



Email: committeeservices@horsham.gov.uk
Direct line: 01403 215465

Planning Committee (North)

Friday, 28th April, 2017 at 10.00 am

Conference Room, Parkside, Chart Way, Horsham

Councillors:

Liz Kitchen (Chairman)	
Karen Burgess (Vice-Chairman)	
John Bailey	Tony Hogben
Andrew Baldwin	Adrian Lee
Toni Bradnum	Christian Mitchell
Alan Britten	Josh Murphy
Peter Burgess	Godfrey Newman
John Chidlow	Brian O'Connell
Roy Cornell	Connor Relleen
Christine Costin	Stuart Ritchie
Leonard Crosbie	David Skipp
Jonathan Dancer	Simon Torn
Matthew French	Claire Vickers
Billy Greening	Tricia Youtan

You are summoned to the meeting to transact the following business

Tom Crowley
Chief Executive

Agenda

	Page No.
1. Apologies for absence	
2. Minutes	3 - 18
To approve as correct the minutes of the meetings held on 21 st March and 4 th April 2017	
3. Declarations of Members' Interests	
To receive any declarations of interest from Members of the Committee	
4. Announcements	
To receive any announcements from the Chairman of the Committee or the Chief Executive	

To consider the following report of the Head of Development and to take such action thereon as may be necessary:

5. **DC/16/1677 - Land North of Horsham (Wards: Holbrook West, Rusper & Colgate, Holbrook East) Applicant: Mr Derek Lloyd, Liberty Property Trust** 19 - 108

6. **Urgent Business**

Items not on the agenda which the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion should be considered as urgent because of the special circumstances

Planning Committee (North)
21 MARCH 2017

Present: Councillors: Liz Kitchen (Chairman), Karen Burgess (Vice-Chairman), John Bailey, Andrew Baldwin, Alan Britten, Peter Burgess, John Chidlow, Roy Cornell, Christine Costin, Leonard Crosbie, Jonathan Dancer, Matthew French, Billy Greening, Adrian Lee, Christian Mitchell, Godfrey Newman, Brian O'Connell, Connor Relleen, David Skipp, Simon Torn, Claire Vickers and Tricia Youtan

Apologies: Councillors: Toni Bradnum, Tony Hogben, Josh Murphy and Stuart Ritchie

PCN/104 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

DC/16/2856 – Councillor Godfrey Newman declared a personal interest because he attends Horsham Football Club matches.

DC/16/2856 – Councillor Claire Vickers declared a personal interest because she is a member of Southwater Parish Council.

DC/16/2856 – Councillor Billy Greening declared a personal interest because he is a member of Southwater Parish Council.

DC/16/2855 – Councillor Peter Burgess declared a personal interest because he is a member of North Horsham Parish Council.

DC/16/2855 – Councillor Karen Burgess declared a personal interest because she is a member of North Horsham Parish Council.

PCN/105 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

PCN/106 **DC/16/2856 - HORSHAM GOLF AND FITNESS, WORTHING ROAD, SOUTHWATER (WARD: SOUTHWATER) APPLICANT: RESIDE DEVELOPMENTS LTD AND HORSHAM FOOTBALL CLUB**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for a floodlit all-weather 3G Football Ground (including main pitch and training pitch), single storey clubhouse, three stands, access, parking and landscaping. The stands would provide for 250 standing spectators and 307 seated spectators. During consideration of the application, the scheme had been amended to include 20 metre high netting and posts adjacent to the golf driving range.

The facilities would serve as the home ground for Horsham Football Club, as well as for use by the local community, including two teams that would be displaced from the Holbrook Club by application DC/16/2855. The proposal would enable the club to expand, and provide facilities to local schools and clubs.

Parking for 66 cars, including four disabled spaces, seven motorcycles, two coach spaces and for 26 bicycles was proposed. Landscaping included filling in part of a pond and extending it in a different direction to compensate for the loss. The site would be fenced off to enclose the facility and to prevent access to the areas of Ancient Woodland to the west.

The proposal was considered in conjunction with the application DC/16/2855 for the redevelopment of playing fields at the Holbrook Club for 58 dwellings.

An Addendum to the report had been circulated to Members, which summarised additional representations and comments that had been received, including additional comments from Southwater Parish Council which strongly objected to the application. The Parish Council had advised that they had referred the application to the Secretary of State.

The Addendum also recommended an amendment to Condition 20 regarding the submission of an Events Plan, an amendment to Condition 24 regarding hours of use of the Club House, an additional condition to prevent the use of fireworks on the site, additional ecology conditions, and an amendment to Condition 23 regarding lighting.

The application site was located two kilometres south of Horsham and two kilometres north of Southwater and formed part of the Horsham Golf and Fitness Club, close to the junction of Worthing Rd and the A24. There was a Civic amenity site and Park & Ride facility nearby. Gate Cottage, a Grade II listed building lay to the north-west, and listed buildings within Denne Park were beyond the golf course to the north-east. A public footpath linking Horsham to Southwater cut through the golf course.

Details of relevant government and council policies, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. Relevant planning history was noted, in particular application DC/14/1090 for the construction of a football ground, which had been refused by the Committee in January 2015 (Minute No. DCN/85 (20.01.15) refers).

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

In response to public consultation, the Parish Council objected to the application. Worthing Road Residents Group, the Stammerham Amenity Association and Denne Park Avenue Ltd all objected to the application. The Campaign to Protect Rural England also raised an objection. The Horsham Society and Horsham Rotary Club both supported the proposal. Ashington

Parish Council supported the application. A further 363 representations of support, and 251 representations of objection had been received.

Three members of the public and a representative of the Parish Council all spoke in objection to the application, and District Councillor Nigel Jupp also spoke in objection to the proposal. Three members of the public spoke in support of the application, including a representative of the Holbrook Club and a representative of Horsham Football Club. The Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture also addressed the Committee in support of the proposal.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: the principle of development in this countryside location; community benefits; its design and impact on the surrounding landscape; the amenity of neighbouring occupiers; highways and access; sustainability; parking; ecology and trees; and the setting of listed buildings. In addition, the previous refusal for the development of this site in 2015 was also a material consideration.

Members were mindful that the proposal was contrary to policies regarding the natural environment and countryside protection within the Horsham District Planning Framework and noted the amendments that had been made to the proposal since refusal of the previous application, and measures that were proposed to mitigate its impact on the countryside location and on the amenity of users of the surrounding area.

Members considered the community benefits of the proposal and discussed the impact the proposal would have on the Holbrook Club and Horsham Football Club.

Members expressed concerns regarding road safety, in particular with regards to pedestrians crossing the A24 to access the site from the park & ride site. Measures proposed to improve access to the site were noted and officers confirmed that discussions with the Highways Authority would ensure appropriate improvements were secured. A representative of the Highways Authority, which raised no objection, advised that intensification of use of the site would be for short periods normally at off peak times, with no significant increase in walking or cycling to the site anticipated.

Concerns that the proposed 20 metre high netting would be too low to protect the site from wayward golf balls from the adjacent driving range were discussed. Members were advised that to increase the height to 30 metres would have an adverse impact on visual amenity and wildlife, and Sport England in consultation with Golf England had advised that they considered 20 metres to be an appropriate height in relation to safety from golf balls. Members recommended that the netting should be in place prior to commencement of works on site to protect construction workers from potential golf ball strike.

Members weighed the community benefits of the proposal, which were considered to be significant, against the potential harm to the character and amenity of the surrounding area.

In accordance with Rule 4a.31 (d) of the Council's Constitution, it was requested that the voting in respect of the proposal to grant the application should be recorded.

The voting was as follows:

Motion to **GRANT** planning permission, subject to the expiration of the public consultation period and consideration of any representations received, and subject to the completion of a legal agreement and the amendments to conditions outlined in the addendum:

FOR THE MOTION

Councillors: John Bailey, Andrew Baldwin, Alan Britten, Karen Burgess, Peter Burgess, Roy Cornell, Christine Costin, Leonard Crosbie, Jonathan Dancer, Matthew French, Billy Greening, Liz Kitchen, Adrian Lee, Christian Mitchell, Godfrey Newman, Brian O'Connell, David Skipp, Simon Torn, Tricia Youtan

AGAINST THE MOTION

Councillor Connor Relleen

ABSTAINED

Councillors: John Chidlow, Claire Vickers

ABSENT

Councillors: Toni Bradnum, Tony Hogben, Josh Murphy, Stuart Ritchie

The motion was therefore declared **CARRIED**.

RESOLVED

- (i) That on expiration of the consultation period for the amended proposal, planning application DC/16/2856 be determined by the Development Manager to consider any further representations.
- (ii) That a legal agreement be entered into to secure:
 - a) Highway works to improve pedestrian safety and access to the site along Worthing Road and from Hop Oast Park and Ride;
 - b) Contribution towards waiting restrictions on Worthing Road;

- c) Details of a scheme to monitor crossing demands at Worthing Road from the Park and Ride to be undertaken by Horsham Football Club;
 - d) Restriction on the use of the new Horsham Football Club facility to retain the community facility;
 - e) Details of rights of way improvements including the new cycle path.
- (iii) That on completion of (i) and (ii) above, planning application DC/16/2856 be determined by the Development Manager. The proposed conditions to be amended as recommended in the Addendum, with an additional condition to ensure the netting adjacent to the driving range be installed prior to commencement of construction works. The view of the Committee was that the application should be granted.

PCN/107 **DC/16/2855 - THE HOLBROOK CLUB, NORTH HEATH LANE, HORSHAM (WARD: HOLBROOK EAST) APPLICANT: RESIDE DEVELOPMENTS LTD AND HORSHAM FOOTBALL CLUB**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the residential development of the Holbrook Club playing fields to provide 58 new dwellings. Two full-sized playing pitches and the Holbrook Club's main sports facility would be retained. Buildings would be predominantly two-storey and there would be 14 (24%) affordable housing. The units would include: market housing comprising four 2-bedroom, 30 3-bedroom and ten 4-bedroom houses; and affordable housing comprising four 1-bedroom flats; eight 2-bedroom and two 3-bedroom houses.

