nuisance. There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the applicant has considered this effectively.
- The location of new homes should not place restrictions on existing site operations or permitted operations. It is clear from the response dated the 11th March 2021 that WSCC continues to object to the proposed development as it would be contrary to policies W2 and W10 of the Waste Local Plan.
- We are concerned that matters relating to the agent of change principle have not been adequately addressed through the Officer's report.
- It is bold and reckless to conclude that Southern Water no longer wish to maintain their objection given their lack of communication.
- Grundon's is the subject of an Environmental Permitted (EP) which seeks to control pollution to levels to be at levels below that which would be considered likely to cause pollution. However, the EP relates to the site in its current state with no residential development close to the site boundary, not a situation which brings residential development much closer to this boundary (approximately 139m away).
- Odour levels that would not be considered likely to cause pollution could be experienced outside the site boundary in current circumstances as there are no sensitive receptors. If sensitive receptors are introduced as is proposed, then this could lead to complaints that in current circumstances would not occur.
- As the agent of change the applicant should have carried out a comprehensive cumulative odour survey and assessment as requested by the Environmental Health Officer with regard to the extant waste management uses and used this information to provide sufficient set back of new residences from the site boundaries of those existing waste facilities.
- The report for F/5/20/PL identified the market application as a prerequisite for these proposals this suggests that this application (F/4/20/OUT) should not therefore be decided before there is a decision on the Ford market application.

- It is not clear how the improvements to the junction with Ford Road will be secured.
- It is unclear how the comments from Historic England have been addressed.

4. Joint representation from the Friends of Ford to Hunston Canal, Sustrans and Arun District Bridleways Group

Below is a summary of the representation which can be found in full on the Arun District Council website.

- Disappointed at the lack of commitment from the developers to properly reflect the heritage of the old canal by designing in expressed local desires that the old route be properly reinstated and re-purposed for the 21st century as a multi-user greenway.
- Para. 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies that "Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better access for users". At the very least a north-south and an east/west route legally available to all users should be being provided, and we would ask that a condition is imposed to that effect.
- A new Greenway along the old Ford to Hunston Canal is a project with strong local support.
- More people in the community would use such routes daily for exercising, than who would ever use facilities such as football pitches.

5. Update regarding the Secondary School Site

An update has been provided by the agent in regards to this matter:

"We understand that the landowners of the land proposed for a Secondary School at Ford have made progress in their discussions with WSCC. As willing landowners, positive discussions between WSCC and the landowners continue around the mechanisms for the transfer of the land to WSCC, all of whom remain committed to the preferred outcome. Whilst progress has been slower than initially anticipated, this is not unusual for school provision where WSCC needs to secure land for its delivery.

This matter is obviously outside of the planning applications for The Landings, where the developers will make s106 contributions toward secondary education akin to other developments in the area. The secondary school will serve a much wider area; but we have made provision for road and pedestrian / cycle connections between The Landings and the secondary school in the Masterplan, which has been agreed in the Masterplan document. The applicants are therefore assuming that the Secondary School will be brought forward by WSCC in the preferred location.

There is understood to be a continued will of all parties involved to secure a positive outcome, without delay; and there is nothing we have been informed of that is likely to hinder the delivery of the secondary school in this location. The expectation is that WSCC will progress the secondary school as a matter of priority following the grant of planning permission at The Landings."

6. Clarification of details contained within the officer's report.

a) The officers report identifies a residential development density of 30 dwellings per hectare. This should be 35 dwellings per hectare.

b) The summary of the consultation response from WSCC as Local Highway Authority identifies that contributions should be provided in accordance with the Arun Transport Study apportionment report 2020.

However, this does not reflect the comments provided in the consultation response of the 5th November which identify the following contributions:

Section 106 Contributions

- £301,000 towards the A27 Ford Roundabout
- £37,500 towards additional parking facilities at Ford Railway Station
- A Travel Plan
- £5,000 for the auditing of the travel plan
- £15,000 towards the provision of offsite real time passenger information

The following 4 contributions are recommended to be grouped together to fund these measures in a manner which would expedite delivery of some of the mitigation works identified in the local plan transport study.

