



Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

STATEMENT OF CASE

ON BEHALF OF HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL

**Appeal by:
Gladman Developments**

**Against the decision of Horsham District Council to refuse:
Outline planning permission for up to 107 dwellings (including up to 40% affordable housing),
informal public open space and children's play area, surface water attenuation, landscaping,
vehicular access point from Storrington Road and associated ancillary works. All matters to
be reserved with the exception of the main site access.**

**At:
Land at Storrington Road Thakeham West Sussex**

Appeal to be determined by an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State under the Public Inquiry
procedure

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 This appeal statement establishes the grounds upon which the Local Planning Authority (LPA) contends that the appeal should be dismissed. It should be read in context with the Council's decision notice, the Officers' report and the Policies and supporting documents referenced therein. Together, these documents form the case under which the LPA will be defending the refusal to grant planning permission.

1.2 The application now the subject of this appeal was originally received by the Local Planning Authority on 21st October 2015.

1.3 The application sought outline planning permission for up to 107 dwellings (including up to 40% affordable housing), informal public open space and children's play area, surface water attenuation, landscaping, vehicular access point from Storrington Road and associated ancillary works. All matters to be reserved with the exception of the main site access.

1.4 The application was recommended for refusal by Officers and was presented to and considered by the Development Management Committee (South) at a meeting on 19th January 2016. Members voted in favour of agreeing the Officers' recommendation, and the decision notice refusing the application was dated 20th January 2016. The reasons for refusal were as follows:

1 *The proposed development is located in the open countryside, outside of any defined Built Up Area Boundary, on a site not allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework, or an adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan. The Council is able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and consequently this scheme would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchical approach of concentrating development within the main settlements. Furthermore, the proposed development is not essential to its countryside location and consequently represents an inappropriate, unsustainable and unacceptable form of development that is contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF and Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, 25 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).*

2 *The provision of housing in this location, at the scale proposed and in conjunction with the approved development for 75 dwellings to land directly to the south, would further diminish the rural and open character of this particular part of the landscape, creating a discordant and uncharacteristically urbanised environment harming the character of the local countryside. The development is, therefore, contrary to the NPPF and Policies 25 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).*

3 *The provision of up to 107 no. dwellings, within the historic landscape setting of the Grade II Listed Building at Snapes Cottage, would affect the significance of the heritage asset by significantly harming the character and appearance of its setting and the appreciation of its sense of rural*

isolation as a countryside residence. The development is therefore contrary to S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

4 *The proposed development makes no provision for securing affordable housing units, or for contributions towards improvements to education provision; transport infrastructure; libraries; fire and rescue services; open space; sport and recreation facilities; community facilities; and is, therefore, contrary to Policies 16 and 39 of the Horsham District Local Development Framework (2015), as it has not been demonstrated how the infrastructure needs of the development would be met.*

1.5 The decision notice is contained within this statement under **Appendix 1**. The Officers' report to the Development Management Committee (South) meeting of 19th January 2016 is attached under **Appendix 2**. The minutes of the aforesaid Committee meeting can be found under **Appendix 3**.

2.0 PLANNING HISTORY

2.1 There is no planning history for this site. The following planning history is relevant to this application and relates to the land to the immediate south of the site, known as land North of Brook Close and Rother Close:

DC/15/2126	Application for Approval of Reserved Matters pursuant to Outline Planning Application DC/13/1265 (Development of approximately 75 dwellings including the creation of an access point from Water Lane. Provision of open space including children's play area, linear park, landscaping and sustainable urban drainage systems on the site)	Approved 21/12/2015
DC/13/1265	Development of approximately 75 dwellings including the creation of an access point from Water Lane. Provision of open space including children's play area, linear park, landscaping and sustainable urban drainage systems on the site (Outline).	Refused 10/02/2014 Allowed on appeal

3.0 THE APPEAL SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

3.1 The application site comprises an area of 4.89 hectares which includes four fields located to the west of Storrington Road. The smallest field is immediately adjacent to Storrington Road and is unused land which has been left to grow naturally. This field is set at a higher ground level than Storrington Road and is surrounded by trees and a hedgerow tree belt. This field has an area of approximately 4,800sqm and is directly north of a neighbouring dwelling at Venters, Storrington Road and south of a separate paddock used for horses. Given the shape of the proposed site, this paddock separates

the majority of the site to the west from Storrington Road. With this separation, the proposed site is an unusual shape with limited roadside frontage.

- 3.2 Adjoining this field, to the west, are the three further fields which are part of the application site. These fields are used for horse grazing and have a total area of approximately 44,000sqm. The fields are divided by timber fencing. Due to the topography of the site the fields slope down from north to south with a central plateau. These fields are also surrounded by trees and a hedgerow belt.
- 3.3 The site is north of the built-up-area of Storrington. Storrington is classed as a 'Small Town and Larger Village' in Policy 3, Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy of the Horsham District Planning Framework. Directly to the south of the site is an expanse of vacant land which abuts the built-up area boundary of Storrington at Rother Close and Jubilee Way. This piece of land was recently granted outline permission at appeal, followed by reserved matters approval, for the development of 75 dwellings (refs: DC/13/1265 & DC/15/2126). Development has commenced on this adjacent site.
- 3.4 The site subject to this appeal is also situated north of a group of detached dwellings at St Marys Close. These houses are the nearest dwellings to the site which are within the built-up-area boundary. The site also adjoins the north and west boundaries of Snapes Cottage. This property is a Grade II listed building. There is also a row of detached dwellings of traditional design opposite the site on Storrington Road. The site also abuts the boundary of a dwelling at Littlebury House to the north of the site. To the west and to the north of the site (adjacent to Littlebury House) are further fields. The field to the west of the application site is used for crops and the field to the north is for grazing. Further to the south west of the site, beyond the fields, there are a number of commercial units within an industrial estate, including a recently constructed warehouse building.
- 3.5 The site is located within the Horsham District Landscape Character Area E1: Parnham & Storrington Wooded Farmlands and Heath. According to this classification, 'the area has a distinctive landscape of rolling sandy ridges and stream valleys with a mosaic of oak – birch / woodland, conifer plantations, heathlands and rough pasture. Despite the proximity of the urban edge of Storrington and the intrusion of traffic, the area retains surprisingly rural qualities.'
- 3.6 The current appeal site is identified in the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) as site no.SA469 Land off Storrington Road. The SHELAA states the following for this site:
- 3.7 'The site abuts the built up area of Storrington and is located within an area having low to moderate capacity for residential development in the HDC Landscape Capacity Assessment 2014. Storrington Road runs to the east of the site providing a sustainable access into the town. There may be potential impacts on the setting of Snapes Cottage Grade II listed building which would need to be

considered. The site is not identified in the emerging Thakeham Neighbourhood Development Plan and as such is considered Developable 11+ years’.

4.0 NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

4.1 National Planning Policy Framework

4.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (hereafter referred to as the NPPF) establishes the relevant policy context upon which this appeal is assessed. Of relevance to this appeal are: paragraphs 6 to 17 (achieving sustainable development); chapter 4 (promoting sustainable transport); chapter 6 (delivering a wide choice of high quality homes); chapter 7 (requiring good design); chapter 11 (conserving and enhancing the natural environment); chapter 12 (conserving and enhancing the historic environment) ‘Decision Taking’ and ‘Implementation’. The NPPF will be referred to in the Council’s evidence.

4.3 **Paragraph 7** of the NPPF describes sustainable development in the following manner:

There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:

- *an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;*
- *a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and*
- *an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.*

4.4 **Paragraph 14** of the NPPF states that there should be a general presumption in favour of sustainable development, meaning that:

For decision-taking this means:

- *approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and*
- *where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out -of-date, granting permission unless:*

- *any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or*
- *specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.*

4.5 **Paragraph 17** of the NPPF establishes the core planning principles:

Within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. These principles include a requirement for planning to::

- *always seek to secure high quality design...;*
- *take account of the different roles and character of different areas... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it;*
- *actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.*

4.6 **Section 4** of the NPPF promotes the important role of sustainable transport policies in encouraging and securing access for walking, cycling and the use of public modes of transport. Paragraph 32 requires that:

“All development that generates significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether (amongst others) – safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people.”

4.7 **Section 6** of the NPPF deals with the need to provide sufficient housing to meet the needs of the current and future population. Of relevance to this appeal is **paragraph 47**:

“LPA’s should use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area... identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5%... identify a supply of specific, deliverable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15... for market and affordable housing, illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a housing trajectory for the plan period...”

4.8 Also of relevance is **paragraph 49**:

“Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.”

4.9 In respect of the need to provide a wide choice of housing **paragraph 50** requires that:

“LPA’s should plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and needs of different groups in the community; identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand; where they have identified that affordable housing is needed LPA’s should set policies for meeting this need on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified.”

4.10 **Section 7** of the NPPF goes onto consider design in new development, and in respect of this, **paragraph 56** states that

‘Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.’

4.11 In addition, **paragraph 61** seeks to address the integration of development into the natural, built and historic environment:

‘Although visual appearance and the architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Therefore, planning policies and decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.’

4.12 **Paragraph 64** establishes the need for good design that takes into account the opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area:

‘Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.’

4.13 **Section 12** of the NPPF relates to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. **Paragraph 129** states that:

‘Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.’

4.14 **Paragraph 132** goes on to states that:

‘When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.’

4.15 **Paragraph 134** states that:

'Where a development leads to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.'

4.16 Planning Practice Guidance

4.17 On 6 March 2014, the Government issued a Written Ministerial Statement that cancelled existing planning guidance documents and in their place issued the web-based Planning Practice Guidance (hereafter referred to as the 'PPG'). Relevant paragraphs of the PPG will be referred to in the Council's evidence.

4.18 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

4.19 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 contains the primary legislation relating to the determination of planning applications relating to the historic environment and Section 66(1) makes clear that impact on setting is an important consideration for decision-makers and should be taken into account when determining applications. This states:

4.20 "In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

5.0 DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

5.1 The Horsham District Planning Framework

5.2 The Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) is the Development Plan for Horsham District for all areas outside of the South Downs National Park. The HDPF was found sound by the Inspector's Examination Report of 8th October 2014, was approved for adoption by Members on 19th November 2015 and was adopted by the Council on 27th November 2015. The HDPF supersedes the Core Strategy, the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document, the Facilitating Appropriate Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), and includes amendments to the Proposals Map. The Planning Obligations SPD remains part of the Development Plan until such time as an updated version has been adopted. As such, the appeal must be determined in accordance with the adopted HDPF, as this forms the Development Plan for the District.

5.3 The following policies of the HDPF (not necessarily exhaustive) are considered to be relevant to this appeal: 1 (Sustainable Development), 2 (Strategic Development), 3 (Development Hierarchy), 4 (Settlement Expansion), 15 (Housing Provision), 16 (Meeting Local Housing Needs), 17 (Exceptions Housing Schemes), 24 (Environmental Protection), 25 (The Natural Environment and Landscape

Character), 26 (Countryside Protection), 27 (Settlement Coalescence), 31 (Green Infrastructure), 32 (The Quality of New Development), 33 (Development Principles), 34 (Cultural and Heritage Assets), 35 (Climate Change), 36 (Appropriate Energy Use), 37 (Sustainable Construction), 38 (Flooding), 39 (Infrastructure Provision), 40 (Sustainable Transport), 41 (Parking) and 42 (Inclusive Communities).