A new vehicular access from Jackdaw Lane was proposed, and there would be two new pedestrian accesses to the site. Landscaping was proposed throughout the site, including new trees and a landscaped buffer along the western boundary. Whilst a majority of trees around the site would be retained, two trees would be removed to provide the new access.

Parking for 135 cars across the site was proposed. Each house would have a cycle store and the block of flats would have provision for bicycles.

The proposal was considered in conjunction with the application DC/16/2856 for the relocation of Horsham Football Club to Horsham Golf and Fitness.

An Addendum to the report had been circulated to Members, which summarised additional representations and comments that had been received, including additional comments from Southwater Parish Council.

The Addendum also advised that Condition 2 would be amended to allow four years for the commencement of works, and additional conditions would be added to protect the amenity of 44 Brook Road.

The application site was an area of playing fields located within the built-up area of Horsham, approximately one third of the land at the Holbrook Club. The site was adjacent to residential properties in Kestrel Close to the south, Foxglove Avenue and Brook Road to the north, and along the rear gardens of some properties in Drake Close. It was behind the tree and vegetation belt between the playing fields and the grassed amenity strip fronting onto Jackdaw Lane. The character of the surrounding area was residential with largely semi-detached and terraced properties.

Details of relevant government and council policies, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. Relevant planning history was noted, in particular application DC/14/1091 for 57 dwellings which had been refused by the Committee in January 2015 (Minute No. DCN/86 (20.01.15) refers).

The responses from statutory internal and external consultees, as contained within the report, were considered by the Committee. As reported in the Addendum, the Council's Air Quality Officer raised no objection, subject to a scheme to improve air quality; given the sustainable location of the site close to the town centre officers did not consider that additional measures to encourage green methods of travel were required.

North Horsham Parish Council and Southwater Parish Council both objected to the application. North Horsham Society objected to the proposal and 42 letters of objection had been received. The Holbrook Club and Horsham Rotary Club both supported the application and 97 letters of support had been received. Three members of the public spoke in objection to the application. Representatives of Southwater Parish Council and North Horsham Parish Council both spoke in objection to the application. The applicant's agent addressed the Committee in support of the proposal.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: the principle of development and loss of playing fields; affordable housing and housing mix; townscape character and layout; highways and parking; the amenity of neighbouring occupiers; nature conservation; and infrastructure contributions. In addition, the previous refusal for the development of this site in 2015 was also a material consideration.

Members discussed the amendments that had been made to the proposal since refusal of the previous application, including an increase in smaller housing units. Whilst the level of affordable housing provision was not policy compliant, the new scheme provided more than the previously refused scheme and on balance Members considered the provision to be acceptable.

Members discussed the benefits of the scheme, which would secure community benefits by enabling the delivery of DC/16/2856, and weighed these against concerns regarding density and the loss of playing fields at this location.

RESOLVED

- (i) That a legal agreement be entered into to secure:
 - a) Affordable housing provision of at least 24% (14 units);
 - b) Contributions for education, libraries, fire and rescue services, highway improvements and health improvements;
 - c) A clause to state that the no works shall take at the Holbrook site until the pitches at the new HFC site are in place and in use by the community;
 - d) A clause to require a review of the HMRC documentation to allow a clawback. Two thirds to go towards affordable housing provision in the District and one third towards improvements to the Holbrook Club to improve community facilities.

- (ii) That on completion of (i) above, planning application DC/16/2855 be determined by the Development Manager. The proposed conditions to be amended as recommended in the Addendum. The view of the Committee was that the application should be granted.

The meeting closed at 9.10 pm having commenced at 6.20 pm

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee (North)
4 APRIL 2017

Present: Councillors: Liz Kitchen (Chairman), Karen Burgess (Vice-Chairman), John Bailey, Andrew Baldwin, Toni Bradnum, Peter Burgess, John Chidlow, Leonard Crosbie, Matthew French, Christian Mitchell, Josh Murphy, Godfrey Newman, Stuart Ritchie, David Skipp, Simon Torn, Claire Vickers and Tricia Youtan

Apologies: Councillors: Alan Britten, Roy Cornell, Christine Costin, Jonathan Dancer, Billy Greening, Tony Hogben, Adrian Lee, Brian O'Connell and Connor Relleen

PCN/108 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 7th March were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

PCN/109 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

DC/16/2568; DC/16/2567: Councillor Stuart Ritchie declared a personal interest in these applications because he knew one of the objectors.

DC/16/2568; DC/16/2567: Councillor Liz Kitchen declared a personal interest in these applications because she knew one of the objectors.

PCN/110 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

PCN/111 **APPEALS**

The list of appeals lodged, appeals in progress and appeal decisions, as circulated, was noted. With regards to the Appeals Lodged, Members were advised that DC/16/1016 should be amended to record that the officer recommendation had been to approve the application.

PCN/112 **DC/16/2936 - LAND AT PELHAM AND WAVERLEY COURTS, BISHOPRIC, HORSHAM (WARD: DENNE) APPLICANT: SAXON WEALD**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the demolition of 24 garages and the erection of two three-storey blocks of flats linked by a single storey section. The design would be flat roofed and contemporary. There would be 21 dwellings comprising eight 2-bedroom and 13 1-bedroom units of which five would be affordable housing (shared ownership), with parking and landscaping.

The existing 99 parking spaces would be reconfigured to provide 102 spaces in five separate areas. Improvements to access from the Bishopric and the internal roadway were proposed.

The application was linked to applications DC/16/2934 and DC/16/2935 which were also being considered by the Committee. Whilst affordable housing provision for this application was not policy compliant, there would be a total of 14 (36%) affordable units provided by the three Saxon Weald applications; this provision would be secured through a legal agreement.

The application site was located alongside the A281 Bishopric. Residential development ran adjacent to the western, southern and part of the northern site boundary, and the service yard of the John Lewis retail site was to the east. The flats currently being constructed at 53-55 Bishopric, which would include 17 affordable housing units, faced the application site to the north.

The site included two three-storey blocks of flats that had been constructed in around 1959. The rest of the site included the garages that would be demolished, other parking areas including car ports, landscaping and bin and cycle storage.

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.

The Neighbourhood Council had commented on the application and had raised issues directly with the applicant. Seven letters of objection had been received, including one from the Horsham Society. The applicant and applicant's agent both addressed the Committee in support of the proposal.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: the principle of the development; housing mix; design and layout; the amenity of current and future residents; sustainable construction; trees and landscaping; and parking.

It was noted that the landscaping scheme would apply to the entire site, and there would be no windows on the elevation facing the John Lewis service yard in order to protect the amenity of residents.

RESOLVED

- (i) That a legal agreement be entered into to secure contributions towards infrastructure and linking this application to applications DC/16/2934 and DC/16/2935 to ensure that the appropriate affordable housing provision and mix is provided across the three sites.

- (ii) That on completion of (i) above, planning application DC/16/2936 be determined by the Development Manager. The view of the Committee was that the application should be granted.

PCN/113 **DC/16/2935 - GARAGE BLOCK, SWANN WAY, BROADBRIDGE HEATH**
(WARD: BROADBRIDGE HEATH) APPLICANT: SAXON WEALD

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the demolition of garages and the erection of a three-storey block of flats of nine affordable dwellings, comprising six 1-bedroom and three 2-bedroom flats. There would be seven parking spaces on site, with an additional four spaces designated for the development on the neighbouring site of DC/16/2394.

The application was linked to applications DC/16/2934 and DC/16/2936 which were also being considered by the Committee. The 100% affordable housing provision would contribute towards the total of 14 (36%) affordable units provided by the three Saxon Weald applications; this provision would be secured through a legal agreement.

The application site was located within the built-up area of Broadbridge Heath, south of Swan Way and currently comprised garages arranged in two blocks. It was within a residential area, including three-storey apartment blocks and two storey dwellings in a mixture of designs and styles, although the prevailing material was brick.

Details of relevant government and council policies, 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.

The Parish Council objected to the application. The Local Member had raised concerns regarding parking provision and loss of garages. Five letters of objection from three households had been received. One member of the public spoke in objection to the application. The applicant's agent spoke in support of the proposal. The applicant also addressed the committee in support of the proposal and stated that his comments were also relevant to applications DC/16/2936 and DC/16/2934. A representative of the Parish Council spoke in objection to the application.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: the principle of development: affordable housing; impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; impact on the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties; and highway safety and parking.

Members discussed parking capacity and, in response to the Local Member's concerns that the proposed layout did not make best use of the available space because of the size of the disabled parking bay, officers agreed that Condition

16 would be amended to allow for the parking bays to be reconfigured and a new plan submitted for approval.

Whilst the loss of garages was not considered to have a significant impact on parking capacity, the informal use of some garages for storage was noted. Members requested that an Informative to the applicant be added regarding the impact of the loss of storage space on the individual highlighted by the member of the public who had spoken in objection to the proposal.

RESOLVED

- (i) That a legal agreement be entered into to secure contributions towards infrastructure and linking this application to applications DC/16/2934 and DC/16/2936 to ensure that the appropriate affordable housing provision and mix is provided across the three sites.
- (ii) That on completion of (i) above, planning application DC/16/2935 be determined by the Development Manager. During determination Condition 16 to be reworded to allow for the approved site plan to be amended. The view of the Committee was that the application should be granted.

PCN/114 **DC/16/2934 - GARAGE BLOCK, SLEETS ROAD, BROADBRIDGE HEATH**
(WARD: BROADBRIDGE HEATH) APPLICANT: SAXON WEALD

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the demolition of garages and erection of a three-storey block of flats of nine dwellings, comprising six 1-bedroom and three 2-bedroom flats. There would be 16 parking spaces, four of which would be designated for use by occupiers of the neighbouring development, application DC/16/2395.