- £600,000 towards the A259 Oyster Catcher
- £97,000 towards the A259 Comet Corner
- £515,000 towards the A259 Corridor Improvement
- £15,000 towards the A259 Lyminster Bypass to A280 junction

In addition to these contributions the following works are required to be delivered:

- Construction of the Yapton Road Access (drawing no. GA-001 Rev E) prior to the 1st or 501st occupation.
- Construction of the Ford Road Access (drawing no. GA-004 Rev B) prior to the 1st or 501st Occupation.
- Improvements to Ford Road/Commercial Site Access (ITB13091-GA-066) prior to the commencement of commercial floorspace.
- Ford Lane/North End Road Improvement (GA-028 Rev C) prior to the 751st Occupation.
- B2233/North End Road Improvement (GA-026 Rev B) prior to the 501st Occupation.
- Bilsham Road/B2233 Improvement (GA-027 Rev C) prior to the 251st Occupation.
- Horsemere Green Lane Pedestrian Access Improvements (GA-058 Rev B) alongside the introduction of the Yapton Road Access or prior to the 101st Occupation.
- Church Lane Pedestrian/Cycle Connection (GA-600 Rev A) Prior to the opening of the Yapton Road Access should CM/1/17 not have been implemented.
- Rollaston Park & Burndell Road Pedestrian Improvements (GA-041 Rev A, GA-200, GA-201 Rev A, GA-202 Rev A. GA-203 Rev A & GA-204) prior to the 1st Occupation.
- Yapton Cycle Route Improvements (GA-059, GA-060 & GA-061) prior to the 101st Occupation.
- Ford Road - Station Road Pedestrian/Cycle Connection to Station (GA-006 Rev B, GA-007 Rev B, GA-008 Rev A, GA-009 Rev A & GA-010 Rev B) prior to the 250th Occupation.

- Footpath Connection (Ford Road to River Arun public right of way) (GA-400 Rev A) (includes works outside the highway) prior to the Occupation of commercial floorspace or 751st Occupation.

c) The officers report through the principle identifies that the development is in accordance with policy H SP2. However, it should be clarified that this is subject to the endorsement of the masterplan through the consideration of the proposals by the planning committee. However, it is the view of officers, as identified through the recommendation report, that the Masterplan document (subject to detailed design) would meet the requirements of policy H SP2 of the Arun Local Plan.

d) Highways and Access

i) It should be clarified that the proposals impact upon the A27 has been considered through the Arun Transport Study and by National Highways. It has been identified that a financial contribution should be secured towards the agreed scheme of works on the A27 Trunk in line with the adopted Local Plan or other such scheme of works to similar of more beneficial effects (which could include an Arundel Bypass scheme should one process for which this development site would benefit).

Therefore, as confirmed through National Highways consultation response the proposed development has been deemed acceptable and will not materially affect the safety, reliability and / or operation of the Strategic Road Network as set out in the Department for Transport C2/13 para's 9 & 10 and NPPF paragraph 111.

ii) The final paragraph of the Highways & Access section identifies that the proposal would be policy compliant 'subject to the outstanding details being provided to and agreed with WSCC'. However, immediately prior to the officer's recommendation being published the outstanding information was provided to WSCC Highways and their consultation response of the 5th November (summarised in the recommendation report) confirms that there are no outstanding details.

e) Heritage Assets

Reference was not made within the recommendation report to paragraphs 203, 204 and 205 of the NPPF which state:

Paragraph 203 identifies that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss of the heritage asset.

Paragraph 204 states that local planning authorities should not permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.

Paragraph 205 states that local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence publicly accessible.

However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.