- 5.4 Policy 1 relates to sustainable development and sets out the Council's general approach to determining planning applications within the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- 5.5 Policy 2 sets out the Council's strategy regarding sustainable growth and the location of development and aims to protect the rural character of the District whilst meeting the needs of the community through sustainable growth and access to services and employment.
- 5.6 Policy 3 classifies the District's settlements into five main categories – 1) Main Town, 2) Small Towns and Larger Villages, 3) Medium Villages, 4) Smaller Villages and 5) Unclassified Settlements and aims to ensure that any infill development within settlements with Built Up Area Boundaries are of an appropriate nature and scale for the settlement. Storrington is listed in the 'Small Towns and Larger Villages' category.
- 5.7 Policy 4 deals with settlement expansion and supports development outside Built up Area Boundaries where the site is allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Development Plan and sets out other criteria to ensure that developments are based on need, that they are appropriate to their surroundings and do not prejudice comprehensive long term development of an area.
- 5.8 Policy 15 makes provision for 16,000 homes and associated infrastructure within the period 2011-2031 including allocations in Horsham, Southwater and Billingshurst, the provision of 1500 homes through Neighbourhood Plans and 750 windfall sites.
- 5.9 Policy 16 aims to meet local housing needs as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the need to provide 20% affordable housing on schemes of 5 to 14 dwellings and 35% on schemes of 15 or more units.
- 5.10 Policy 17 relates to Exception Housing Schemes. This policy states that, in exceptional circumstances, limited amounts of greenfield land, that would not be released for general market housing, may be released for the development of affordable homes subject to criteria. This policy is not applicable to this proposal as the policy is only applicable for schemes which are solely for affordable housing.
- 5.11 Policy 24 relates to environmental protection and aims to ensure that developments minimise exposure to, and the emission of, pollutants including noise, odour, air and light pollution.

- 5.12 Policy 25 aims to protect the natural environment and landscape character of the District, and the setting of the South Downs National Park, from inappropriate development.
- 5.13 Policy 26 relates to countryside protection and requires proposals to be essential to their countryside location and to meet the needs of either agriculture or forestry, enable the extraction of minerals or disposal of waste, provide quiet informal recreation use or enable the sustainable development of rural areas. The policy also makes it necessary to ensure that developments are appropriate to the character and landscape of their surroundings.
- 5.14 Policy 27 seeks to protect landscapes from development that would result in the coalescence of settlements, stating that development will be resisted unless it is demonstrated that there is no significant reduction in the openness between settlements, and would not result in urbanising effects within the settlement gap.
- 5.15 Policy 31 aims to protect and enhance the existing network of green infrastructure, supports developments which retain or enhance significant features of nature conservation and aims to secure appropriate mitigation.
- 5.16 Policy 32 requires developments to be of a high quality and inclusive design based on a clear understanding of the context for development.
- 5.17 Policy 33 relates to Development Principles and requires development, amongst other matters, to recognise any constraints that exist, to not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding occupiers, to ensure that the scale, massing and appearance of the development is of a high standard of design and layout, are locally distinctive, favour the retention of important landscape and natural features and create safe environments.
- 5.18 Policy 34 sets out the Council's planning policy on cultural and heritage assets and, amongst other things, aims to reinforce the special character of the District's historic environment, that developments retain and improve the setting of heritage assets including views, public rights of way and landscape features, and ensure appropriate archaeological investigations.
- 5.19 Policy 35 supports developments that make a contribution to mitigating and adapting to the impacts of climate change.
- 5.20 Policy 36 relates to energy use and requires all development to contribute to clean, efficient energy in the District. This should be established by the submission of an Energy Statement with planning applications to demonstrate compliance with the Lean, Green, Clean Energy Hierarchy.
- 5.21 Policy 37 relates to sustainable construction and aims to ensure that proposals improve the sustainability of development including through the use of materials and renewable energy.

- 5.22 Policy 38 deals with flooding and sets out the need to follow a sequential approach to ensure that areas at lowest risk of flooding are prioritised and where necessary that appropriate mitigation measures and drainage strategies are in place.
- 5.23 Policy 39 states that the release of land for development will be dependent on their being sufficient infrastructure capacity and, where necessary, that infrastructure improvements are made to serve the development and secured through legal agreements, CIL or conditions.
- 5.24 Policy 40 aims to secure a sustainable transport system and supports proposals which promote an improved and integrated transport network and non-car modes of transport.
- 5.25 Policy 41 aims to ensure that developments are served by adequate parking facilities including provision for cycle, motorcycle, low emission vehicles and the mobility impaired.
- 5.26 Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document
- 5.27 The Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document of the Horsham District Local Development Framework was adopted in June 2007. The Document provides details on services and facilities and the priorities of provision that will be required when land is proposed for a development and where a planning obligation would be sought. The SPD on Planning Obligations should be read in conjunction with the latest costs schedule, which is included in Annex B (2009) of the SPD.
- 5.28 The Horsham District Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2014) & Horsham District Council Community Infrastructure Levy
- 5.29 The Council is in the process of introducing a CIL Charging Scheme. This has recently been through consultation and is not expected to be in place until the end of 2016.
- 5.30 Policy 39 of the HDPF provides guidance on the provision of infrastructure required in connection with new development.
- 5.31 Neighbourhood Plan
- 5.32 The site is within the Parish of Thakeham. Thakeham has been designated as a Neighbourhood Development Plan Area, and a Pre-Submission plan has been out for Regulation 16 consultation. The consultation ended on the 11th December 2015. At the time of writing the report, the draft plan was about to be considered by an independent examiner. The current application site is not allocated in the draft plan.

- 5.33 The site is adjacent to the Parish of Storrington & Sullington to the south. The Parishes of Storrington & Sullington and Washington have been designated jointly as a single Neighbourhood Plan Area. The draft Neighbourhood Plan for this joint area has been submitted for examination. The Examiner subsequently found that the Neighbourhood Plan cannot be progressed to Referendum.
- 5.34 As neither Plan has been made, the Neighbourhood Plans for Thakeham and Storrington, Sullington and Washington currently are afforded little weight in decision-making.

6.0 THE CASE FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

6.1 Main Issues and the Scope of the Council's Evidence

6.2 The main planning issues relevant to this appeal are:

- i. Whether the proposal is sustainable development in accordance with the definition in paragraph 7 of the NPPF;
- ii. the appropriateness of the appeal proposal in terms of the location of the development, the principle of development and housing need;
- iii. the impact of the proposal on the landscape character of this area;
- iv. the impact of the proposal on the setting of the adjacent listed building;
- v. the provision of affordable housing;
- vi. the provision of infrastructure sufficient to meet the needs of the development;

6.3 The Council's evidence will address the reasons for refusal with reference to the main issues above and to relevant Development Plan Documents and background evidence informing these, as well as National and Local Planning Policies and Guidance. These issues are further expanded upon below.

6.4 Principle of the Development

6.5 The Council's evidence will address the current Policy context in which the appeal proposal is to be considered and determined. This indicates that permission should not be granted as the principle of development is not in accordance with the Development Plan and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to outweigh the harm set out in the reasons for refusal.

6.6 The development of this site would be contrary to the countryside restraint policies within the HDPF, namely policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, 25 and 26. The use and form of development is not one that can reasonably be said to comply with the necessary criteria within these Policies, and it therefore attracts an unacceptable level of harm by principle alone.

- 6.7 Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that *'housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development'* and that *'relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.'* The recently adopted HDPF does provide for a 5-year housing land supply plus a buffer of over 5%, as confirmed by the Inspector's Examination Report of 8th October, which found the Plan sound. The current trajectory indicates a housing land supply surplus of 13%. The relevant policies for the supply of housing are therefore up-to-date.
- 6.8 Policy 2 of the HDPF deals with settlement expansion and aims to concentrate development in and around the main settlement of Horsham and to allow growth in the rest of the District in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. In this case the site is located outside of the Storrington built-up area boundary and is therefore part of the open countryside. Policy 3 of the HDPF deals with development within settlement boundaries, and sets out the settlement hierarchy, which includes Storrington in the "Small Towns and Larger Villages" category. These are settlements with a good range of services and facilities, acting as a hub for smaller villages to meet their daily needs, but with some reliance on larger settlements and each other to meet some of their requirements. However, the appeal site is located outside of the built-up-area of Storrington, where Policy 4 of the HDPF, which deals with settlement expansion, should be applied. This Policy states that settlement expansion outside of built up area boundaries will only be supported where the site is allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan. In this case the site is not allocated for development in the HDPF, is a not a specific allocated site and is not allocated in a Neighbourhood Plan.
- 6.9 It will be shown through the Council's evidence that the Council can demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, with current trajectories for housing delivery, and that the current Development Plan, i.e. the Horsham District Planning Framework, is in accordance with the NPPF and therefore to be afforded full weight in decision making. This will be backed up by recent appeal decisions which accept the strategic approach of the Horsham District Planning Framework as being sound.
- 6.10 The Council's evidence will demonstrate that the HDPF meets the identified housing need in a sustainable way which considers the economic, social and environmental roles of sustainable development. Reference will be made to the background evidence supporting the HDPF, the Inspector's Examination Report of the HDPF and the Council's Annual Monitoring Reports.
- 6.11 Policy 2 of the HDPF sets out the overall strategy for growth in the District, seeking to focus development within the key settlement of Horsham, and to allow for growth in other settlements in accordance with the settlement hierarchy in Policy 3. The reason for this concentration of development within the defined areas is to ensure that growth is directed to settlements that are accessible and have a good range of facilities and services, including shops, schools and health centres.

- 6.12 Major development, such as a proposal for up to 107 dwellings, places a strain on both the environmental ability to appropriately support such a large increase in built form, but also on social infrastructure, accessibility and sustainability, and the sense of place. Therefore, the Council have taken the approach of focussing development in larger settlements with a good level of services and facilities, and supporting the expansion of smaller settlements such as Storrington only where the proposal accords with a Neighbourhood Plan allocation and where there is a local need demonstrated. This ensures that local residents can direct development to the most suitable sites within their areas, but also to ensure that any local infrastructure requirements are considered in detail when allocating sites and that those requirements are specified in site allocation Policies and any infrastructure delivery and housing plans contained within a Neighbourhood Plan.
- 6.13 The HDPF has assessed housing need and seeks to direct development to the most suitable sites to accommodate that need. Seeking to manage development and growth in this way is one of the fundamental principles of planning and the plan-led system. The appeal scheme is therefore contrary to this approach, insofar as the site is not within a defined settlement boundary and is not allocated within a made Neighbourhood Plan.
- 6.14 The HDPF identifies a need for 800 dwellings per annum to be delivered in the period to 2031. Of these, it is anticipated that about 1500 will come forward through allocations in Neighbourhood Plans, which should not only meet a local need, but also contribute to the wider housing need in the District. Horsham District currently has 91% of its Parishes covered by a Neighbourhood Plan Designation with Neighbourhood Plans being in various states of progress. Two Neighbourhood Plans (Nuthurst and Henfield Parishes) have been through referendum and have been made. Therefore, if allocations proceed at a similar level across the remaining Neighbourhood Plan designation areas within Horsham District, it is likely that the 1500 dwelling target will be exceeded. The HDPF Examination Report also commits the Council to the preparation of a review of the HDPF to commence within the first three years following adoption, in order to take into account any updated housing needs requirements together with a review of the process for housing delivery, including Neighbourhood Plans. Prior to this review, the Council has also programmed the preparation of a Site Allocations SPD, which will enable a range of smaller sites to meet local needs to be allocated. There is therefore scope for additional site allocations within the District to meet housing need beyond the identified 5-year period, in the unlikely event that Neighbourhood Plans do not deliver the required 1500 units. However, before these reviews take place, the priority is for the development of sites allocated in Neighbourhood Plans and current site allocations.
- 6.15 In November 2014 application DC/13/1265 was allowed on appeal for up to 75 dwellings on a site immediately to the south of the appeal site (this adjacent site abuts the existing Built Up Area Boundary). A Reserved Matters application has also been recently approved for this site and works have commenced on site. The current appeal scheme is a similar density to that approved on the appeal site. In determining the appeal, the Inspector commented that the development should be determined in accordance with the SPD on Facilitating Appropriate Development (FAD). The FAD

SPD was brought in to address the lack of a five year housing supply at that time and outlined an assessment of what would be considered appropriate development under the policies of the then adopted Development Plan Documents. With the adoption of the HDPF, the Council can now clearly demonstrate a five year housing supply and the FAD SPD no longer forms part of the Development Plan. The Inspector, in his decision in regard to the adjacent site, also commented that whilst the FAD SPD and NPPF were material considerations in the appeal, the reason for refusal of the scheme considered at appeal referred to maintaining and enhancing landscape and townscape character and not about the supply of housing.