The application was linked to applications DC/16/2935 and DC/16/2936 which were also being considered by the Committee. Whilst this application provided no affordable housing, there would be a total of 36% affordable housing provided by the three Saxon Weald applications, which would be secured through a legal agreement.

The application site was located within the built-up area of Broadbridge Heath, west of Sleets Road and currently comprised garages arranged in two blocks. It was within a residential area of dwellings in a mixture of designs and styles; although the prevailing material was brick. To the immediate north they were single storey, to the west two-storey, and the rest of the site was surrounded by three-storey blocks of flats.

Details of relevant government and council policies, 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.

The Parish Council objected to the application. The Local Member had raised concerns regarding parking provision and loss of garages. Four letters of objection had been received. One member of the public spoke in objection to the application and the applicant's agent addressed the Committee in support of the proposal. The applicant stated that his comments in support of DC/16/2935 also applied to this application. The representative of the Parish Council who had spoken in objection to DC/16/2935 stated that her comments also applied to this application.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: the principle of development; affordable housing; impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; impact on the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties; and highway safety and parking.

RESOLVED

- (i) That a legal agreement be entered into to secure contributions towards infrastructure and linking this application to applications DC/16/2935 and DC/16/2936 to ensure that the appropriate affordable housing provision and mix is provided across the three sites.
- (ii) That on completion of (i) above, planning application DC/16/2934 be determined by the Development Manager. The view of the Committee was that the application should be granted.

PCN/115 **DC/16/2568 - TWIGS, BASHURST HILL, ITCHINGFIELD (WARD: ITCHINGFIELD, SLINFOLD & WARNHAM) APPLICANT: MR DUNCAN JAGGER**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought retrospective permission for the tarmacking of a hardstanding area to the front of the site. As a result of discussions with West Sussex County Council, the area of tarmacking had been reduced from 50 square metres to 17 square metres, thus reducing the parking space that had been created to a widened access. The tarmacked area was between a stream that ran to the front of the site and the highway, north of the existing vehicular crossover.

The application site was located on the west of Bashurst Hill, along which were large detached dwellings in generous plots, in a countryside location. It comprised a square-shaped residential plot, on which a two storey property had been constructed following the demolition of a bungalow.

Details of relevant government and council policies and relevant planning history, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. It was noted that the Highways Authority raised no objection to the amended proposal.

The Parish Council objected to the application, and the Local Member had raised concerns regarding the applicant's non-compliance. Eleven letters of objection, from nine households, had been received in response to the original application. A further four letters of objection, from three households, had been received in response to the amended plans. Three members of the public spoke in objection to the application.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and highway impacts. It was noted that ownership of the land was not a planning consideration.

Members discussed the application in the context of the history of the site and were concerned that tarmac had not been removed when the grass verge was reinstated. Members noted that Condition 2 would ensure that reinstatement of the grass verge was carried out to a satisfactory standard.

After careful consideration Members concluded that there were no planning grounds for refusing the application.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/2568 be granted subject to the conditions and reasons as reported.

PCN/116 **DC/16/2567 - TWIGS, BASHURST HILL, ITCHINGFIELD (WARD: ITCHINGFIELD, SLINFOLD & WARNHAM) APPLICANT: MR DUNCAN JAGGER**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought retrospective permission for the erection of an oak framed pergola to the south of the property and black painted metal fencing and gates to the front of the property. The application had also included an earth bund adjacent to the stream at the front of the site. Amendments had been made to the application, which required the extent of fencing either side of the access to be reduced and removal of the earth bund.

The application site was located on the west of Bashurst Hill, along which were large detached dwellings in generous plots, in a countryside location. It comprised a square-shaped residential plot, on which a two storey property had been constructed following the demolition of a bungalow.

Details of relevant government and council policies and relevant planning history, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. It was noted that the Highways Authority raised no objection to the proposal.

The Parish Council objected to the application, and the Local Member had raised concerns regarding the applicant's non-compliance. Nine letters of objection, from seven households, had been received in response to the original application. A further three letters of objection, from two households, had been received in response to the amended plans. Three members of the public spoke in objection to the application.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and the impact on the privacy and amenity of neighbouring occupiers. It was noted that ownership of the land was not a planning consideration.

Members agreed that the bund and railing to the front of the site were inappropriate and should be removed and the land restored to its previous condition, and noted that this would be secured through condition. The wording of the condition requiring the removal of this section of fencing and the bund would be agreed in consultation with the Local Members.

Members were assured that the Compliance Team would take action should the applicant not comply with these conditions.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/2567 be granted subject to the conditions and reasons as reported, including a condition requiring the removal of the fencing and bund to the front of the site, the wording of which to be agreed in consultation with Local Members.

PCN/117 **DC/16/2618 - LAND EAST OF WOODLANDS WALK, MANNINGS HEATH (WARD: NUTHURST) APPLICANT: HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission to carry out surgery to an ash tree, which had been subject to Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 947 since August 1998.

The application site was within a wooded strip east of 23 Woodlands Walk in the built up area of Mannings Heath.

Details of relevant government policies and good practice, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. It was noted that surgery to the tree had been approved on two previous occasions. The Parish Council raised no objection to the application.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which outlined the health of the tree and reasons why reducing the canopy by up to 30% would benefit the tree, which was of moderate amenity value.

Officers were requested to ensure that a suitably qualified tree surgeon be contracted to carry out the work to a high standard.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/2618 be granted subject to the conditions and reasons as reported.

The meeting closed at 7.28 pm having commenced at 6.00 pm

CHAIRMAN



**Horsham
District
Council**

PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

TO: Planning Committee North

BY: Head of Development

DATE: 28th April 2017

DEVELOPMENT: Outline planning application with all matters reserved except access for a mixed use strategic development to include housing (up to 2,750 dwellings), business park (up to 46,450 m²), retail, community centre, leisure facilities, education facilities, public open space, landscaping and related infrastructure

SITE: Land North of Horsham Horsham West Sussex

WARD: Holbrook West, Rusper and Colgate, Holbrook East

APPLICATION: DC/16/1677

APPLICANT: Mr Derek Lloyd, Liberty Property Trust

REASON FOR INCLUSION ON THE AGENDA: More than 8 letters of representation contrary to the Officers' recommendation have been received

RECOMMENDATION: To delegate the application for approval to the Director of Planning, Economic Development and Property, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Committee (North) subject to a Legal Agreement to secure the details as set out in the attached Heads of Terms and appropriate conditions. Both the Legal Agreement and planning conditions may be added to, removed or varied.

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

To consider the planning application.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

- 1.1 This application seeks outline planning permission, with all matters reserved except for access, for the creation of a mixed use strategic development to include housing, a business park, retail, community facilities, leisure facilities, education facilities, public open space, landscaping and related infrastructure.
- 1.2 The application site is generally in accordance with the strategic site allocated for a mixed use development in the adopted Horsham District Planning Framework (November 2015) as set out in Policy SD1.
- 1.3 The development proposed includes:
 - Up to 2750 homes, with a mix of house types and tenures,

- 46,450 sqm business park;
- Two primary schools;
- Site for and contributions to a new secondary school
- Provision for special educational needs;
- 'Early years ' provision;
- Local centres and community facilities;
- Retail provision of 4,900 sqm sales floorspace together with other appropriate local shopping facilities,
- Multi use community centre;
- Land safeguarded for a parkway railway station on the Crawley/Horsham line and associated uses including car parking;
- Open space including a nature park, sport and recreation facilities and allotments;
- Landscape buffers;
- A cemetery;
- Commercial leisure facilities of up to 5,100 sqm;

1.4 Local transport infrastructure to include delivery of and /or contributions towards highway improvements, comprising:

- Closure of Langhurstwood Road with associated left in/left out junction onto the A264 and re-alignment of Langhurstwood Road to the East with a new signalised roundabout on the A264;
- Upgrade and enlargement of the Rusper Road roundabout to a signalised roundabout;
- A new left in/left out junction from the A264 into the development east of Rusper Road;
- A new roundabout on Rusper Road;
- A new roundabout on Langhurstwood Road;
- A new cross road junction on Old Holbrook to facilitate the crossing of it by the development's spine road;
- A new emergency access on Wimland Road including access for pedestrians and cyclists;
- Priority access for buses only to/from Pondtail Drive;
- New pedestrian and cycle crossing points on the A264; and
- A number of off-site highway improvements.

1.5 Parameter plans, statements and drawings, as amended by submission of further information and documents include those set out below:

- Design and Access Statement
- Addendum to the Statement of Community Involvement
- Housing Statement and Viability Assessment
- Open Space Statement
- Retail Impact Assessment
- Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms
- DWG 2153A-01L 'Red Line' on OS base
- DWG 2153A-04P Comparative red line with Land North Of Horsham Concept Masterplan Map contained in Appendix 2 of the adopted Horsham District Planning Framework
- DWG2153A Land Use Parameter Plan

- DWG 2153A-101M Density Parameter Plan
- DWG 2153A-102N Building Heights Parameter Plan
- DWG 215A-103P Movement & Access Parameter Plan
- DWG2153A-105M Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan
- DWG 2153A-150S Illustrative Masterplan

- 1.6 In addition the application as submitted and amended falls to be determined under Regulation 10(b) of the Town and Country planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 Schedule 2 which requires an EIA to be submitted. The applicants have submitted an EIA.
- 1.7 The application was amended, as stated above, on 6th March 2017 following its initial submission in August 2016. The revised scheme comprises revisions to the red line to omit from the development site private dwellings situated on the eastern side of the site which fall outside the control of the applicant, and to reflect existing ownership boundaries and highway land associated with the application. Other revisions to the red line include the exclusion of Ancient Woodland not proposed for development in the North West of the site near Morris's farm; other drawings which feature the 'red line' were also revised to ensure consistency.
- 1.8 Revised ecology reports were submitted as part of these additional details, utilising further survey information for invertebrates, breeding birds territory mapping, ecological mitigation and management plan, together with information and justification relating to the illustrative layout showing internal roads within the development running through two areas of ancient woodland, in the eastern part of the site adjacent to Bush Lane, and in the west adjacent to Morris Farm.
- 1.9 In addition the amended details contains additional information within the transport assessment requested by the Highway Authority to assist their consideration of the application. Finally additional information has been submitted relating to climate change and an emissions assessment technical note.
- 1.10 Based on the indicative mix of proposed units at this stage, the development would provide the following in terms of residential units:

Market Housing

- 39 No. 1 bed apartments
- 97 No. 2 bed apartments
- 230 No. 2 bed houses
- 731 No. 3 bed houses
- 731 No. 4 bed houses
- 97 No. 5 bed houses

Housing for Local Needs

- 169 No. 1 bed apartments
- 251 No. 2 bed apartments
- 239 No. 2 bed houses
- 8 No. 3 bed apartments
- 100 No. 3 bed houses
- 51 No. 4 bed houses
- 7 No. 5 bed houses

- 1.11 The application proposes a total of 2,750 dwellings, of which 825 are defined by the applicants as housing for local need (30%), with market housing comprising some 1,925 dwellings (70%).
- 1.12 The application also includes contributions towards upgrading existing parts of the road network outside the application site. These are:
- Great Daux roundabout – additional circulatory lane added;
 - Moorhead roundabout – signalisation and additional circulatory lanes and additional lanes on approaches;
 - Bewbush Manor roundabout – additional lanes on approaches and additional circulatory lanes;
 - Hop Oast roundabout – additional lanes on approaches;
 - Roffey Corner signalised crossroads – signal staging amendments;
 - Rusper Road/Lemington Way roundabout – flare length increases and pedestrian refuge islands;
 - Rusper Road/Crawley Road roundabout – flare length increases;
 - Kings Road/Harwood junction – signal timing adjustments;
 - M23 Junction 11 – alterations to left filter lane from A23 northbound off-slip to signalised lane and flare length increase on A264 approach.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

- 1.13 The application site comprises some 249.6 hectares of land situated north of the A264 between Langhurstwood Road and Wimland Road. The site is adjacent to the northern boundary of Horsham with the edge of the suburban area of Crawley lying some two miles to the north east.
- 1.14 The site comprises a number of fields in arable and pasture use, as well as several small copses and woodland, including three areas designated as ancient woodland comprising six separate land parcels, one situated towards the south east of the site adjoining Bush Lane, known as Bush Copse and a further area adjoining Morris' farm in the north west (Morris Wood).
- 1.15 A further area of ancient woodland is excluded from the site edged red and is situated to the southwest of Morris' Farm complex (Holbrook Plantation).
- 1.16 The majority of the site (155.4 Ha) is Class 3b Agricultural Land, which is not the highest value agricultural land. This land typically comprises topsoil of predominantly medium or heavy silty clay loam, the subsoil comprising silty clay with instances of heavy silt clay loam. Approximately 9.1 Ha of the site is Class 3a Agricultural Land which is of higher value and is located to the south east of the site, distributed in various land parcels.
- 1.17 The remainder of the site is in non-agricultural use, comprising woodland, watercourses, domestic curtilages, highway land and employment sites.
- 1.18 The majority of the site slopes from north to south, and to the north a ridge of high ground containing mature woodland forms a strong northern boundary. The site is also contained within clearly defined boundaries on its eastern and southern borders, by roads, mature hedgerows and trees. The A264 forms a well-defined boundary to the south. The site is lower in the middle than at the edges and is well screened with mature trees.
- 1.19 Watercourses known as Chennells Brook and Horseheads Gill runs east to southwest through the eastern area of the site which flows into the River Arun to the west of Horsham.

- 1.20 The site contains two designated heritage assets, a Scheduled Monument, Homestead Moat, 200m west of Graylands Copse and a Grade II listed building (The Moated House). There are also two historic parkscape within the site boundary, Greylands and Holbrook Park.
- 1.21 Adjacent to the site are other heritage assets including a number of Grade II Listed Buildings, historic parkscape and two Scheduled Monuments.
- 1.22 The site contains four Sites of Archaeological Importance (SAI)/Archaeologically Sensitive Areas (ASA)/Archaeological Notification Areas (ANA) which are all local designations:
- A rectangular area within the fields west of 'The Castle' scheduled monument associated with a pre-historic findspot;
 - Area around the Moated site west of Graylands Copse;
 - Area around The Moated House;
 - An alleged moat at Bush Lane.
- 1.23 Vehicular access to the site is currently via Wimlands Road, the Rusper Road roundabout on the A264, and from the A264 onto Old Holbrook and Langhurstwood Road.
- 1.24 There are also two Public Rights of Way (PROW) that cross the A264 in the vicinity of the site as well as other routes through the site namely a bridleway at Bush Lane running east to west through the site (which continues as a footpath to Old Holbrook Road), a footpath to the west of the site north of the A264/Langhurstwood Road junction running north and the Horsham and Crawley cycle route running through the site and across the A264 at Rusper Road.

2. INTRODUCTION

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 2.2 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The following Policies are considered to be the main policies relevant to the assessment of this application:

- 2.3 National Planning Policy Framework (2012) (NPPF)
- Achieving sustainable development
 - Section 4: Promoting sustainable transport
 - Section 6: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
 - Section 7: Requiring good design
 - Section 8: Promoting healthy communities
 - Section 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
 - Section 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
 - Section 12: conserving and enhancing the historic environment

2.4 Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

2.5 Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

2.6 Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) (HDPF)

- Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development
- Policy 2 - Strategic Policy: Strategic Development
- Policy 4 - Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion
- Policy 7 - Strategic Policy: Economic Growth
- Policy 12 - Strategic Policy: Vitality and Viability of Existing Retail Centres
- Policy 15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision
- Policy 16 - Strategic Policy: Meeting Local Housing Needs
- Policy SD1 - Strategic Policy: Land North Of Horsham
- Policy SD2 - Employment and Business Opportunities
- Policy SD3 - Local Centre
- Policy SD4 - Housing Needs
- Policy SD5 - Open Space, Sport and Recreation
- Policy SD6 - Landscape Buffer, Landscape Character, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure
- Policy SD7 - Design
- Policy SD8 - Education
- Policy SD9 - Transport Infrastructure
- Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
- Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
- Policy 27 - Strategic Policy: Settlement Coalescence
- 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 43 - Community Facilities, Leisure and Recreation
- Appendix 2 : Site Plans, Land North of Horsham

RELEVANT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

2.7 Within the application site, Rusper Parish has been designated as a Neighbourhood Plan area and North Horsham Parish have recently applied for designation, which is currently out for consultation.

PLANNING HISTORY AND RELEVANT APPLICATIONS

2.8 There are a number of domestic and commercial applications relating to the existing buildings within the site. The scale of these applications renders them not relevant to this planning application.

A five year woodland management strategy (precautionary TPO) was served during the pre-application process of the application on areas within the designated ancient woodlands (Ref DC/15/2617) dated 23/2/16.

3. OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1 HDC Air Quality • To be reported in Addendum or verbally at Committee
- 3.2 HDC Archaeology
- The Archaeology DBA is a competent and professional document in line with the necessary industry standards.
 - Notwithstanding this, lack of reference to non-intrusive fieldwork other than a recommendation for further mitigation.
 - Following communication with the report author, a geophysical survey and fieldwalking were undertaken.
 - Lack of correlation between the two therefore, further work necessary.
 - Conclusions and recommendations within the DBA for further works are reasonable and are supported.
 - Preservation of significant remains in situ may be required.
 - Public dissemination of this the information gathered should be included in the mitigation proposals.
 - A strong case must be made for removal of historic hedgerows.
 - The final layout will be heavily influenced by the archaeological evaluation therefore early commissioning of archaeological works is recommended.
 - Concur with comments made by Historic England on Scheduled Monuments and Historic Landscape Character.
 - Further geophysical surveys and fieldwalking should be carried out to enhance understanding of the site. The results will guide test pit and trench arrays for archaeological field evaluation.
 - Applicant engagement with Historic England is necessary to address their concerns.
 - Buffers around designated assets during construction should be agreed with the LPA.
 - The historic landscape character should be protected by the retention of ancient woodland and historic hedges. Unavoidable removal must be mitigated by archaeological survey work.
 - A Conservation Management Plan for the scheduled moated site must be prepared.
 - Further consideration to the setting of designated heritage assets necessary.
 - A public information strategy relating to archaeological and cultural heritage should be developed including interpretation and potential inclusion in the new education facility.
 - Supplementary response received relating to an objection to the proposal made by CPRE made on archaeological matters.
 - Concur with the CPRE recommendation that LIDAR should be used for archaeological remote sensing, the assessment regarding potential for Romano-British activity and the opinion about the absence of the number of relevant sites from the Baseline data.
- 3.3 HDC • No overall objection to the proposal.