The recommendation report has taken into consideration the significance of non-designated heritage assets and drawn a balanced judgement having had regard to the scale of the loss as is required by paragraph 203.

In terms of paragraph 204 in this case the application site is a strategic allocation within the local plan, and it is considered that it is sufficiently likely that the development will progress. Finally, in terms of paragraph 205 the recommendation report identifies that the route of the western arm of the runway would be retained as open space with a heritage walk to be secured using an appropriately worded condition. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would accord with paragraph 205 of the NPPF.

f) Infrastructure Provision

i) The infrastructure development plan for this site identifies that an on-site 3G pitch should be provided as part of this development. However, the Arun District Council Sports Strategy has superseded this with an off-site contribution being secured.

ii) In terms of education the report sets out the required financial contribution for each facility. However, those to be delivered on-site could be delivered by the developer in which case there would be no financial contribution secured.

iii) It is identified in the report that the financial contributions towards healthcare will be directed towards off-site healthcare facilities. This is contrary to policy SA2 of the Ford Neighbourhood Development Plan. However, this aligns with the adopted approach by the CCG for the delivery of primary healthcare in Arun.

iv) It has been agreed with WSCC that the financial contribution towards Ford Lane/North End Road can be flexible to allow for the delivery of alternative highway arrangements. This would allow for the delivery of a roundabout in this location. However, the CIL regs would not allow the Council to secure full funding to deliver a roundabout in this location as it would go beyond what has been assessed as necessary to mitigate the impact of the development upon the operation of this junction.

7. Amendments to Conditions

Whilst the recommendation has been amended to deferral of the application there are some amendments required to conditions.

Condition 4 - The plan reference in regards to the 'Ford Airfield Geometry - Eastern Access onto Ford Road' should be amended once confirmed.

Condition 5 - Bullet point three of the phasing condition should be amended to read "Vehicular access from Ford Lane, Yapton Road and Ford Road".

Condition 7 - The word allocation is replaced by the word application.

Condition 28 - Added "for that dwelling".

Condition 32 - Reference to Condition 28 amended to Condition 29.

Officers Comment:

1. No comments.

2. No comments.

3. In response to the letter of representation the following comments are made:

- The representation challenges the conclusions of the recommendation report in regards to odour generation from Grundon Waste Transfer Station. This matter will need to be considered further prior to the determination of the application.

- The representation also raises concerns that this application is being determined ahead of planning application F/5/20/PL. However, whilst the two applications are certainly related in nature the determination of F/5/20/PL prior to this application is not necessary. It is acknowledged that the approval of F/5/20/PL will regularise the operation of Ford Market and reflect the loss of the western arm of the runway. But it is not necessary in principle or policy terms.

- Concerns have also been raised in regards to the comments from Historic England. Further information has been submitted by the applicant to address the concerns of Historic England and the Council's Conservation Officer. This information has been considered by the Conservation Officer who has confirmed that the developments impact upon the designated and non-designated heritage assets is acceptable.

4. The application seeks outline permission and as such the detailed masterplan is purely indicative at this time. Details of pedestrian and cycle linkages within the site are a matter for consideration at detailed design stage. It is considered that the parameter plans provide adequate opportunity to provide strong pedestrian linkages across the site and into the wider area.

The path of the former canal is also identified on the parameter plans with the alignment to be reflected in the layout. This will also be covered by Condition 7 (Design Code) which states that the design code will demonstrate how the detailed proposals will reflect the contents of the Masterplan Document. The Masterplan Document includes more detail on the approach to be taken with the canal and how it should be reflected within the internal movement/landscaping proposals, including pedestrian/cycle connections up to the boundary of the site with Grundon, then up the western edge connecting with the footpath network. Given that the Design Code will need to be approved prior to the submission of the reserved matters application it is considered that sufficient measures are in place to ensure that the development will respect the canal and ensure strong sustainable links across the site.

5. No comments.

6. No comments.

7. No comments.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the application is deferred to allow for further consideration of the odour impacts.