- 6.16 Given that the HDPF has now been adopted and that the Council can now clearly demonstrate a five year housing supply, the Local Planning Authority will demonstrate that the appeal decision for the development of the land directly to the south is not considered to set a precedent for the development of the current application site. This will include setting out concerns that the current scheme would further erode the character of this countryside location which would already be detrimentally affected by the development of the land to the south and would also harm the rural setting of the adjacent listed building at Snapes Cottage.
- 6.17 Impact of the Proposal on the Landscape Character of this Area
- 6.18 The site is located in a countryside location to the north of the village of Storrington. The site is located outside of Storrington's defined build up area and therefore covered by HDPF policy 26 which protects the countryside against inappropriate development unless it is considered to be appropriate in scale and essential to that location. The Local Planning Authority will demonstrate that the development of this site would have a detrimental impact on the landscape setting of this area. This will include reference to national and local policies, guidance and background documents and relevant appeal decisions.
- 6.19 The site is seen against the backdrop of open countryside to the north and west and by existing suburban residential development to the east. There is an urbanising influence of the industrial development of Water Lane and recently constructed commercial unit on the land immediately to the south west of the site and this will be added to by the approved housing development to the south.
- 6.20 The site is identified within the Horsham District Landscape Character Assessment (HDLCA) as Landscape Character area 'E1: Parham and Storrington Wooded Farmlands and Heaths'. The landscape condition is considered overall to be good. Characteristics of relevance to the site itself are small mostly well hedged pasture fields with mature hedgerow oaks and small areas of heathland.
- 6.21 The site is also identified in section 5 'Settlement Character and Guidelines' of the HDLCA and quantified in terms of sensitivity to urban extensions as having 'some' intrinsic landscape qualities,

that provides a partial 'contribution to the distinctive settlement setting', of 'moderate' overall sensitivity and with low intervisibility.

- 6.22 At a local level, the site is categorised in the Horsham District Landscape Capacity study as Landscape Character Area 59: Land North of Water Lane, with low-moderate capacity for small scale housing development, defined as housing development of no more than 100 dwellings. It should be noted that this area has already been granted permission for 75 dwellings under DC/15/2126 for the land to the immediate site of the current appeal site. Characteristics relevant to the site include its 'undulating landform with small to medium scale irregular pasture and arable fields', the 'strong network of thick hedgerow field boundaries', and the 'landscape condition is generally good' with a strong rural character except close to some of the urban edge'.
- 6.23 With regards to visual amenity, the proposals show the existing hedgerow field pattern of the site is to be maintained and reinforced by new planting in its majority with a view to assisting in mitigating the adverse visual effect of the development. Nevertheless, given the elevated position of the site (where the land rises up to form a plateau) it is considered that this increase in height together with the two storey height of the proposed buildings, would cause the development to be seen from the adjacent public footpath and possibly over the existing treeline and hedgerow to the south, thereby impacting upon the residential receptors and views from the South Downs.
- 6.24 The Landscape Officer has commented that although site boundary features would be retained, the landscape characteristics of the site would be lost and replaced by significant urbanising form. The landscape context of the site is informed as much by the tranquillity and rurality of the pastoral and arable fields to the north and west as it is by the settlement edge to the south and east. It is considered that the site is key to the transition from and separation of the built-up suburban area of Storrington to the rural feel of Thakeham. With the new housing development approved on the land to the south, this transition would be further eroded resulting in the urbanisation of the area and the unacceptable loss of countryside.
- 6.25 The Council will therefore demonstrate that the proposal amounts to an urbanising form of development with the provision of up to 107 dwellings incorporating ancillary infrastructure including vehicular and pedestrian access onto the public highway, parking, landscaping, and boundary treatments. In addition to the adjacent development site to the south for 75 dwellings, the proposal would result in a significant cumulative impact and adverse effect on the landscape character and appearance of the area including an adverse impact on the landscape setting of Snapes Cottage.
- 6.26 Impact of the Proposal on the Setting of the Adjacent Listed Building
- 6.27 Policy 34 of the HDPF states that the Council recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and as such the Council will sustain and enhance its historic environment through positive management of development affecting heritage assets. Section 66(1) of The Planning (Listed

Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 contains the primary legislation relating to the determination of planning applications relating to the historic environment and Section 66(1) makes clear that impact on setting is an important consideration for decision-makers and should be taken into account when determining applications.

- 6.28 In addition, the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The Local Planning Authority will demonstrate that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the heritage asset, at Snapes Cottage. This will include reference to relevant national legislation and guidance, local policies and background documents, the building's listing, A History of the County of Sussex: Volume 6, Historic England guidance and relevant appeal decisions.
- 6.29 Snapes Cottage is a Grade II Listed building adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. The proposed development would wrap around the north and west boundaries of Snapes Cottage and would be adjacent to the driveway to the cottage. The listed building draws its significance from its architectural and historic value as a traditional building constructed of the local vernacular. It alludes to the historic land use of the region which is evident on the historic mapping. Whilst its context as an isolated farmstead has been eroded by the loss of traditional ancillary structures, as a result of the relocation of the farm nucleus to the land on the eastern side of Storrington Road, it still does have an association to the surrounding countryside which is important in respect of the morphology of the listed building and its setting.
- 6.30 The appeal decision for the adjacent land south of Snapes Cottage development did consider the setting of the listed building and concluded that there would be negligible less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed building. The development scheme, approved at appeal, retained an undeveloped margin along the northern boundary in order to minimise the impact upon the listed building and thus retained its context as a countryside residence.
- 6.31 The supporting statement submitted as part of this application relies heavily upon the Inspectors findings for the development to the south without however fully assessing the conclusions made or how these have been reached. The appellant's documentation fails to recognise that if the land to the north, east and west of Snapes Cottage was built upon that the building would be completely engulfed in modern housing estates. Whilst the retained margin to the south would reduce the impact on the setting of Snapes Cottage its existing context as a countryside residence would be substantially lost. In this regard there would be less than substantial harm to the setting and context of the listed building which would not be outweighed by the public benefit.
- 6.32 The topography of site results in the land rising up from the northwest of Snapes Cottage to a plateau. This increase in height will ensure that the built form will inevitably rise up out of the site, likely exceeding the existing treeline and hedgerow canopy, thereby impacting upon the setting of the listed building. The proposed layout scheme has identified the entire area to be set aside for

development, and whilst it does include a small “green” this is consumed by built form and urbanisation in the form of boundary fencing, ancillary buildings, garaging and hard landscaping all of which cumulatively impact upon the sense of place and landscape characterisation both of which contribute to the setting of the listed building.

6.33 It will therefore be demonstrated that the appeal scheme results in less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed building and, whilst acknowledging that the development could provide some positive social and economic outcomes, it is not considered that these would be of a sufficient scale to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the harm identified to the setting of the Listed Building. Additionally, as the Council can now demonstrate a 5 year housing supply, there is no overriding public benefit arising from the development which would outweigh the great weight to be applied to the harm caused to the heritage asset. On that basis, the proposed development is not considered to represent a sustainable form of development as prescribed by the NPPF. In reaching this conclusion, significant weight is given to the fact the Council can deliver its housing requirements as outlined in the HDPF without having to rely on sites located outside built up areas. It is therefore considered that there is insufficient justification for overriding the presumption in favour of preserving the setting of the Grade II Listed Building.

6.34 Legal Agreement- Affordable Housing and Infrastructure Provision

6.35 Where a need for affordable housing has been identified, such as in Horsham District, the NPPF requires the LPA to set Policies for meeting that need on site. Policy 16 of the HDPF requires that new developments of 15 or more residential units provide 35% affordable housing. This should be an on-site provision unless in exceptional cases where an off-site contribution will be accepted in lieu. At the current time, the need is greatest for affordable rented accommodation and therefore the Council would be seeking a minimum of 70% of the affordable units to be rented and 30% for shared ownership.

6.36 The Appellant confirmed their agreement to provide 40% affordable housing at the planning application stage. This exceeds the 35% affordable housing requirement required by the HDPF, which equates to 43 units of 102 dwellings. The Housing Section has commented that the greatest need in the District is for 2 bed 4 person homes. The scheme includes a low number of 2 bed 4 person units and the proposed mix put forward in the scheme is not supported by the Housing Section. However, as this is an outline application, with only access to be considered, the final mix of dwellings proposed across the site would be considered and controlled as part of a Reserved Matters application and based on the most up to date need at that time. Early discussion is therefore required regarding the delivery of affordable housing. This could be agreed as part of a Statement of Common Ground.

6.37 Policy 39 of the HDPF relates to infrastructure provision, and states that the release of land for development will be dependent on there being sufficient capacity in the existing local infrastructure to

meet the additional requirements arising from the new development, or suitable necessary mitigation arrangements for the improvement of infrastructure, services and community facilities caused by the development being provided. This policy is in conformity with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) that requires contributions towards infrastructure projects where they are necessary, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale.

- 6.38 As stated in the report WSCC advised that there is insufficient capacity at nearby schools and libraries to accommodate demand from the proposal and the additional dwellings would put further strain on the local transport network and the local fire and rescue service. However, WSCC advise that these shortcomings can be addressed through the provision of financial contributions. In terms of the District Council, the Planning Obligations SPD has not been superseded by the HDPF and remains part of the Development Plan. This provides guidance and formulae for calculating the level of contributions for identified projects related to the development.
- 6.39 In terms of relevant District level infrastructure necessary to support the development, a scheme of this scale would require contributions towards Outdoor Space and Recreation Areas, Community Centre and Halls.
- 6.40 At the time of issuing the LPA decision notice, there was no completed Legal Agreement in place by which the affordable housing provision and infrastructure contributions could be secured. At the time of finalising this Statement, no completed Legal Agreement was in place, and the scheme therefore failed the requirements of policies 16 and 39 of the HDPF, and paragraph 50 of the NPPF.
- 6.41 The Council will be liaising with the Appellant to seek to finalise an Agreement of acceptable wording to secure the necessary affordable units and infrastructure contributions prior to the opening of the Inquiry. However, if it is not possible to secure affordable housing and infrastructure contributions through a Legal Agreement, the scheme would not contribute to the affordable housing needs of the District and there would not be sufficient infrastructure in place to support the development.
- 6.42 The Three Roles of Sustainable Development
- 6.43 Paragraph 7 of the NPPF sets out the economic, social and environmental roles of sustainable development. Paragraph 8 goes on to advise that these roles should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent, and that to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.
- 6.44 In light of the issues set out in the Officers' report, the Local Planning Authority's decision notice and this Statement, it is clear that the appeal proposal does not meet, or provide gains, in respect of all three of these rolls and therefore the proposal does not amount to sustainable development.

- 6.45 In terms of the economic role, the development would provide employment in the short term through the construction process, and new residents would contribute to sustaining local services and businesses. However, the economic role also requires the planning system to identify and coordinate development requirements, and to ensure land is available at the right time and in the right place to support growth. In this case, the District is seeking to play an active role in guiding development to sustainable locations through the HDPF policies, in particular through sustainable expansion of settlements in accordance with Policy 4. At the local level, the allocation of sites in Neighbourhood Plans provides a means by which to identify and coordinate development requirements, and to ensure land is available at the right time and in the right place to support growth.
- 6.46 In terms of the social role, the proposal would provide housing, contributing to an identified need in the Parish and District. However, the social role also requires the planning system to create a high quality built environment and to reflect the community's needs, social and cultural well-being. The social role of sustainable development has strong links to Localism and therefore to Neighbourhood Planning. The Neighbourhood Plan process is intended to give the local community the opportunity to direct development to the most suitable sites within their areas, and the collaborative process of plan preparation is important to the cultural well-being of the community. Support for Neighbourhood Plan allocations, and resisting development which is not in accordance with Neighbourhood Plan allocations, through the planning decision-making process is a clear means by which to deliver the government's Localism agenda through the plan-led system. Furthermore, without a completed Agreement in place, there is no means by which to ensure these are delivered. For these reasons, the development does not meet the social role of sustainable development for this reason.
- 6.47 In terms of the environmental role, the Local Planning Authority will demonstrate that the development would not be acceptable in terms of the impact on the setting of the adjacent heritage asset and therefore fails on this account. As a site located outside of the built-up area, the Council seeks to direct development to appropriate sites which are in compliance with allocations in either the Local Plan or a Neighbourhood Plan. This is to ensure that only the most suitable sites are developed, and to protect the countryside and rural areas from inappropriate development and settlement encroachment. Given the impact of the proposal on the setting of the adjacent listed building, the location of the proposal site in a countryside location, and the absence of any allocation for development in the Local Plan, or any Made Neighbourhood Plan, the proposal would not fulfil the environmental role of sustainable development.
- 6.48 In terms of Planning Balance, it is acknowledged that the proposed additional housing would provide economic benefits, including employment opportunities during the construction process and that the prospective occupiers would be likely to contribute to the local economy and would also be required to pay Council Tax. It is also acknowledged that 40% of the dwellings would be made available on the affordable housing market. Financial contributions secured through a planning obligation could, together with appropriate conditions, require the provision of off-site highway improvements and

enhanced local facilities, thereby supporting the local community's social well-being. The indicative plans also show that the proposed development would provide an area of public open space. Whilst the provision of this open space could help to provide recreational opportunities for prospective occupiers, given the location of the site, away from Storrington village, it is considered unlikely that this facility would provide wider public benefits to existing local residents.