- Community and Culture
- The proposed provision of leisure, open space and community facilities appears to accord with HDPF policies and the concept Master Plan and is therefore broadly acceptable at this stage, subject to appropriate controls being imposed to ensure timely delivery and suitable siting and specifications. These will need to be considered at the detailed design stage.
 - There is concern that the proposed NEAPs and open access ball courts are to be sited close to residential properties. Sufficient space will need to be provided at the detailed stage to ensure that the necessary buffer areas for these facilities can be incorporated.
 - The applicants indicate the provision of a BMX track as part of the youth activity facilities, however, this should be substituted for a mountain bike trail. Such a facility would support the objectives of the WSCC Walking and Cycling Strategy 2016-2026 and follows consultations with the WSCC Cycle Training Officer and a local amenity group.
- 3.4 HDC Conservation
- The proposed quantum of development within the setting of scheduled monuments, listed buildings and within the historic landscape would change the rural character of the surrounding area.
 - The surrounding countryside is characterised by its open field-scape, hedgerows, ancient woodland, historic parklands and sporadically sited vernacular buildings.
 - Heritage assets within and adjoining the application site include the following Grade II listed buildings: Holbrook Park, Hollywick Farmhouse, The Moat House, Hawkebourne Farmhouse, Brook House and the barn to Brook House, and King's Farmhouse. Three scheduled monuments lie within or immediately adjacent to the application site boundary: the Castle Moated Site, the Moated Site west of Graylands Copse and the Motte and Bailey Castle at Chennells Brook Farm.
 - The provision of a conservation management plan for the Graylands Copse scheduled monument is welcomed, as are the interpretation panels for the scheduled monuments, in accordance with paragraph 137 of the NPPF.
 - It is considered that the proposed development would cause 'less than substantial harm' to the setting of the heritage assets (NPPF paragraph 134); but this 'should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.'
 - As it is an outline planning application, details such as the scale, design, form and orientation of the proposed buildings are not available. Therefore, the relationship between the proposed new build and the setting of the heritage assets cannot be assessed. Consequently, an informed judgement cannot be made regarding the level of harm to the heritage assets or the amount of mitigation measures required.
 - A detailed survey is required to be submitted at the Reserved Matters stage of the heritage assets and their settings and the contribution the settings makes to the significance of the assets; together with the significant views within and out of the site and the inter-visibility between the site and the heritage assets.
 - The Reserved Matters application(s) should also include the provision of landscape buffers to mitigate the visual impact of the proposed development on the heritage assets. Areas of open

landscape should be maintained to preserve the open rural environment in which the heritage assets are sited.

- 3.5 HDC Drainage
- No objection
 - Until detailed design information has been submitted at the Reserved Matters stage, suitable drainage conditions should be applied that also include securing the implementation and maintenance of the Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) features to ensure they remain effective for the lifetime of the development.
- 3.6 HDC Ecologist
- An options appraisal to show routes considered for the eastern and western links through the ancient woodland has now been submitted.
 - Following a site visit on 8th March 2017 it has been determined that the western link through ancient woodland follows an existing road through the woods and will only require limited widening, some of which would include areas of Japanese Knotweed to be treated and removed. This road link should be constructed using no-dig methods and lighting should be avoided. If a footpath is required, positioning this adjacent to the road is likely to have least impact upon the woodland.
 - The proposed eastern route through Bush Copse would result in 885 sqm of plantation on ancient woodland site and 135 sqm of ancient semi-natural woodland. The options appraisal does not appear to illustrate that there are no acceptable alternatives to this route and as such the impacts to the ancient woodland are not outweighed.
 - The proposed development would impact upon the European Protected Species of great crested newts, bats and dormice and therefore, in order for the development to be acceptable, and able to obtain a European Protected Species licence from Natural England, the three tests of Regulation 53 of the Habitats Regulations, will need to be met.
 - Additional information has been submitted relating to Barbastrelle bats. This shows that there is sufficient flexibility in the masterplan to provide suitable buffers, appropriate lighting and dark corridors. These will ensure the continued functionality of the site for this species.
 - Further bat activity survey information relating to the use of the site is required. This is being undertaken and these results will need to inform any appropriate mitigation as required.
 - Recommends conditions
- 3.7 HDC Housing
- This site is key to delivering homes to those in housing need and on the Horsham District Council's Housing Register.
 - The level of affordable housing provision proposed falls short of the 35% policy requirement. However, it is acknowledged that the applicant has submitted viability information to justify this position.
 - Given the independent review of the applicant's viability situation and the difficulties for registered providers of securing funding arrangements, it is accepted that the proposal accords with Policy 16.
 - The application includes 825 units of local needs housing, of which 350 would be affordable rented units and 145 shared ownership units.

- The remaining units would be discount marker units, private rented units and custom/self-build units. These do not assist in removing people from the Housing Register.
 - The Housing White Paper is consulting on widening the definition of affordable housing to include a similar range of tenures and it is accepted that these forms of tenure would provide a range of accommodation to suit the population of the District, but not those in greatest housing need.
 - The applicant is encouraged to reach agreement with an affordable housing provider as soon as possible, in order that funding arrangements can be secured.
- 3.8 HDC Landscape Architect
- The principle of development has been established through the strategic allocation, and harm to the landscape character and visual amenity is inevitable and expected.
 - The applicant has made efforts to provide a landscape led approach to the masterplan through retention of most green infrastructure and wildlife corridors.
 - However, further alternative routes to the eastern link need to be considered given the ancient woodland status.
 - The Green Infrastructure parameter plan does not show two sections of Historic Hedgerow (HH155 and HH150), this should be amended to show their retention.
 - There is some concern that green links and tree avenues are not represented within the parameter plans. Also, the Highways Authority may raise issue with attenuation ponds sited within roundabouts.
 - Concern that the density to the Village Green and building Heights adjacent to the Moathouse, would impact upon heritage assets.
 - Implementation of the strategic landscape buffer and key open spaces needs to be considered. The landscape buffer should be delivered early to mitigate construction works, including for road infrastructure. The design of large open spaces should be considered as one rather than being broken into sections.
 - Detailed planting plans showing the attenuation pond and including semi-mature tree and hedgerow planting will be required to mitigate the impacts of footways and the bridge.
 - Details of planting and landscaping works for the roundabouts should be provided.
 - The landscape principles and mitigation measures outlined in the LVIA are considered appropriate and reserved matters should carry these forward.
 - Recommends conditions
- 3.9 HDC Public Health and Licensing
- Initial concerns and queries with regard to land contamination, noise and air quality were raised with the applicant.
 - These have been largely addressed through the additional information submitted.
 - No overall objections subject to conditions.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

- 3.10 British Horse Society
- Wimland Road and Bush Lane Bridleway (1585) are well used as part of circular routes for riding and exercising horses.
 - A new east – west, multi use route with bridleway status would

enhance PROW facilities for walkers, cyclists and equestrians.

- 3.11 Clinical Commissioning Group
- A new Primary Care Centre is required to serve new residents.
 - A comprehensive mix of NHS services from one building does appear suitable, necessary and cost effective.
 - A building to shell and core of at least 1,500 to 2,000 sqm. Alternatively S106 should be used to secure a contribution of £1,698,210 on a pro rata basis (equating to an average of £658 per dwelling house and £397 per flat / apartment). Current West Sussex average occupancy rates have been used to calculate this sum.
 - New and existing residents require access to medical services.
- 3.12 Crawley Borough Council
- Support the principle of the allocated site being progressed.
 - Maximising the delivery and densities of development is essential to ensuring the district (and wider HMA) meets its housing delivery targets.
 - The topography of the land together with the existing hedgerows and trees and blocks of woodland surrounding the site will contain views within the landscape.
 - Existing natural features together with enhancements should be utilised to provide defensible boundaries around the site. This will avoid urbanisation and potential settlement coalescence.
 - Defensible landscape boundaries will be particularly important along the north and eastern site boundaries.
 - Opportunities should be taken to create links from existing urban areas.
 - Traffic modelling must take account of growth across the wider HMA.
 - The use of rural roads should be discouraged.
 - The importance of Rusper Road in serving existing farms, hamlets and dwellings is downplayed. Measures to prevent this road being used as a 'rat run' should be clarified.
 - The provision of a secondary school is supported to accommodate education needs within CBC.
 - The preferred location for a new railway station is Kilnwood Vale. The proposed location is poorly placed to serve future residents which would place pressure on existing roads. CBC would object to a new railway station at the site if it would preclude the delivery of a new station at Kilnwood Vale.
- 3.13 Environment Agency
- No objection in principle
 - The Peter Brett Technical Note (December 2016) shows appropriate analysis of climate change and blockage scenarios.
 - Applicant should check the development does not compromise any area identified as compensation to address surface water run-off as part of the A264 works.
 - Site poses a low risk of water pollution to controlled waters.
 - Recommendation that the Council's Environmental Health department is consulted re advice on land contamination.
 - Appropriate conditions should be applied to manage risk to human health and controlled waters from any contamination on the site.
 - Recommendation that the developer should: (1) Follow the risk management framework in CLR11; (2) refer to EA Guiding Principles for land contamination; (3) refer to the contaminated

land pages on GOV.UK.

- 3.14 Gatwick Airport
- No objection subject to conditions
 - Confirmation in the revised 'Energy Strategy' that wind turbines and large installation of solar panels are not proposed (only those on domestic roofs that will not cause issues for the airport). The previous renewables condition has been removed accordingly.
 - Details of the proposed energy centre are not yet available. LGW wish to be consulted on these when available.
 - The development could conflict with aerodrome safeguarding criteria unless the following conditions are imposed. LGW will object unless these conditions are applied.
 - Submission of a landscaping scheme (soft and water landscaping works)
 - Submission of SUDS details
 - LGW have consulted their bird-strike consultants who have a concern with the number of water bodies indicated (around 30 water bodies, flanked by open green space). This is potentially hazardous to aviation (particularly the presence of large of flocking waterfowl). It is possible to design a SUDS scheme to achieve require drainage, and to increase biodiversity without increasing the bird-strike risk.
 - Cranes required during construction should adhere to the British Standard Code of Practice for safe use of cranes in close proximity to aerodromes. LGW will require 4 weeks' notice for this.
- 3.15 Gatwick Diamond
- Strong support for the development which will help provide employment space, supply housing and provide high quality education facilities.
 - The business park is most welcome to address the pressing need for top quality employment space.
 - Site is well located for a strategic development subject to necessary infrastructure being provided.
 - A new railway station would enhance the positive economic and sustainability impact of the development.
 - Early provision of education and community infrastructure is welcomed. A firm commitment from HDC and WSCC to work with central government in respect is sought.
- 3.16 High Weald AONB
- The development is outside but within the setting of the AONB and is therefore, likely to affect it.
 - Consideration should be given to protecting dark skies, providing appropriate landscaping, utilising local materials and using colour to blend the new development with the local landscape.
 - Excessive use of tree screening would in itself harm the landscape and locally sourced landscaping should be used to ensure the development is attractive.
 - A commitment to make full use of timber from responsibly managed local woodlands, installation of wood fuel heating systems and wood storage would contribute towards landscape management and support local employment.
 - Wish to work with the developer/s and the HDC to ensure the business park and railway station are developed in colours to help to integrate the development with the surrounding countryside.