6.49 The Council will demonstrate that, on balance, and whilst acknowledging that the development could provide some positive social and economic outcomes, it is not considered that these would be of a sufficient scale to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the principle of the scheme in light of the strategic policies for growth outlined in the HDPF, the harm identified to the setting of the adjacent listed building and the harm identified to landscape character of the area. On that basis, the proposed development is not considered to represent a sustainable form of development as prescribed by the NPPF. In reaching this conclusion, significant weight is given to the fact the Council can deliver its housing requirements as outlined in the HDPF without having to rely on sites located outside built up areas.

6.50 The Local Planning Authority will therefore demonstrate that, taking all matters into account, the proposal is considered to represent an unsustainable form of development, on a site where the principle of residential development is unacceptable and cannot be supported. The provision of housing in this location, at the scale proposed and in conjunction with the approved development for 75 dwellings to land directly to the south, would further diminish the rural and open character of this particular part of the landscape, creating a discordant and uncharacteristically urbanised environment. Furthermore, the development would adversely harm the setting of a Listed Building. The development is considered harmful, even when weighed against the economic and social benefits of the scheme and as such, the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out in Paragraph 14 of the NPPF, cannot be applied.

7. CONCLUSION

7.1 The Council considers that their determination represents the proper and correct decision, with regard to the relevant planning policies in place at the time of determination and other material considerations.

7.2 Attention is drawn to Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which requires determination of a planning application to be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

8. APPENDICES

- 1 Decision Notice of DC/15/2374
- 2 Officer's Report of DC/15/2374
- 3 Extract from Committee Minutes of 19 January 2016

Appendix 1: Decision Notice of DC/15/1995



Mr Gladman Developments
Gladman House
Alexandria Way
Congleton
Cheshire
CW12 1LB
United Kingdom

Application Number: DC/15/2374

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT, 1990 (as amended)
TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order
2015

On behalf of:

In pursuance of their powers under the above-mentioned Act and Order, the Council hereby REFUSE to permit the works specified hereunder, that is to say:

Outline planning permission for up to 107 dwellings (including up to 40% affordable housing), informal public open space and children's play area, surface water attenuation, landscaping, vehicular access point from Storrington Road and associated ancillary works. All matters to be reserved with the exception of the main site access.

Land at Storrington Road Thakeham West Sussex

as shown on Plan and Application Number DC/15/2374 submitted to the Council on 23/10/2015. The reasons for the Council's decision to refuse to permit the above works are specified hereunder.

- 1 The proposed development is located in the open countryside, outside of any defined Built Up Area Boundary, on a site not allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework, or an adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan. The Council is able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and consequently this scheme would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchical approach of concentrating development within the main settlements. Furthermore, the proposed development is not essential to its countryside location and consequently represents an inappropriate, unsustainable and unacceptable form of development that is contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF and Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, 25 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
- 2 The provision of housing in this location, at the scale proposed and in conjunction with the approved development for 75 dwellings to land directly to the south, would

further diminish the rural and open character of this particular part of the landscape, creating a discordant and uncharacteristically urbanised environment harming the character of the local countryside. The development is, therefore, contrary to the NPPF and Policies 25 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 3 The provision of up to 107 no. dwellings, within the historic landscape setting of the Grade II Listed Building at Snapes Cottage, would affect the significance of the heritage asset by significantly harming the character and appearance of its setting and the appreciation of its sense of rural isolation as a countryside residence. The development is therefore contrary to S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
- 4 The proposed development makes no provision for securing affordable housing units, or for contributions towards improvements to education provision; transport infrastructure; libraries; fire and rescue services; open space; sport and recreation facilities; community facilities; and is, therefore, contrary to Policies 16 and 39 of the Horsham District Local Development Framework (2015), as it has not been demonstrated how the infrastructure needs of the development would be met.

Schedule of plans/documents:

Location plan Drwg no. SB-01 Received: 21.10.2015

Plans - development framework plan Drwg no. DF-01 REV F Received: 21.10.2015

Supporting Docs Drwg no. 4746/33/01A Received: 18.12.2015



Dr Chris Lyons

Director of Planning, Economic Development & Property

Date: 20/01/2016

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Right of Appeal

If you are aggrieved by the decision to refuse permission for the proposed development or to grant it subject to conditions, then you can appeal to the Secretary of State under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

You must appeal within 12 weeks of the date of the decision notice for a householder application and within 26 weeks for other types of planning applications. Please note, only the applicant possesses the right of appeal.

The details of how to appeal together with the form which must be used can be obtained from the Planning Inspectorate at Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN (Tel: 0303 444 5000) or on-line at www.planningportal.gov.uk/pcs



**Horsham
District
Council**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT REPORT

TO: Development Management Committee (South)

BY: Development Manager

DATE: 19 January 2016

DEVELOPMENT: Outline planning permission for up to 107 dwellings (including up to 40% affordable housing), informal public open space and children's play area, surface water attenuation, landscaping, vehicular access point from Storrington Road and associated ancillary works. All matters to be reserved with the exception of the main site access.

SITE: Land at Storrington Road Thakeham West Sussex

WARD: Chanctonbury

APPLICATION: DC/15/2374

APPLICANT: Gladman Developments

REASON FOR INCLUSION ON THE AGENDA: Departure from the Development Plan

RECOMMENDATION: To refuse the application.

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

1.1 To consider the planning application.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

1.2 The application is made in outline. The proposed main access is for consideration with the application. Matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved for later consideration.

1.3 The application proposes the erection of up to 107 dwellings, served by a new access from Storrington Road. The application indicates an indicative layout of detached, semi-detached and terraced two storey dwellings with parking spaces and garages. The proposal includes up to 40% affordable housing units. 40% affordable housing relates to 43 units.

1.4 The indicative layout submitted with the application shows a development with 5 cul-de-sacs coming off a central road. The proposed density of the site would be 22 dwellings per hectare. The site is shown with proposed infiltration basins in the north west and south east corners of the site and a proposed village green and

open space in a central position. New planting and green links are indicated as part of the proposal including a green buffer area around the boundary with Snapes Cottage. The proposal would retain the majority of trees around the borders of the site. The scheme would require the removal of a hedgerow tree belt to accommodate the proposed site access from Storrington Road (B2139). A section of internal hedgerow tree belt would also be required to be removed to accommodate access through the site between fields.

- 1.5 The application has been accompanied by a number of supporting document including:
- Design and Access Statement
 - Planning Statement
 - Built Heritage Statement
 - Air Quality Assessment
 - Flood Risk Assessment
 - Statement of Community Involvement
 - Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
 - Framework Travel Plan
 - Archaeological Assessment
 - Noise Impact Assessment
 - Economic Impact Assessment
 - Foul Drainage Analysis
 - Ecology Report

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

- 1.6 The application site comprises an area of 4.89 hectares which includes four fields located to the west of Storrington Road. The smallest field is immediately adjacent to Storrington Road and is unused land which has been left to grow naturally. This field is set at higher ground level than Storrington Road and is surrounded by trees and a hedgerow tree belt. This field has an area of approximately 4,800sqm and is directly north of a neighbouring dwelling at Venters, Storrington Road and south of a separate paddock used for horses. Given the shape of the proposed site, this paddock separates the majority of the site to the west from Storrington Road. With this separation, the proposed site is an unusual shape with limited roadside frontage.
- 1.7 Adjoining this field to the west are the three further fields which are part of the application site. These fields are used for horse grazing and have a total area of approximately 44,000sqm. The fields are divided by timber fencing. Due to the topography of the site the fields slope down from north to south with a central plateau. These fields are also surrounded by trees and a hedgerow belt.
- 1.8 The site is north of the built-up-area of Storrington. Storrington is classed as a 'Small Town and Larger Village' in Policy 3, Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy of the Horsham District Planning Framework. Directly to the south of the site is a piece of vacant land which abuts the built-up area boundary of Storrington at Rother Close and Jubilee Way. This piece of land was recently granted outline permission at appeal followed by reserved matters approval for the development of the 75 dwellings (refs: DC/13/1265 & DC/15/2126). Development has not

commenced on this adjacent site. The current application site is approximately 115m from the nearest dwelling on Rother Close.

- 1.9 The current application site is also north of a group of detached dwellings at St Marys Close. These houses are the nearest dwellings to the site which are within the built-up-area boundary. The site also adjoins the north and west boundaries of Snapes Cottage. This property is a Grade II listed building. There is also a row of detached dwellings of traditional design facing the site on Storrington Road. The site also abuts the boundary of a dwelling at Littlebury House to the north of the site. To the west and to the north of the site (adjacent to Littlebury House) are further fields. The field to the west of the application site is used for crops and the field to the north is for grazing. Further to the south west of the site, beyond the fields, there are a number of commercial units within an industrial estate, including a recently constructed warehouse building.
- 1.10 The site is located within the Horsham District Landscape Character Area E1: Parnham & Storrington Wooded Farmlands and Heath. According to this classification, 'the area has a distinctive landscape of rolling sandy ridges and stream valleys with a mosaic of oak – birch / woodland, conifer plantations, heathlands and rough pasture. Despite the proximity of the urban edge of Storrington and the intrusion of traffic, the area retains surprisingly rural character.'
- 1.11 The current application site is identified in the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) as site no.SA469 Land off Storrington Road. The SHELAA states the following for this site:
- 1.12 'The site abuts the built up area of Storrington and is located within an area as having low to moderate capacity for residential development in the HDC Landscape Capacity Assessment 2014. Storrington Road runs to the east of the site providing a sustainable access into the town. There may be potential impacts on the setting of Snapes Cottage Grade II listed building which would need to be considered. The site is not identified in the emerging Thakeham Neighbourhood Development Plan and as such is considered Developable 11+ years'.

2. INTRODUCTION

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICY

- 2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), sections 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12.
- 2.3 Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014).

RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICY

- 2.4 The following policies in the HDPF are considered to be relevant:

- Policy 1: Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development
- Policy 2: Strategic Policy: Strategic Development
- Policy 3: Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy
- Policy 4: Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion
- Policy 15: Strategic Policy: Housing Provision
- Policy 16: Strategic Policy: Meeting Local Housing Needs
- Policy 17: Exceptions Housing Schemes
- Policy 24: Strategic Policy – Environmental Protection
- Policy 25: Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
- Policy 26: Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection
- Policy 31: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
- Policy 32: Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
- Policy 33: Development Principles
- Policy 34: Cultural and Heritage Assets
- Policy 35: Strategic Policy: Climate Change
- Policy 36: Strategic Policy: Appropriate Energy Use
- Policy 37: Sustainable Construction
- Policy 38: Strategic Policy: Flooding
- Policy 39: Strategic Policy: Infrastructure Provision
- Policy 40: Sustainable Transport
- Policy 41: Parking
- Policy 42: Strategic Policy: Inclusive Communities

2.5 Local Development Framework: Supplementary Planning Document:

- Planning Obligations (2007)

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

- 2.6 The site is within the parish of Thakeham. Thakeham has been designated as a Neighbourhood Development Plan Area, and a Pre-Submission plan has been produced which has recently been out for Regulation 16 consultation. The consultation ended on the 11th December 2015. At the time of writing the report, no date had been set for the examination of the plan. The site is not allocated in the Pre-Submission plan.