- Condition relating to lighting within the development recommended.
- 3.17 Highways
England
- No objection subject to conditions
 - HE are satisfied that the proposed development at North Horsham can be achieved (subject to conditions) without detriment to the Strategic Road Network (SRN).
 - The agreed highways mitigation scheme at J11 of the M23 (Peas Pottage) is linked to an agreed mitigation scheme associated with the recently approved Mid-Sussex development (Land East of Brighton Road). HE state that the highways mitigation works associated with the North Horsham development should either coincide or precede the improvement works for the Land East of Brighton Road development.
 - As timings are unknown, the condition suggested is 'scheme implementation prior to any part of the development being brought into use'.
 - If necessary, HE will work with the planning authority and applicant if there is significant delay between the two developments coming forward.
 - HE suggest wording for a condition and an informative.
- 3.18 Historic
England
- No overall objection
 - The revised chapter 13 (Archaeology and Cultural Heritage) satisfactorily addresses HE's previous comments.
 - HE note that geophysical and field-walking surveys have been carried out, and a survey of ancient woodland is proposed. It is recommended that the results of archaeological work should be used to inform the development's design.
 - HE defer to the Council's local archaeological advisors regarding assessment and mitigation of impacts on undesignated archaeological assets.
 - No evidence has been seen that the assessment of setting-related effects on designated heritage assets has considered the attributes of the development at specific locations (i.e. the mass/height of new buildings), so HE is not confident that the magnitude of impacts on heritage significance will be negligible. Landscape buffers will help to mitigate this impact to a degree.
 - HE welcomes the proposal to prepare a conservation management plan for the Graylands Copse scheduled monument and interpretative materials for all three scheduled monuments. This provision should be confirmed through a voluntary undertaking by the applicant or a condition of permission.
- 3.19 Horsham
District Cycling
Forum
- Considers that the information covering cycling is lacking in detail, ambiguous and often contradictory.
 - There is a lack of commitment by the developer to ensure cycling provision is well accommodated.
 - With the site not being CIL liable, full details of the cycling infrastructure should be provided upfront. If this cannot be demonstrated at this stage, then the overall viability of the scheme should be questioned.
 - The site will be severed from Horsham by the A264, causing a critical problem for cyclists and pedestrians. Underpasses are required.
 - There are a lack of cycle routes connecting the development to

- Horsham.
 - The cycle routes within the development are incomplete and inadequate.
 - Cycle parking within the development needs to be improved to encourage cycle use over car use.
 - The Interim Advice Note (ref IAN/195/16) has now been adopted and should be used to assess cycling infrastructure.
 - Maintain stance that underpasses remain a successful and safe way of cross the A264, without restriction to major road junctions.
- 3.20 Mole Valley District Council
- No objection.
 - Comments from WSCC Highways regarding mitigation against impacts on the A24 should be adhered to.
 - Surrey CC should be consulted regarding their comments on the A24 at Dorking / Leatherhead.
 - Surrey Downs and West Sussex CCG's should be consulted to ensure the needs of primary healthcare are met.
 - No objection in relation to flooding subject to compliance with point 12 of Policy SD1.
- 3.21 Natural England
- No objection. The proposed development is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected nature conservation sites.
 - The proposed development is outside but within the setting of the High Weald AONB. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF gives the highest status of protection for the 'landscape and scenic beauty' of AONBs. Paragraph 116 sets out criteria to determine whether the development should exceptionally be permitted within the designated landscape.
 - The proposed development includes areas of priority habitat as listed in Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act, 2006. The NPPF says that 'when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity'.
 - The proposed development has the potential to adversely affect ancient woodland. Natural England refers to its Standing Advice on ancient woodland.
 - Natural England has not assessed the proposed development for impacts on protected species. Natural England has published Standing Advice on protected species which should be applied to the proposed development.
 - HDC should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity of the site from the applicant, in accordance with paragraph 118 of the NPPF.
 - There may be an opportunity, with this planning application, to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, through green space provision and access to and contact with nature.
- 3.22 Network Rail
- No objection.
 - It is noted that the proposals include a new Parkway Station between the existing Littlehaven and Faygate stations.
 - Specific guidance on construction works and the finished development relative to railways must be adhered to.

- 3.23 Southern Water
- No objection.
 - Exact position of public water mains, trunk mains, sewers and decommissioned mains should be established before layout is approved.
 - No excavation, mounding or tree planting should be carried out within 3m or 4m of public mains (dependant on type) without Southern Water consent.
 - All existing infrastructure should be protected during construction works.
 - No new soakaways within 5m of a public water distribution mains, trunk mains or sewers.
 - There are deed of easement for water mains and decommissioned mains within the site.
 - Southern Water approval is required for mains and sewer diversions on the site.
 - Additional local infrastructure is needed to accommodate the development.
 - Adequate Wastewater facilities are necessary to serve the development and should be secured by condition.
 - Any SUDS scheme should be offered for adoption to secure operation throughout its lifetime.
 - HDC Drainage or Building Control staff should comment on the proposed means of surface water drainage for the site. This should comply with Part H3 of the Building Regulations.
 - No new soakaways, swales, ponds, watercourses or any other surface water retaining or conveying features should be located within 5m of the a public gravity sewers, rising mains or water mains.
 - Conditions relating to the implementation of a drainage strategy, waste water facilities, surface water sewerage disposal and proposed water infrastructure are recommended.
 - Informatives relating to Southern Water approval of works recommended.
- 3.24 Sport England
- Consultation has taken place with other main NGBs regarding the proposed sports hub and associated outdoor pitches.
 - ENGLAND HOCKEY: encourage the provision of a full sized AGP sand-dressed pitch with floodlighting and changing room facilities. Horsham has 3x hockey clubs, none are asset-owning, and all can demonstrate growth.
 - THE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION: There is no 3G pitch provision in Horsham. Using the FA mapping analysis there is a need for the equivalent for 6x full-size 3G pitches in the area. Therefore, a full-size 3G pitch is recommended as part of the NH development. The FA welcomes the inclusion of a dedicated sports hub, and the commitment to meet Sport England and NGB design standards.
 - THE ENGLISH CRICKET BOARD: There is potential demand for a cricket facility in the area. A fine-turf or non-turf pitch playing area (compliant with technical specification) would be required.
 - THE LAWN TENNIS ACCOCIATION: There is a good level of demand for tennis, but more community accessible facilities are required. Suggest that an addition

4x courts would help to provide a good level of community access. Floodlights would be an advantage and would allow year-round participation.

- For Sport England to support the application, the comments from the NGBs above should be taken into account. This detail should be established at Outline stage.
- 3.25 Surrey County Council
- Main concern is traffic impact on highways in Surrey – particularly A24 and A281.
 - Liaison has occurred between the developer and the CC, and agreement has been reached that impact on Surrey is not significant.
 - Initial concerns have now been addressed.
 - Surrey CC has no objection to the application.
- 3.26 Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner
- Response follows initial comments on 23rd December.
 - Additional population generated by the development will place additional demand on existing policing in the area.
 - A £5 (3.4%) increase in the Council Tax precept to Police has been approved for 2016/17 budget.
 - Police are required to deliver £35 million in savings over 4 years.
 - To maintain current levels of policing, developer contributions towards capital infrastructure will be required.
 - A contribution of £403,880 is sought to fund the cost of additional policing of the area as a result of the new development.
 - In their response of 22 March 2017, Sussex Police raise no further concern or comment regarding the new information submitted by the applicant.
 - Further comments received 12th April 2017 reiterating the additional resourcing requirements needed to serve the proposed development (namely 5 No. police officers).
 - Following discussions regarding the overall viability of the proposal, the request for a contribution to create a new neighbourhood policing centre has been removed and the Sussex Police will work with the developer and partners to utilise a multi-functional community building.
 - A revised contribution of £117,690 is therefore requested.
- 3.27 Sussex Wildlife Trust
- Recognition that the site is allocated.
 - Concerned the proposal does not comply with HDPF Policies 25, 31,33 and 35.
 - All Ecology surveys should comply with BS42020.
 - The total amount of species rich hedgerow to be removed should be clarified.
 - Bush Copse (Ancient Woodland) will be harmfully impacted as a result of the proposed road crossing it.
 - The provision of additional bat survey work is encouraging.
 - Site supports a wide range of bat species including Barbastelle's. It is important the impact on all of these species is fully understood.
 - Light pollution from the Sports Hub and Bush Copse should be prevented.
 - Concern that the impact on all protected species has not been properly considered.
 - Should the applications progress, the biodiversity gains suggested for the area should be further developed to include

long term management and funding.

- Remind HDC of their duty under the NERC Act 2006 to have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.

3.28 Woodland Trust

- Raise objection due to loss and damage to Bush Copse, Furze field Copse, Hurst Wood, Tenacre Gill, Castle Copse, Seagrass Copse and Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland on the site.
- Contrary to NPPF para 118.
- The woodland should not be considered in isolation of the wider ecological network and landscape types in accordance with NPPF para 120.
- Loss of Ancient Woodland cannot be compensated for; the impacts of development are numerous.
- Direct loss of Bush Copse from an access road resulting in irreplaceable loss of habitat, creation of isolated habitat and incremental future loss of additional woodland.
- Noise, air and light impacts on retained woodland from development.
- Potential negative impact of proposed cemetery on Woodland from phosphates and risk of visitors planting non-native, invasive species with no satisfactory buffer.
- Potential negative impact on Furze field Copse from traffic movements.
- SuDS attenuation ponds should be free from potential pollutants. Concern regarding Ancient Woodland being used as open space.
- Where Ancient Woodland overhangs public areas, branches and trees could be indiscriminately lopped or felled.
- Potential for future fly tipping from residential development adjoining woodland.
- Potential changes to hydrology including increased and decreased ground and surface water and introduction of pollution / contamination.
- Concern regarding overall cumulative impact.
- Natural England's Standing Advice on Mitigate Measures should be followed.
- Buffers between Woodland and housing should be 15m minimum, increased to 50m in some areas and be made of at least 50% native tree cover to allow semi-natural habitat to develop. Buffers should be monitored for effectiveness with additional buffers included as necessary including temporary fencing to prevent encroachment where necessary.