PLANNING HISTORY

- 2.7 There is no planning history for this site. The following planning history is relevant to this application and relates to the immediate site to the south at land North of Brook Close and Rother Close:

DC/15/2126	Application for Approval of Reserved Matters pursuant to Outline Planning Application DC/13/1265 (Development of approximately 75 dwellings including the creation of an access point from Water Lane. Provision of open space including children's play area, linear park, landscaping and sustainable urban drainage systems on the site)	Approved
DC/13/1265		Refused:

Development of approximately 75 dwellings including the creation of an access point from Water Lane. Provision of open space including children's play area, linear park, landscaping and sustainable urban drainage systems on the site (Outline) Allowed on appeal

3. OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1 Where consultation responses have been summarised, it should be noted that Officers have had consideration of the full comments received, which are available to view on the public file at www.horsham.gov.uk.
- 3.2 **HDC – Housing (summarised):** Comment. The applicant proposes 40% affordable homes (43 units). The mix of housing proposed is not supported and the Council would request a higher number of 2 bed properties as well a small number of 1 beds. Due to Government announcements in the July 2015 Budget and proposals in the Housing and Planning Bill (October 2015) the final tenure mix of the affordable homes will be agreed in writing by the Council prior to commencement of development.
- 3.3 **HDC - Strategic Planning (Summarised):** Objection. The site is located in the countryside, well outside of the BUAB of Storrington, and is unrelated to the existing settlement edge. As such, the site is considered against 'Countryside Protection Policy 26' which protects the countryside against inappropriate development. Additionally, the Council can demonstrate a full 5-year housing land supply against the required number of dwellings per annum. It is also considered that a housing site of up to 107 dwellings in a countryside location such as this would not be of an appropriate scale. The site has not been allocated for development in the Neighbourhood Development Plan which is currently out for Regulation 16 public consultation.
- 3.4 **HDC – Technical Services (Drainage) (summarised):** No overall objections to the drainage strategy proposed subject to a detailed design information to be submitted at the appropriate planning stage. Suitable drainage conditions should be applied that secure the implementation and maintenance of the SuDS to ensure they remain effective for the lifetime of the development.
- 3.5 **HDC – Environmental Management, Waste and Cleansing (summarised):** Comment. A full refuse strategy is required to be submitted for approval.
Officer note: This is an outline application and we would therefore expect such a strategy to be submitted as part of a Reserved Matters application in the event that an outline approval is granted.
- 3.6 **HDC – Environmental Health (summarised):** No objection subject to the following:
- Submission of Construction Environmental Management Plan to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

- The noise report submitted by Peter Brett Associates is acceptable. The scheme is to be implemented in accordance with the details outlined in the report which recommends trickle vents to the windows of some dwellings.
- The site is over 1km from the Storrington Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The applicant has submitted an air quality assessment report. However, the report lacks sufficient details. Therefore, a condition is recommended requiring the submission of a 'low emission strategy' scheme for the approval of the local planning authority.
- Given the sensitivity of the proposed end use, a condition relating to the submission of a scheme associated with the contamination of the site for the approval of the local planning authority is recommended. The Environmental Health would expect to see at least a desk top study and depending on the findings of this work, recommendations for further intrusive work and a watching brief over site preparation and groundworks.

3.7 **HDC – Parks & Countryside**: No objection. Under the approved scheme for the land to the south, there is some natural play provision in the open space at the north of that site. It is recommended that this provision is expanded and enhanced with additional play equipment to provide a facility, equally accessible from both developments. This would obviate the need for the play area at the centre of the current scheme but it would still be important to ensure appropriate quantities of amenity/natural green space are included within that development.

3.8 **HDC – Ecology Consultant (summarised)**: No objection subject to the plans and particulars submitted in support of the reserved matters application to include the following ecological details:

- Updated ecology surveys, including an update badger survey, a suite of dormouse surveys, and additional bat activity survey(s), with appropriate avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures as required;
- A reptile mitigation method statement to expand upon those recommendations made within sections 4.18-4.20 of the Ecology Report by FPCR, dated March 2015, and to provide detail on reptile protection measures and receptor areas. This should include a reptile population survey and results to inform receptor site requirements;
- A lighting plan showing measures to be used to avoid illumination of boundary habitats, and proposed areas of open space, to avoid disturbance to bats and mature trees with potential to support bats;
- A management plan to ensure the long-term viability of new and existing habitats.

3.9 **HDC - Archaeology Consultant (summarised)**: No objection subject to the submission of a written scheme of investigation to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.

3.10 **HDC - Design & Conservation Consultant (summarised)**: Objection. It is considered that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the setting of the Grade II listed Snapes Cottage.

3.11 **HDC – Landscape Officer (summarised)**: Objection. The proposal of 107 dwellings on the site in addition to the adjacent Crest Nicholson development will

have a significant cumulative impact and adverse effect on the landscape character and appearance of the area.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

- 3.12 **West Sussex County Council – Flood Risk Management Consultant (summarised):** No objection. Current mapping shows the proposed site is primarily at 'low risk' from surface water flooding and ground water flooding. Development should not commence until finalised detailed surface water drainage designs for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of hydrological and hydro geological context of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 3.13 **West Sussex County Council - Highways (summarised):** No objection. As amended and subject to the submission of further details, the highway authority is satisfied that the development would not result in any severe highway safety or capacity impacts.
- 3.14 **Southern Water (Summarised):** No objection subject to the following:
- The applicant is to enter into a formal agreement with Southern Water to provide the necessary sewerage infrastructure required to service this development.
 - The applicant will need to ensure that arrangements exist for the long term maintenance of the SUDS facilities.
 - No soakaways, swales, ponds, watercourses or any other surface water retaining or conveying features to be located within 5 metres of a public sewer.
 - Details of the proposed means of foul and surface water sewerage disposal to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to development commencing.
- 3.15 **Environment Agency (summarised):** No objection.
- 3.16 **Campaign to Protect Rural England Sussex (summarised):** Objection.
- The application does not recognise and therefore take into account the intrinsic beauty of the locality's countryside. If permitted, the development would have a significant harmful impact on the landscape character of the site and its surroundings which would change from rural to urban.
 - The scheme is predicated on the presumption that Council would not have an up-to-date plan. With the adoption of HDPF the Council now has a 5 year housing supply.
 - Essential information regarding biodiversity and ecology has not been submitted.
 - The scheme would cause significant harm to the character of the adjacent Grade II listed building, Snapes Cottage.
 - Given the remoteness of the site, the scheme would have an impact on the air quality of Storrington.
 - The scheme is opposed by both Thakeham and Storrington & Sullington Parish Councils and is not designated in a Neighbourhood Plan.

- 3.17 **West Sussex County Council – Section 106 (summarised):** No objection subject to S106 contributions. Contributions are required in relation to School Infrastructure, Library Infrastructure, Transport, Fire & Rescue Service Infrastructure. As the housing mix is not known at this stage, it is not possible to establish the proposed contributions for this scheme. If recommended for approval, a formula could be inserted into any legal agreement so that the necessary contributions can be calculated at a later date.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

- 3.18 **Thakeham Parish Council:** Objects to the proposal on the following grounds:
- The proposal conflicts with the local HDPF strategic planning framework. The site is greenfield and outside the Category 1 settlement of Storrington and Sullington. It is not included in the HDPF for development, which was recently found to be sound by the Planning Inspector and has now been made by Horsham District Council.
 - The proposal conflicts with the emerging local planning framework. In particular it is in direct conflict (as acknowledged by the applicant's Planning Statement) with the Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan (TNP), which is currently out for s.16 formal consultation pre-referendum following extensive consultation with local residents and validation processes via Horsham District Council, including external health check. The site of this proposal was specifically considered during the development of the TNP. Even with an assumed lower number of units (75) the site scored poorly and was ruled out on the grounds of: being outside current built-up areas, coalescence, negative impact on landscape and impact on listed buildings.
 - To add a further 107 homes by granting permission on this site would derail the Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan in terms of housing supply, its strong emphasis on avoiding further coalescence between the villages of Thakeham and Storrington, and in terms of planned provision of community facilities.
 - The proposed development will demonstrably harm the setting of a grade II listed building (Snape's Cottage), within 30m of the southern boundary of the site.
 - The proposal would have a serious adverse impact on the landscape character of this area, which currently eases the transition from built-up suburbs, via sporadic development northwards along the B2139, to the rural feel of most of the rest of Thakeham parish.
 - The site makes a valuable contribution to biodiversity at the edge of the existing built-up area. The existing considerable tree cover is in good condition and contains some outstanding trees. As the applicant's ecological report (para 4.16) notes, there is species richness within the field areas, which will not survive the development.
 - The applicant argues that the site is suitable for walking and cycling to the facilities of central Storrington. The site is in an unsustainable location being practically 2km from the local service centre of Storrington. Residents will therefore inevitably be mainly reliant on the car for access to shops and all other facilities.
 - The extra cars/journeys created will increase accidents. Snapes Corner is a dangerous location; the proposed site entrance is just north of the bend

where there have been a number of car accidents in recent years, including fatalities.

- The additional cars and high number of journeys necessitated by the unsustainable location will further exacerbate the well-known and serious air pollution problems in Storrington.
- This is not a sustainable location. The strong sense of Storrington is that schools, dentists and doctor's surgeries in the area are already at maximum capacity.

3.19 **Storrington & Sullington Parish Council:** Objects to the proposal on the following grounds

- The proposed site is not included in the HDPF or in Thakeham's or Storrington, Sullington & Washington Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plans.
- It became apparent whilst conducting Neighbourhood Plan Surveys that residents of all surrounding villages wanted to protect the gaps between each individual village.
- Members also feel that the scheme should be objected to on the grounds of traffic, air quality, lack of infrastructure and the fact that the schools, dentists and doctors surgery are already at maximum capacity.

3.20 **Thakeham Village Action:**

- This land in the Thakeham Countryside is an unsuitable rural location outside the limits of any existing settlement.
- With the decision to adopt the HDPF, the Council has a five year supply of housing.
- The forthcoming Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan, currently at Regulation 15 public notice stage, does not allocate this site for housing.
- Introducing suburban type housing would not be appropriate to this countryside location and would harm the landscape character and countryside ambience, amenity and atmosphere of this rural location.
- The site is visible from the South Downs National Park. Building on this land would harm the landscape character of the National Park.
- The site is not well contained in the wider landscape. It has a high degree of visual sensitivity from higher ground, the B2139 and the nearby footpath.
- The site has poor access to services and facilities. It is some 2km to the nearest service centre (Storrington) and more than 500m to the nearest frequent bus stop, so owners would be reliant on the use of the private car.
- Developing this site would lead to coalescence between Thakeham and Storrington.
- Introduction of a housing development would create light pollution.
- Development of this site would result in the loss of good quality agricultural soils.
- Change of land use from an agricultural field to housing would result in a less balanced living and working community.
- The old hedgerows on the site provide refuges for wildlife, including protected species.
- The local infrastructure (roads, schools, health facilities, water supply, sewerage) are unable to take the increased pressure development would place on them.
- Development would affect the setting of a listed building.

- Local air quality problems would be made worse.
- The proposed development would not result in a use required for a countryside location.

3.21 **72** no. letters of **objection** (from 68 different addresses) have been received. The grounds of objection are as follows:

- The proposal would swallow up an area of Greenfield land and be overdevelopment resulting in a loss of countryside.
- The site is not allocated in the Thakeham or Storrington Neighbourhood Plans.
- The scheme is not supported or for the benefit of the local community and is just for profit.
- The scheme would increase vehicle movements on Storrington Road. This is a dangerous junction.
- Permission has already been granted for development of the land to the south for 75 dwellings and for 146 houses at the Abingworth Nursery site as well as other sites nearby. This is too much for this small parish with limited facilities.
- The scheme would put pressure on local services such as doctor's surgeries, schools and dentists. A doctor's surgery has recently closed down in the local area.
- The scheme would reduce the quality of life for existing residents.
- The houses should have maximum energy efficiency.
- Along with other approved developments in the area, The scheme would result in disruption to the area.
- The proposal is near to the National Park and should be kept as countryside.
- The proposal should include more affordable housing.
- This site is an add-on to an add-on to the town boundary and would set a further precedent.
- Residents of the proposal would be commuters as there is limited employment in the area resulting in increased traffic.
- Local wildlife would be put in danger by this proposal.
- Drainage from the site would no longer be natural resulting in flooding problems.
- The scheme is not sustainable given its distance from local services.
- The scheme would contribute to the coalescence between Thakeham and Storrington.
- There is insufficient water supply in the area to accommodate this development.
- The scheme would add to the air pollution problem in Storrington.

4. HOW THE PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION WILL PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS

4.1 Article 8 (Right to respect of a Private and Family Life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to this application, Consideration of Human rights forms part of the planning assessment below.

5. HOW THE PROPOSAL WILL HELP TO REDUCE CRIME AND DISORDER

5.1 It is not considered that the development would be likely to have any significant impact on crime and disorder.

6. PLANNING ASSESSMENTS

6.1 As an outline application, the main issue in the consideration of this application is whether the proposal is acceptable in principle having regard to both central government and local development plan policies, and to any other material considerations.

6.2 The applicant has requested that all matters except access are to be considered for later determination. 'Access', in this instance, relates to the accessibility to and within the site, for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians in terms of the positioning and treatment of access circulation routes and how these fit into the surrounding access network.

6.3 As set out in Section 2, the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) was adopted on 27th November 2015. It is, therefore, necessary to assess this application for outline planning permission against the relevant Policies of the HDPF and the national planning policies contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is also relevant to this application.

6.4 The NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should contribute to building strong, responsive and competitive economies; vibrant and healthy communities that meet the needs of present and future generations; high quality built environments, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; protect and enhance the natural, built and historic environment and; improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution and mitigate and adapt to climate change.

6.5 In accordance with the above objectives, the main issues for the Local Planning Authority

to consider in the determination of this application for outline planning permission are the acceptability of the principle of the proposed residential development in land use terms; the impact on the setting on the adjacent Grade II Listed Building; the impact on the character and visual amenity of the landscape and locality; the impact of the development on the amenity of prospective and neighbouring occupiers; whether safe vehicular and pedestrian access can be provided to the site and the impact of the development on highway and pedestrian safety; traffic conditions in the locality; whether appropriate provision can be made for car and cycle parking, refuse storage/collection, drainage/flooding and; whether the development can be delivered without harming the interests of nature conservation, flooding, land contamination, archaeology and air quality.

Principle of Development

6.6 The HDPF demonstrates that there is adequate housing land available to provide the required 800 dwellings per annum for a 5 year period. Policy 3 of the HDPF, confirms that development should be focused within Built-Up Area Boundaries. In

addition to Built-Up Areas, it is recognised that, in order for some communities to be able to grow and develop, it will be necessary for them to expand beyond their current built form. Accordingly, Policies 3 and 4 note that, by allocating sites in the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plans, it will be possible to meet the identified local needs of these settlements and provide an appropriate level of market and affordable housing, as well as maintaining the viability of smaller villages and towns. The Policy notes the importance of retaining the rural character of the District beyond these settlements. In this instance, the proposed site is well beyond the Built-Up-Area of Storrington in a countryside location.

- 6.7 The HDPF outlines that the proposed settlement hierarchy which is the most sustainable approach to delivering housing. New development should be focused in the larger settlements of Horsham, Southwater and Billingshurst, with limited new development elsewhere, and only where it accords with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. Specifically, Policy 3 of the Horsham District Planning Framework seeks to retain the existing settlement pattern and ensure that development takes place in the most sustainable locations as possible.
- 6.8 As the development site is outside the built-up-area boundary, not allocated in a Neighbourhood Plan and not within a strategic development site, the principle of residential development in this location is, therefore, contrary to Policies 2, 3 and 4 of the HDPF.
- 6.9 In this countryside location, the site is also considered against 'Countryside Protection' Policy 26 which protects the countryside against inappropriate development unless it is considered to be appropriate in scale and essential; and must also meet one of four criteria. The proposed development does not meet any of these four criteria, nor is it considered to be essential given the Council can demonstrate a full 5-year housing land supply against the required number of dwellings per annum.
- 6.10 As stated, the application site is not allocated for development within an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. Thakeham has been designated as a Neighbourhood Development Plan Area, and a Pre-Submission plan has been produced which has recently been out for Regulation 16 consultation. The site has not been designated within the Thakeham Pre-Submission plan.
- 6.11 Whilst the Thakeham NDP has reached Regulation 16 stage, it is considered to be too early to afford this plan any meaningful weight in the decision making process of this application. Notwithstanding this, given Thakeham Parish Council's strong objection to this proposal, it is unlikely that this site will be adopted as a housing site in the Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan within the immediate future. This is reinforced in the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) appraisal of the site which states that this site is developable in over 11 years' time.
- 6.12 Policy 15 of the HDPF outlines the provision of 16,000 homes for the Horsham District within the period 2011-2031. The policy includes the provision of 750 units within 'windfall sites'. As the Council can now demonstrate a 5 year housing supply, it would expect any windfall sites to now be located within the built-up-area

boundary in accordance with the HDPF. As unallocated land outside the built-up-area boundary, this site could not be considered as a 'windfall site'.

- 6.13 In November 2014 application DC/13/1265 was allowed on appeal for up to 75 dwellings on a site immediately to the south (which abuts the existing BUAB). A Reserved Matters application has also been recently approved for this site and condition applications have been submitted. The current scheme is a similar density to that approved on the appeal site. In determining the appeal, the Inspector commented that the development should be determined in accordance with the SPD on Facilitating Appropriate Development (FAD). The FAD SPD was brought in to address the lack of a five year housing supply and outlined an assessment of what would be considered appropriate development under the policies of the adopted Development Plan Documents. With the adoption of the HDPF, the Council can now clearly demonstrate a five year housing supply and the FAD SPD no longer forms part of the Development Plan. The Inspector also commented that whilst the FAD SPD and NPPF were material considerations in the appeal, the reason for refusal of the scheme considered at appeal referred to maintaining and enhancing landscape and townscape character and not about the supply of housing.
- 6.14 Given that the HDPF has now been adopted and that the Council can now clearly demonstrate a five year housing supply, the appeal decision for the development of the land directly to the south is not considered to set a precedent for the development of the current application site. As outlined below, there are also concerns that the current scheme would further erode the character of this countryside location which would already be detrimentally affected by the development of the land to the south and would also harm the rural setting of the adjacent listed building at Snapes Cottage.
- 6.15 For the reasons outlined above, the principle of providing 107 no. houses, outside the Built-Up-Area Boundary, within the countryside, and where the land hasn't been allocated for development within a Local or Neighbourhood Plan, is unacceptable. The development is not essential to its countryside location and is therefore contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, 25 and 26 of the HDPF.

Dwelling Type and Tenure

- 6.16 40% of the proposed 107 no. dwellings would be made available on the affordable housing market, which exceeds the guideline figure of 35%, as set out in Policy 16 of the HDPF. The proposed affordable housing provision is, therefore, acceptable in principle. The exact size and tenure split of the units could be controlled by a suitably worded legal agreement, if all other aspects of the proposed development were considered acceptable.
- 6.17 Policy 16 of the Horsham District Planning Framework seeks to achieve a mix of housing sizes to meet the District's housing needs, as identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), in order to create balanced and sustainable communities. The Housing Section has commented that the greatest need in the District is for 2 bed 4 person homes. The scheme includes a low number of 2 bed 4 person units and the proposed mix put forward in the scheme is not supported by

the Housing Section. However, as this is an outline application, with only access to be considered, the final mix of dwellings proposed across the site would be considered and controlled as part of a Reserved Matters application and based on the most up to date need at that time. Should this application be recommended for approval, the Council will need to open an early discussion with the developer regarding the delivery of affordable housing.

Impact on the Setting of Snapes Cottage

- 6.18 Snapes Cottage is a Grade II Listed building adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. The proposed development would wrap around the north and west boundaries of Snapes Cottage and would be adjacent to the driveway to the cottage.
- 6.19 A History of the County of Sussex: Volume 6 Part 2 informs that Snapes Cottage was likely the original farmhouse of Snapes Farm but was replaced with a new farmhouse on the opposite side of the road in the late 17th century. The publication goes on to state that in 1982 Snapes Cottage “retained a 15th-century timber framed and jettied north cross wing of two bays with a crown-post roof, traceried bargeboards, and bay window. The hall range to the south was replaced in the 19th century by a small double-depth stone block.”
- 6.20 The building draws its significance from its architectural and historic value as a traditional building constructed of the local vernacular. It alludes to the historic land use of the region which is evident on the historic mapping. Whilst its context as an isolated farmstead has been eroded by the loss of traditional ancillary structures, as a result of the relocation of the farm nucleus to the land on the eastern side of Storrington Road, it still does have an association to the surrounding countryside which is important in respect of the morphology of the listed building and its setting.
- 6.21 The appeal decision for the land south of Snapes Cottage did consider the setting of the listed building and concluded that there would be negligible less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed building on the basis that the historic value of the building as an isolated farmstead had been eroded to an extent that its context was of a detached historic property located within the countryside. The development scheme approved at appeal retained an undeveloped margin along the northern boundary thereby minimising the impact upon the listed building and thus retaining its context as a countryside residence.
- 6.22 The supporting statement submitted as part of this application relies heavily upon the Inspectors findings for the development to the south without however fully assessing the conclusions made or how these have been reached. The applicant’s documentation fails to recognise that if the land to the north, east and west of Snapes Cottage was built upon that the building would be completely engulfed in modern housing estates. Whilst the retained margin to the south would give some benefit to the setting of Snapes Cottage its existing context as a countryside residence would be substantially lost. In this regard there would be significant harm to the setting and context of the listed building which would not be outweighed by the public benefit.

- 6.23 The retention of a margin area of the proposed development to the south of Snapes Cottage which is to be retained as meadow and the undeveloped agricultural land to the north are major influences on the listed building and its significance, which includes its setting. The appeal decision for land to the South of Snapes Cottage concluded; “It is a great advantage of the appeal proposal that the higher ground on the north of the site would not be built upon, thus restricting the proposed housing to land where it would not impinge noticeably on views from the north and north-west, or indeed on views from the South Downs.”
- 6.24 The site is, as described in the supporting document, “positioned on a crown of a ridge between the valleys of streams flowing to the west. The ground slopes away towards the north-western and southern boundaries. Views across the site are available from the higher ground to the northwest and from the extending crown of the ridge to the north and northeast. There is strong inter-visibility between the central and much of the southern portions of the site with the listed building, Snapes Cottage, immediately to the south of the Site.’
- 6.25 The topography of site results in the land rising up from the northwest of Snapes Cottage to a plateau. This increase in height will ensure that the built form will inevitably rise up out of the site, likely exceeding the existing treeline and hedgerow canopy thereby impacting upon the setting of the listed building. Within the submitted documentation photographic evidence clearly shows that the boundary between Snapes Cottage and the application site is more open affording far reaching views of open countryside bordered with established trees and hedgerow from Snapes Cottage when looking west. The proposed layout scheme has identified the entire area to be set aside for development, and whilst it does include a small “green” this is consumed by built form and urbanisation in the form of boundary fencing, ancillary buildings, garaging and hard landscaping all of which cumulatively impact upon the sense of place and landscape characterisation both of which contribute to the setting of the listed building.
- 6.26 In conclusion, it is considered that the negative cumulative impact upon the context, sense of place and landscape characterisation would be severe, resulting in harm to the significance and setting of the listed building.
- 6.27 Policy 34 of the HDPF states that the Council recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and as such the Council will sustain and enhance its historic environment through positive management of development affecting heritage assets.
- 6.28 It is acknowledged that the proposed additional housing would provide economic benefits, including employment opportunities during the construction process and that the prospective occupiers would be likely to contribute to the local economy and would also be required to pay Council Tax. It is also acknowledged that 40% of the dwellings would be made available on the affordable housing market. Financial contributions secured through a planning obligation could, together with appropriate conditions, require the provision of off-site highway improvements and enhanced local facilities, thereby supporting the local community’s social well-being. The indicative plans also show that the proposed development would provide an area of public open space. Whilst the provision of this open space could help to provide recreational opportunities for prospective occupiers, given the location of the site,

away from Storrington village, it is considered unlikely that this facility would provide wider public benefits to existing local residents.