3.29 WSCC Education

- Current projections show that an increase in capacity at both primary and secondary level would be required in the academic year 2018/19.
- An increase in primary school pupil population in the District has led to an increasing demand for school places and this trend is predicted to continue for the foreseeable future.
- It is agreed that the development will provide 2 primary schools, including early years facilities. The development is predicted to generate a need for 3FE, however, this should be monitored and if further children arise from the development, then a fourth FE should be provided by the developer. This should be secured through a legal agreement.
- There are currently 3 secondary schools in Horsham providing a cumulative total of 27.6 forms of entry (FE) (828 places in each

year group).

- The proposed development will produce a further nearly 3 forms of entry by the end of the plan period.
 - A 6.91 hectare site within the North Horsham development would be required to accommodate a secondary school, as all schools are full and projected to be oversubscribed.
 - The application proposes that land would be allocated for a 6FE school with an adjacent additional 2 hectares for a further 2FE expansion.
 - It is agreed that the development is likely to generate a need for 43% of a 6FE secondary school. The developer should be required to either provide a 6FE secondary school with a contribution equivalent to 57% from WSCC, or to make a contribution equivalent to 43% to WSCC or the Education Funding Agency, dependant upon delivery mechanism. This should be secured through a legal agreement.
 - A contribution of ~£1.9M towards expanding sixth form provision at The College of Richard Collyers is proposed and agreed in principle. There is sufficient space and playing fields for expansion here.
 - Land is to be provided for a Special Educational Needs facility. WSCC would seek that this is available at the same timescales as the secondary and primary schools and provided at an institutional land rate.
- 3.30 WSCC
Highways
- The Local Highway Authority acknowledges that the principle of development has been established through the adoption of the HDPF.
 - Matters relating to the layout of on-site carriageways, footways and parking areas will be subject to review when reserved matters applications are submitted.
 - The current outline planning application does not seek permission for a railway station; only to safeguard land to provide a station and car park at a later stage.
 - The site is to take its primary vehicle access from three junctions onto the A264:
 1. A new signalised gyratory in the vicinity of the existing left in/left out junction of the A264/Langhurstwood Road (referred to as the Western Site Access). This will result in the existing A264/Langhurstwood Road junction being permanently closed and Lanbghurstwood Road diverted through the proposed development. A bus only route is proposed onto Pondtail Drive from the southern arm of the gyratory.
 2. The remodelling to enlarge the existing Rusper Road Roundabout (referred to as the Central Site Access) to create a signalised gyratory.
 3. A signalised left in, left out junction (referred to as the Eastern Site Access), which will be located on and affect the A264 eastbound carriageway only.
 - Compact roundabouts are to be constructed on the interfaces of the development with Rusper Road and on Langhurstwood Road. The Rusper Road Roundabout will incorporate the existing Rusper Road on the northern and southern arms, with the development then served from the eastern and western arms. At Langhurstwood Road the roundabout will incorporate Langhurstwood Road, Mercer Road and the proposed

development.

- An emergency access is proposed onto Wimlands Road, which will also facilitate access for pedestrians and cyclists.
- The following highway design aspects need to be addressed at this stage:
 - A formal departure from standard is required for the forward visibility to the traffic signals on the Rusper Road northbound entry onto the roundabout at the Central A264 junction.
 - A formal departure from standard is required for the junction inter-visibility zone at the bus only access arm of the A264 Western Roundabout.
 - The over-runnable area should be removed from the proposed compact roundabout on Langhurstwood Road, due to the high number of east to north movements. These areas are difficult to maintain.
 - The indicative masterplan is showing open drainage features for both the Central and Western A264 junctions. The Local Highway Authority does not accept open drainage features on roundabouts. Below ground attenuation tanks are recommended.
 - The proposed traffic calming measures on Rusper Road on the approaches to the proposed Rusper Road Roundabout will need to be the subject of a separate statutory consultation process, before they could be agreed. The installation of the proposed Pegasus signalised crossing on Rusper Road also needs to be the subject of a separate public advertising process.
 - The traffic calming measures and Pegasus signalised crossing provide pedestrian links across Rusper Road. The provision of the pedestrian links should not be approved now, but be the subject of a condition requiring the submission of details in conjunction with the adjoining reserved matters phases of development, so as to ensure that these connect with east-west walking and cycling routes in the site.
 - The proposed development site crosses Old Holbrook, which is a rural, single track lane with only informal passing places. Policy SD1(4) prohibits improvement to Old Holbrook and vehicular access into the development from this route. Old Holbrook allows for vehicular access for a number of existing properties, therefore, any improvement should enable access for these properties.
 - A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be needed to provide a legally enforceable means of preventing vehicles from turning from the development onto Old Holbrook. The TRO would be subject to a separate consultation process to the current planning application.
 - A strategy will be necessary to monitor traffic flows along Old Holbrook and an obligation upon the applicant to install further measures to deter the use of this site by development traffic. This should be linked to the appropriate phasing of the development connected with the construction of the Old Holbrook crossroad with the A264.
 - The majority of highway drawings have been revised since the Stage One Road Safety Audit was initially undertaken. The revised drawings should be submitted to the Auditor to ensure they have no further comments.
 - A number of Traffic Regulation Orders will be required, which

includes Old Holbrook (referred to above), a prohibition of driving following the closure of the existing Langhurstwood Road junction, and to restrict access to buses only at the bus gate on Pondtail Drive. A consultation process is also required for the installation of traffic management measures, traffic signals and signalised crossing points. The need for highway lighting will be determined as part of the detailed design.

- The Local Highway Authority has undertaken a multi-stage process to determine the potential impact of the proposed development upon the highway network (highway capacity):
Trip Generation and Mode Choice
 - Potential trip generation from the uses proposed have been derived through the TRICS database of surveys of completed developments. The TRICS trip rates have been presented as person trip rates, i.e. trips generated by the proposed uses by all modes of transport.
 - For all trips from the residential uses originating or departing off-site the mode by which these are undertaken have been determined using Census Travel to Work data, taken from the existing residential areas within Horsham to the south of the A264.
 - Travel to Work Census data is also used to determine mode choice for the employment trips, based on existing employment areas within Horsham.
 - For the secondary school, the method of travel as recorded in the Millais School travel plan has been used, amended slightly to proportion an additional number of cycle based trips.

Trip Distribution

- For the residential and employment uses, Census Travel to Work data has been applied to determine origins and destinations of trips to and from the site.
- For the proposed retail use, the submitted Retail Impact Assessment has been used to determine where the store is anticipated to draw trade from.

Assignment to Routes

- A traffic model has been used to assign vehicle trips to routes on the network to their potential destinations. Trips to and from the site are assigned by the model to the network using the fastest possible route.

Internalisation

- The Local Highway Authority accepts that a number of trips would be retained within the site rather than having to visit locations beyond the development. These trips have been deducted from those trips taking place beyond the site. Internal trips are set out as person trips; no mode of travel is identified.

Junction Modelling Scenarios and Study Area

- The impact of the development on the local road network has been considered in a future year (2031), which assumes that the North Horsham development will be complete and fully built-out. Two future year scenarios have been undertaken; one with and one without the proposed development at North Horsham. A comparison can then be made between the two scenarios to identify the specific impact arising from the proposed development.

- Given the uncertainty relating to the delivery of the railway station at North Horsham, the with-development scenario does not directly assume that this will be provided.

Traffic Growth and Committed Developments

- In order to generate the data for the 2031 assessment, a growth rate has been applied to the data recorded in 2014. The growth rate has been derived from TEMPRO, which uses data from the National Traffic Model (the NTM) to forecast potential traffic growth. The TEMPRO growth rate has been adjusted based upon the housing and employment growth planned within the adopted HDPF. The NTM uses planning data and will include other permitted developments (i.e. committed developments) in Horsham District.
- For the 2031 future year assessments, it is important to note that the junction improvements proposed accommodate both traffic generated by the proposed North Horsham development, traffic growth associated with the HDPF, and that associated with other committed developments.
- The NPPF says that 'development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe'. The impact of the development therefore should be viewed against the situation without the North Horsham development. This is particularly so where the junction is forecast to operate over capacity without the proposed development.

Junction Capacity Assessments

- The impact of the additional development traffic has been assessed in the future year scenario at a number of junctions. This includes those new and improved junctions proposed as part of the current planning application. The assessments have been undertaken using industry accepted modelling techniques.

Impact on wider Network

- The following comments are made specifically for the 2031 future year with and without the proposed development at North Horsham for the network peak hours (0800-0900 and 170-1800). Comments are made only in connection with those roads and junctions maintained by WSCC.
- Future year modelling shows that the existing Central A264/Rusper Road Roundabout is not fit to accommodate the North Horsham development. An improvement on highway capacity grounds is therefore critical to enable the proposed development. The use of traffic signals (i.e. signalisation) is considered necessary to accommodate the development and increase capacity, giving priority to traffic on the A264. With the proposed development traffic and the improvement, queues and delays on all arms are forecast to be significantly reduced with the scheme as proposed.
- The Highway Authority is developing the detailed design of the A24/A264 Great Daux Roundabout independently of the current planning application (DC/16/1677). The re-design accommodates the traffic generated by the East of Horsham (DC/09/2138) and South of Broadbridge Heath (DC/09/2101) as well as the current application. The re-design includes an additional entry arm and circulatory lane, together with the installation of traffic signals agreed as part of the former two planning permissions.
- The applicant is proposing to signalise the A264 Moorhead

Roundabout and to construct additional traffic islands on the B2195 to accommodate the North Horsham traffic. This should reduce the dominance of traffic on the A264 and assist traffic exiting the B2195.