- 6.29 On balance, therefore, and whilst acknowledging that the development could provide some positive social and economic outcomes, it is not considered that these would be of a sufficient scale to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the harm identified to the setting of the Listed Building. Additionally, as the Council can now demonstrate a 5 year housing supply, there is no overriding public benefit arising from the development which would outweigh the great weight to be applied to the harm caused to the heritage asset. On that basis, the proposed development is not considered to represent a sustainable form of development as prescribed by the NPPF. In reaching this conclusion, significant weight is given to the fact the Council can deliver its housing requirements as outlined in the HDPF without having to rely on sites located outside built up areas. It is therefore considered that there is insufficient justification for overriding the presumption in favour of preserving the setting of the Grade II Listed Building.
- 6.30 As outlined above and in accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the requirements of the NPPF and policy 34 of the HDPF, the scheme would result in considerable harm to the setting of the listed building and is recommended for refusal on this basis.

Impact on landscape character and the visual amenity of the locality

- 6.31 The site is located in a countryside location to the north of the village of Storrington. The site is located outside of Storrington's defined built up area and therefore covered by HDPF policy 26 which protects the countryside against inappropriate development unless it is considered to be appropriate in scale and essential to that location.
- 6.32 The Council's Landscape Officer has commented that the site itself is considered to be of an overall moderate-high visual sensitivity due to its elevated position, its attractive middle-long distance views and its distinctive large hedgerow oaks. The topography gently rises to the centre of the site forming a plateau 5m above the bottom of the slope. The land then continues to rise more gently to the ridgeline to the north. As existing, the site is visually well contained to public views by mature hedgerows and trees, with the exception of the north-west boundary which affords glimpsed views from the public footpath.
- 6.33 The site is also seen against the backdrop of open countryside to the north and western boundary and existing suburban residential development to the east. There is an urbanising influence of the industrial development of Water Lane and recently constructed commercial unit on the land immediately to the south west of the site and this will be added to by the approved Crest Nicholson housing development to the south.
- 6.34 The site is identified within the Horsham District Landscape Character Assessment (HDLCA) as Landscape Character area 'E1: Parham and Storrington Wooded Farmlands and Heaths'. The landscape condition is considered overall to be good. Characteristics of relevance to the site itself are *small mostly well hedged pasture fields with mature hedgerow oaks and small areas of heathland*. The proposals

show the existing hedgerow field pattern of the site is to be maintained and reinforced by new planting with limited hedgerow removal to provide access into and through the site therefore maintaining, to an extent, one of the landscape characteristics of the site.

- 6.35 The site is also identified on section 5 'Settlement Character and Guidelines' of the HDLCA and quantified in terms of sensitivity to urban extensions as having 'some' intrinsic landscape qualities, that provides a partial 'contribution to the distinctive settlement setting', of 'moderate' overall sensitivity and with low intervisibility.
- 6.36 At a local level, the site is categorised in the Horsham District Landscape Capacity study as Landscape Character Area 59: Land North of Water Lane, with low-moderate capacity for small scale housing development, defined as housing development of no more than 100 dwellings. Characteristics relevant to the site include its '*undulating landform with small to medium scale irregular pasture and arable fields*', the '*strong network of thick hedgerow field boundaries*', and the '*landscape condition is generally good*' with a *strong rural character except close to some of the urban edge*'.
- 6.37 With regards to visual amenity, the proposals show the existing hedgerow field pattern of the site is to be maintained and reinforced by new planting in its majority which would assist in mitigating the adverse visual effect. Nevertheless, given the elevated position of the site (where the land rises up to form a plateau) it is considered that this increase in height together with the two storey height of the proposed buildings, would cause the development to be seen from the adjacent public footpath and possibly over the existing treeline and hedgerow to the south, thereby impacting upon the residential receptors and views from the South Downs.
- 6.38 The Landscape Officer has commented that although site boundary features would be retained, the landscape characteristics of the site would be lost and replaced by significant urbanising form. Whilst it is acknowledged that the landscape context of the site is informed as much by the tranquillity and rurality of the pastoral and arable fields to the north and west as it is by the settlement edge to the south and east, it is also considered that the site is key to the transition from the built-up suburban area of Storrington to the rural feel of Thakeham. It is considered that, with the new housing development approved to the land to the south, this transition would be further eroded resulting in the urbanisation of the area and the unacceptable loss of countryside.
- 6.39 With regard to the recently approved Crest Nicholson development to the south, it should be noted that, contrary to the current application site, this approved development would facilitate the transition between residential areas and the open countryside with the provision of an open space buffer to the north of the development. This was also key to retaining the setting of the listed building adjacent to the application site. The location of the approved development on the site to the south with an appropriate buffer, in addition to the existing and enhanced boundary trees and vegetation, considerably reduced the adverse impact on the very attractive, mostly unspoilt rural character of the land to the north and retains the setting of the listed building. As outlined above, the current proposal would have a negative impact on the sense of place and landscape character both of which contribute to the setting of Snapes Cottage.

- 6.40 Overall, it is considered that the proposal amounts to an urbanising form of development with up to 107 dwellings incorporating ancillary infrastructure including vehicular and pedestrian access onto the public highway, parking, landscaping, and boundary treatments. In addition to the adjacent development site to the south for 75 dwellings, the proposal would result in a significant cumulative impact and adverse effect on the landscape character and appearance of the area including an adverse impact on the landscape setting of Snapes Cottage. The scheme is therefore considered contrary to policy 26 of the HDPF which aims to protect the rural character and undeveloped nature of the countryside from inappropriate development outside built-up-areas.

Impact on the Amenity of Existing and Prospective Occupiers

- 6.41 The occupiers of Littlebury House, Snapes Cottage and the properties opposite the site on Storrington Road currently enjoy views onto the application site, which would undoubtedly be altered by the proposed development. The indicative plans show, however, the proposed quantum of development could be successfully designed to achieve appropriate separation distances and to ensure that there is no harmful loss of light, outlook or privacy to the occupiers of any adjacent properties. Additionally, with the approved green buffer zone in place, the proposal would not result in a significant impact on the amenity of the any of the recently approved dwellings on the land to the south.
- 6.42 Parking areas and access roads could be designed so as to be sited away from adjacent properties and this would help to avoid harmful levels of disturbance to existing occupiers. The exact design and location of street lighting could be controlled by condition, if all other aspects of the development were considered acceptable, and this would help to ensure that adjacent occupiers were not exposed to unacceptable levels of glare/light pollution.
- 6.43 The introduction of 107 no. dwellings into what are currently open fields would result in increased levels of disturbance to adjacent residential occupiers associated with, for instance, the comings and goings of vehicles and the use of rear gardens. However, it is not considered that this would result in unacceptably harmful impact on the living environment of adjacent residents.
- 6.44 The indicative plans show that the development could be designed in such a way so as to ensure that all prospective occupiers had access to a suitably sized area of private amenity space that would provide a safe and pleasant area of useable outside space, complemented by on-site open space provision.
- 6.45 In light of the above, it is considered that the development could be designed to avoid harmful impacts on the amenities of existing or prospective occupiers in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy. Measures to protect residents from harmful effects of noise, vibration and dust during the construction period could be controlled by a suitably worded condition requiring the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan to be approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Highway Impact, Access and Parking

- 6.46 The application is made in outline and includes access to be considered as part of the proposal. To address the highway and transport impacts of the proposal, the application includes a Transport Assessment and Framework Travel Plan. The main highway and access issues to be considered under this scheme are as follows:
- Whether the proposed new vehicular access onto Storrington Road (B2139) is acceptable from a highway safety perspective.
 - Whether the addition of 107 units is appropriate in this location in terms of trip generation and highway impacts.
 - Whether the proposal offers appropriate accessibility to and within the site, for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians.
- 6.47 It should be noted that the detail of the internal roads and footpath layout can be considered under a reserved matters application.
- 6.48 With respect to the new vehicular access onto Storrington Road, the highway authority of West Sussex County Council has commented that the new access is appropriate in principle. The proposed layout shows a 5.5 metre access road with footpaths on each side running around the radius to tie in with the existing footpaths paths on Storrington Road . The new access is shown opposite a dwelling called Springfields on Storrington Road and would require the removal of hedges. The scheme indicates visibility splays of 2.4 x 4.3 metres for the new access. Taking account of recorded vehicle speeds, the highway authority has commented that the new access with the visibility splays proposed would allow sufficient stopping sight distances and would be appropriate from a highway safety perspective.
- 6.49 The highway authority is also satisfied that the trip generation resulting from an additional 107 units in this location would not result in any severe highway capacity impacts. This is based on the TRICS selection parameters put forward which take into account local infrastructure and the permitted development at Abingworth Nurseries for 146 dwellings.
- 6.50 The Transport Assessment reviews access by walking, cycling, and passenger transport for the proposed development. As originally submitted, the highway authority felt that additional information was required. In this respect, it was felt that little consideration was given to the nature of walking routes and whether these would in their current form promote and encourage access by these modes. To address these concerns, additional information has been submitted including the submission of a Framework Travel Plan. The principal objective of the plan is to encourage a shift from the use of the private car, in particular single-occupancy vehicles, to the use of the more sustainable non-car modes for travel to and from the site. The plan would include the appointment of a Travel Plan Co-ordinator, a 'Sustainable Travel Information Pack' and regular surveys of residents.
- 6.51 The highway authority has commented that the review of proposed and existing accessibility is acceptable and that the broad layout of the Framework Travel Plan is appropriate.
- 6.52 With respect to access it should also be noted that the applicant has agreed in principle to opening up the boundaries of the site to allow access from the approved

development to the immediate south for pedestrian access. This would also improve access through the site for pedestrians and cyclists.

- 6.53 If recommended for approval, further details of the proposed transport and access details, such as the submission of a Full Travel Plan and exact details of the road and pavement layout could be secured by condition. On the basis of the submission, the highway authority is satisfied that the scheme would not result in any adverse highway impacts and no objection is raised to the scheme with respect to access and highway safety.

Arboricultural Impacts

- 6.54 The applicant has submitted a Tree Survey which records 19 principal species including mature Oak trees which are located around the borders of the fields of the site. The surveyed trees are dominated by Category B trees (considered to be of moderate to good quality and value) and Category C trees (considered to be of lower value). This reflects the overall fair to moderate quality of the tree stock, largely dominated by the young mature fieldside swathes of naturalised tree belts with scattered larger mature trees. There is a collective value to the boundary stock, with trees of a similar age, quality, contribution and character providing a fairly consistent visual screen and typical arrangement of pastoral enclosure.
- 6.55 Several trees were considered to represent specimens of notably high value (Category A). These are prominent larger trees with high screening value and maturity. The belt mature Oaks are considered to represent a principal screen along the southern reaches of the site and are discernible from across the wider rising landscape of the South Downs.
- 6.56 The scheme would require the removal of a hedgerow tree belt to accommodate the proposed site access from Storrington Road. A section of internal hedgerow tree belt would also be required to be removed to allow access through the site between fields. The report indicates the removal of two trees within the tree belt, a Hawthorn and a Field Maple.
- 6.57 Both trees are indicated as Class B trees of moderate quality and value. Having regard to the retention of the majority of trees around the site including the retention of the Class A trees, the loss of two trees is considered acceptable. If recommended for approval, a condition could be imposed requiring the submission of a method statement outlining measures to protect the trees to be retained on site during construction works for the approval of the Local Planning Authority.
- 6.58 The scheme indicates landscaping for the proposal including green links across and around the site and a green buffer around the boundary with Snapes Cottage. Given this is an outline application, the precise details of the landscaping are not indicated. If recommended for approval, details of the landscaping for the site could be required by condition to be submitted and considered as part of a Reserved Matters application. These details could include replacement trees to replace the ones to be lost on site.

Nature Conservation, Ecology and Biodiversity

- 6.59 The application is supported by Ecological Reports that outline the findings of initial ecological surveys undertaken at the site. Additional information has been submitted which addresses the potential impact of the development on protected species and habitats that might be present on the site itself. The County Ecologist has stated that the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions to secure ecological surveys and mitigation measures specifically in relation to bats, reptiles and dormice habitats. If recommended for approval, a condition could be imposed requiring the submission of these details to be approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Flooding and Drainage

- 6.60 The site is located within Flood Zone 1 where there is a low probability of flooding and where residential development is considered acceptable by the NPPF.
- 6.61 Southern Water and the Council's Drainage Engineer have raised no objection to this proposal, subject to the use of a condition requiring the submission and approval of details relating to the proposed means of foul and surface water drainage for the site.

Contamination

- 6.62 Any contamination found during the construction period could be subject to a risk assessment and a series of mitigation measures agreed, depending on the type of any contamination identified and the receptor being affected. The necessary investigation and remediation measures, including implementation, could be controlled by condition, if all other aspects of the development were considered acceptable, in accordance with the NPPF.

Archaeology

- 6.63 The Consultant Archaeologist has commented that there is potential for archaeology to be present at the site which has not been fully addressed in the submission. As such, a condition could be attached to any planning permission preventing development until such a time that a programme of archaeological work to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site has been agreed with the Council.

Renewable Energy

- 6.64 In accordance with Policies 35, 36 and 37 of the HDPF, if all other aspects of the development were considered acceptable, planning conditions could be used to promote the use of renewable energy sources and to restrict water use, control construction waste and to encourage the use of natural lighting and ventilation.

Air Quality

- 6.65 Storrington has been designated as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) by Horsham District Council. This is an area where pollution levels exceed the UK air quality objectives due to elevated levels of nitrogen oxide, a by-product of combustion and primarily attributed to road traffic emissions. The application site lies just over 1km to the north of the Storrington air quality management area.

- 6.66 The application is supported by an air quality assessment report dated October 2015 prepared by Peter Brett Associates. The assessment provides a qualitative assessment of impacts associated with the construction phase and a dispersion modelling assessment to predict the impact of the proposed development on pollutant concentrations. The Environmental Health Team has commented that there are insufficient mitigation measures identified in the report to meet the requirements of the Horsham District Council's guidance document on Air Quality and Emissions Reduction. The guidance sets out appropriate and reasonable mitigation measures that should be designed into each scheme in order to make the scheme sustainable in air quality terms. The Environmental Health Team has stated that, if recommended for approval, a condition could be imposed to require the submission of a 'Low Emission Strategy' scheme, specific to the proposal, to fully mitigate against the predicted increase in traffic emissions.

Legal Agreement

- 6.67 In the event that planning permission were to be granted, Policy 39 of the HDPF requires new development to meet its infrastructure needs. For this development, contributions would be required towards open space, play and recreation areas, indoor and outdoor sports provision, community facilities, libraries, education, transport infrastructure, fire and rescue, highway improvements and affordable housing.
- 6.68 All contributions must be justified in accordance with the three tests set out under Regulation 122 of the Community and Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, in so far that they must be; necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development and; fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 6.69 The developer contributions, secured in the event that planning permission is granted, could be allocated towards improvements within the local area, to ensure they benefit local resident. For the reasons outlined above, the provision of a commuted sum for specific local projects is considered a fair approach to deal with the cumulative pressure on existing qualitative and quantitative deficiencies in the District and in this case, to enhance existing facilities in the local area.
- 6.70 Although the applicant has confirmed a willingness to enter into a legal agreement to secure the necessary sums, such an agreement is not yet in place. The development is, therefore, contrary to Policy 39 of the HDPF.

Coalescence

- 6.71 Policy 27 of the HDPF states that landscapes will be protected from development which would result in the coalescence of settlements. A number of the objections received have raised coalescence as an issue with this scheme. The proposal does represent an extension of development approved to the south, adjacent the built-up-area boundary with Storrington. Whilst this is considered to create an extension to an urbanised area, the proposal is not considered as coalescence. The development would link some individual houses to Storrington's built-up-area but would not link Storrington to any other village or settlement. Thakeham is the

nearest settlement to the application site which is located further to the north separated by several fields. For this reason, the scheme would not result in any significant coalescence between the settlements of Storrington and Thakeham.

Open Space Provision

- 6.72 Under the approved scheme for the land to the south, there is some natural play provision in the open space at the north of that site. Leisure Services have commented that this provision should be expanded and enhanced with additional play equipment to provide a facility, equally accessible from both developments. This would obviate the need for the play area at the centre of the current scheme but it would still be important to ensure appropriate quantities of amenity/natural green space are included within that development.
- 6.73 If recommended for approval, the layout to be submitted at the Reserved Matters stage should indicate a proposed open space / play area adjacent to the southern boundary with access between the two sites. This alteration to the indicative layout submitted would not alter the ability of the scheme to provide 107 units within the site. The applicant has agreed in principle to this approach and indicated gaps to the boundary which would allow access between the current site and the approved site. This access would not require the removal of mature trees.

Health Provision

- 6.74 Lack of health facilities (doctor's surgeries and dentists) has been raised as an issue by the representations received for this proposal. Under the Horsham District Infrastructure Study Main Report (2010) health is seen as an essential criteria in the consideration of developments. The study states that in the Storrington and Sullington areas, 'the main constraint to growth relates to secondary school capacity at Steyning Grammar, which is oversubscribed.'
- 6.75 In relation to health provision, the study indicates that there is adequate provision to accommodate growth for dentists and doctors in the Storrington area. This provision would have been affected by the recent closure of the Mill Stream Medical Centre in 2014. It is understood that there are four local GP practices within the immediate local area who would welcome new patients. These are the Glebe Surgery in Storrington, Pulborough Medical Group, Steyning Health Centre and Billingshurst Surgery. There are also dentists locally and within the District who have sufficient capacity to accept new patients. Given the findings of the Horsham Infrastructure Study and the availability of GP practices in the area, it is not felt that the current scheme can be refused on the grounds of lack of health facilities.

Other Considerations:

- 6.76 With respect to refuse collection, as an outline application the Council would expect a full refuse strategy to be submitted as part of a Reserved Matters application in the event that an outline approval is granted.

Conclusions

- 6.77 Taking all matters into account, the proposal is considered to represent an unsustainable form of development, on a site where the principle of residential development is unacceptable and cannot be supported. The provision of housing in this location, at the scale proposed and in conjunction with the approved development for 75 dwellings to land directly to the south, would further diminish the rural and open character of this particular part of the landscape, creating a discordant and uncharacteristically urbanised environment. Furthermore, the development would adversely harm the setting of a Listed Building. The development is considered harmful, even when weighed against the economic and social benefits of the scheme and as such, the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out in Paragraph 14 of the NPPF, cannot be applied.
- 6.78 When all material considerations are taken into account, and given appropriate weight in the planning balance, the adverse effects of granting outline planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 To refuse planning permission for the following reasons:
1. The proposed development is located in the open countryside, outside of any defined Built Up Area Boundary, on a site not allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework, or an adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan. The Council is able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and consequently this scheme would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchical approach of concentrating development within the main settlements. Furthermore, the proposed development is not essential to its countryside location and consequently represents an inappropriate, unsustainable and unacceptable form of development that is contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF and Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, 25 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
 2. The provision of housing in this location, at the scale proposed and in conjunction with the approved development for 75 dwellings to land directly to the south, would further diminish the rural and open character of this particular part of the landscape, creating a discordant and uncharacteristically urbanised environment harming the character of the local countryside. The development is, therefore, contrary to the NPPF and Policies 25 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
 3. The provision of up to 107 no. dwellings, within the historic landscape setting of the Grade II Listed Building at Snapes Cottage, would affect the significance of the heritage asset by significantly harming the character and appearance of its setting and the appreciation of its sense of rural isolation as a countryside residence. The development is therefore contrary to S66(1) and S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
 4. The proposed development makes no provision for securing affordable housing units, or for contributions towards improvements to education provision; transport infrastructure; libraries; fire and rescue services; open space; sport and recreation facilities; community facilities; and is, therefore, contrary to Policies 16 and 39 of the

Horsham District Local Development Framework (2015), as it has not been demonstrated how the infrastructure needs of the development would be met.

Note to Applicant:

The reason for refusal relating to infrastructure contributions and affordable housing provision could be addressed through the completion of a legal agreement. If the applicant is minded to appeal the refusal of this application you are advised to liaise with the Local Planning Authority prior to the submission of an appeal with a view to finalising an acceptable Agreement.

Appendix 3: Extract from Committee Minutes of 19 January 2016

DCS/90 PLANNING APPLICATION: DC/15/2374 – OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR UP TO 107 DWELLINGS (INCLUDING UP TO 40% AFFORDABLE HOUSING), INFORMAL PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND CHILDREN'S PLAY AREA, SURFACE WATER ATTENUATION, LANDSCAPING, VEHICULAR ACCESS POINT FROM STORRINGTON ROAD AND ASSOCIATED ANCILLARY WORKS. ALL MATTERS TO BE RESERVED WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE MAIN SITE ACCESS
SITE: LAND AT STORRINGTON ROAD, THAKEHAM
APPLICANT: GLADMAN DEVELOPMENTS

The Development Manager reported that this application sought outline permission for up to 107 dwellings and a new access from Storrington Road, with all other matters reserved for future determination. The applicant had submitted an indicative layout of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings arranged as five cul-de-sacs off a central road. Forty-three (40%) of the units would be affordable housing.

There would be infiltration basins in the North West and South East corners of the site and an open space in a central position. The application also indicated a green buffer area around the boundary with Snapes Cottage. Some hedgerow would be removed to accommodate the new access, and a section of internal hedgerow would also be removed.

The application site was located North of the built-up area of Storrington, to the West of Storrington Road. It comprised four fields, the smallest of which was adjacent to the road and surrounded by trees and hedgerow. This field was directly North of a dwelling known as Venters, and South of a paddock. This paddock separated the majority of the site from Storrington Road. The other fields within the site were surrounded by trees and hedgerow and were used for grazing horses.

The site was separated from the built-up area of Storrington by an area of land adjacent to Rother Close and Jubilee Way which had recently been granted planning permission at appeal for 75 dwellings. There were detached buildings to the South, including Snapes Cottage, a Grade II listed building.

Details of relevant government and council policies and relevant planning history, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee.

The responses from statutory internal and external consultees, as contained within the report, were considered by the Committee.

Thakeham Parish Council and Storrington & Sullington Parish Council had both objected to the application. Seventy-four letters of objection from 70 addresses had been received. One member of the public, a representative of CPRE Sussex, spoke in objection to the application. A representative of Thakeham Parish Council also spoke in objection to the proposal.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal included; the principle of the development; the proposed dwelling type and tenure; its impact on the setting of the Grade II listed dwelling; its impact on the landscape character and visual amenity of the area; the amenity of existing and future occupiers; highways, access and parking; trees; flooding and drainage; and air quality.

Members noted the closure of Mill Stream Medical Centre in 2014 and were concerned that there would be insufficient capacity for additional patients within existing GP practices in the

area. Members considered that the proposal was an unsustainable form of development that was contrary to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and policies within the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF).

It was noted that the third reason for refusal, as printed in the report, should be amended to remove the reference to S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as the site was not in a Conservation Area.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/15/2374 be refused for the following reasons:

01 The proposed development is located in the open countryside, outside of any defined Built Up Area Boundary, on a site not allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework, or an adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan. The Council is able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and consequently this scheme would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchical approach of concentrating development within the main settlements. Furthermore, the proposed development is not essential to its countryside location and consequently represents an inappropriate, unsustainable and unacceptable form of development that is contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF and Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, 25 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

02 The provision of housing in this location, at the scale proposed and in conjunction with the approved development for 75 dwellings to land directly to the south, would further diminish the rural and open character of this particular part of the landscape, creating a discordant and uncharacteristically urbanised environment harming the character of the local countryside. The development is, therefore, contrary to the NPPF and Policies 25 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

03 The provision of up to 107 no. dwellings, within the historic landscape setting of the Grade II Listed Building at Snapes Cottage, would affect the significance of the heritage asset by significantly harming the character and appearance of its setting and the appreciation of its sense of rural isolation as a countryside residence. The development is therefore contrary to S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

04 The proposed development makes no provision for securing affordable housing units, or for contributions towards improvements to education provision; transport infrastructure; libraries; fire and rescue services; open space; sport and recreation facilities; community facilities; and is, therefore, contrary to Policies 16 and 39 of the Horsham District Local Development Framework (2015), as it has not been demonstrated how the infrastructure needs of the development would be met.