- The Highway Authority is minded to accept a monitoring type arrangement for the A264 Faygate Roundabout, which would require the development to contribute towards an improvement scheme or deliver an improvement if certain thresholds are met. This arrangement depends on a statutory consultation into the imposition of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO); therefore a flexible approach needs to be taken to this roundabout.
- The Highway Authority is recommending a proportionate contribution for the A264 Bewbush Manor Roundabout, based upon the cost of amending the indicative mitigation scheme submitted with the Kilnwood Vale development so as to accommodate the North Horsham development.
- It is proposed to signalise the A24 Robin Hood Roundabout, which will be delivered by the Local Highway Authority.
- The A24 Hop Oast Roundabout will require works involving the creation of additional lanes on both the A24 arms and the Worthing Road (B2237) arm, to accommodate the North Horsham development and improve the overall operation of the junction.
- The traffic signal controlled junction on Roffey Corner could accommodate the additional development traffic with no adverse impact.
- Increasing the flare on the arms of the Rusper Road/Crawley Road Roundabout and the flare on the north arm of the Rusper Road/Lemington Way Roundabout, where capacity issues are anticipated, will mitigate the impact of the additional development traffic. The overall operation of both junctions would not be affected by the additional development traffic.
- Altering the signal timings to the pedestrian crossing at the Kings Road/Harwood Road Roundabout will mitigate the impact of the additional development traffic and the overall operation of the junction is forecast to be improved.
- The introduction of traffic signals will link junctions and give priority to traffic on the A264, which will minimise delays and increase the capacity of these junctions.
- A scheme of traffic monitoring is recommended incorporating Langhurstwood Road, Old Holbrook and Rusper Road to the north of the development, to monitor traffic flows. Should adverse issues be identified as a direct result of development traffic using these, the developer should implement an appropriate scheme of works to resolve any issues.
- The LPA may wish to consider the amenity issues of the potential increase in vehicle movements on Rusper Road (south of the A264) to and from Horsham town centre.
- The planning application (WSCC/16/062/NH) for a new energy from waste plant on the Warnham and Wealden Brickworks site would generate no more vehicle movements than have already been approved for the permitted waste development at the brickworks site. It would have no greater impact upon the North Horsham development than that scheme already approved.
- The delivery of the phases of the North Horsham development should be linked to the delivery of the proposed at-grade

crossings (including cycle crossings) at the A264 Western and A264 Central roundabouts and the new bridge to the east of Rusper Road; so as to overcome the significant barrier formed by the A264 to non-motorised road users travelling to or from the North Horsham development. This is in the same way that Phases 1 and 3 of the North Horsham development are dependent upon the construction of the signalised junctions on the A264 at Rusper Road and Langhurstwood Road.

- The applicant should undertake to monitor car parking around Littlehaven railway station and agree to fund additional traffic regulation orders (TROs) should the additional parking demands generate highway safety issues.
- A short length of footway should be provided on Mercer Road between the North Horsham development and Warnham railway station.
- Due to the uncertainty relating to the delivery of the railway station within the North Horsham development, consideration needs to be given to the potential for increased usage of Warnham, Littlehaven and Horsham stations.
- The Transport Assessment includes details of a potential bus loop starting and finishing at the proposed A264 Western roundabout, which will include a bus gate on the Pondtail Drive arm, enabling buses only to enter and exit into the existing residential areas of North Horsham. The LPA may wish to consider the amenity impacts associated with buses using this route.
- Details of the passenger transport infrastructure, including bus shelters and real time information, should be included as part of reserved matters applications.
- The precise nature of cycle routes (on or off carriageway, surfacing, etc.) including that forming part of the Horsham to Crawley route within the development will need to be determined as part of reserved matters applications.
- Engineering measures for the adoptable highway crossing areas of ancient woodland will need to be agreed with the Local Highway Authority as part of any further highway adoption agreement.
- The diverted Langhurstwood Road must be designed to take into account HGV traffic and protect the amenity of future residents.
- Construction management plans covering the relevant phase of development will be required, to manage construction traffic accessing the site(s).
- The following matters need to be included in a S106 Agreement:
 - The potential trigger points for off-site highway works should be prior to the occupation of a certain number of dwellings and/or square metres of business floor-space. Some flexibility would be required in case the delivery of dwellings overtakes that for the business units, or vice versa.
 - The delivery of improvements to be delivered by applicant for:
 - a. A264 Moorhead Roundabout
 - b. A24 Hop Oast Roundabout
 - c. Rusper Road/Lemington Road Roundabout
 - d. Roffey Corner traffic signals
 - e. Crawley Road Roundabout
 - f. Pondtail Drive
 - g. Surfacing/lighting improvements to the underpass below

the A264 and Riverside Walk to the south of the A264 and to use all best endeavours to secure the creation of continuous route to Bartholomew Way, including the diversion of public right of way 1586.

- Contributions towards improvements to be delivered by the Local Highway Authority for:
 - a. A24/A264 Great Daux Roundabout
 - b. A264 Bewbush Manor Roundabout
 - c. A Traffic Regulation Order to enable the reduction of the speed limit on the A264 between Great Daux and Moorhead Roundabout.
- Separate schemes of monitoring covering:
 - a. The increase in traffic using the lanes to the north of the development (this is to include Langhurstwood Road, Old Holbrook and Rusper Road).
 - b. Traffic growth on Tower Road and Faygate Lane, and the impact on the operation of Faygate Roundabout.
 - c. Pedestrian crossing demands at Old Holbrook (to commence in conjunction with Phase 3).
 - d. Parking demands in an around Littlehaven railway station.
 - e. The implementation of the phase specific travel plan.
- Bus service provision. The extension/new bus service would need to be funded entirely by the applicant.
- Six highway conditions are proposed to be imposed if planning permission is granted, so that certain infrastructure is in place prior to the first occupation of certain land uses or development phases. The wording of the conditions needs to link the respective land uses to the specific item of infrastructure, or in certain instances link two items of infrastructure together (i.e. the realignment of Langhurstwood Road could not take place until both the new A264 Western junction and the new roundabout on Langhurstwood Road are in place).
- It is considered that the proposed development complies with the relevant sections of HDPF Policies SD1: 'Land North of Horsham' and SD9: 'Transport Infrastructure'.

3.31 WSCC Rights of Way Officer

- Network of PROW's within and adjacent to site. The applicant needs to consider Stopping Up and diversion through the Town and Country Planning Act.
- New PROW's could be created through the site and be offered for adoption.
- A continuous (minimum) 3m wide east / west non-motorised user link should be provided through the site that is physically separate from the road network. This should be landscaped and unenclosed.
- The surface of any new east / west route should facilitate year round access and the specification should be agreed by WSCC ahead of works commencing.
- Route 1575 to Langhurstwood Road will require the applicant to provide a route of consistent status.
- Future access for motorised and non-motorised users beyond the site to the north requires consideration. Motorised access to and from Northlands Road is discouraged.
- Value in retaining Wimland Road's character as a quiet lane.
- Hurst Hill could be retained for vehicular access with potential non-motorised access nearby.

- Grade separated crossings of the A264 should be provided.
- Footpath 1586 currently crosses the A264 at grade. An additional tunnel is recommended providing a more direct link between the development and Horsham.
- Existing PROW's (1421 and 1573) should be improved through S106 / CIL to mitigate impacts of additional footfall from the development. Footpaths 2946 and 1569 and Bridleway 1590 should also be enhanced.
- Contributions should be sought towards a Horsham – Crawley cycle route and towards Bridleway 1550.
- A cycle link from Bridleway 1590 along the railway to Faygate would be ideal.
- Clarification of the impact of a potential new railway station on Faygate is sought.

PARISH AND NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCILS

- 3.32 Colgate Parish Council
- Comments of 25 August 2016 – objection to application. The PC note the following concerns:
 - Faygate train station should stay open. Station at Kilnwood Vale to progress as planned.
 - Question the need for the business units.
 - Inadequate access points to/from the development.
 - A comprehensive cycle way should be included.
 - Adequate health care provision to be provided.
 - S106 monies to provide a crossing at the Faygate roundabout.
 - Further comment on 13 September 2016 – objection on grounds of lack of affordable housing, poor access to site from Dorking side, insufficient width of roads for industrial traffic.
 - No additional comments in response of 15 March 2017.
- 3.33 Denne Neighbourhood Council
- Comments of 25 August 2016 – objection to the application.
 - Does not comply with the principle of development in HDPF Policy SD1.
 - Fails to meet the 35% affordable housing target.
 - Fails to comply with NPPF with regard to sustainable transport solutions. No guarantee of a railway station.
 - No confirmed high speed broadband.
 - Further comments to follow.
 - Comments of 13 March 2017 – objection to application.
 - Failure to comply with principle in SD1.
 - Not sustainable in the long term.
 - Reserved matters applications will not be in accordance with the site masterplan.
 - Insufficient infrastructure or public transport, schools, health care, community centre, police station, sewerage, water supply etc.
 - Fails to meet affordable housing targets.
 - No guarantee of a new railway station.
 - The link roads through the site will result in loss of habitats and biodiversity.
 - Reduced lighting across the site will be a safety concern.
 - Concern regarding rat running through the site.
 - Water and sewerage capacity is insufficient.
 - The development will increase flooding risk in existing

parts of Horsham.

- No onsite police station proposed.
- Traffic impact has not been addressed properly.
- Concern regarding Biffa waste site and associated HGV movements along Langhurstwood Road.
- Request to speak at the Committee Meeting.

3.34 Forest
Neighbourhood
Council

- Raise objection.
- Development on the green strategic gap with Crawley is unwelcome.
- Additional offices are not needed as there are vacant premises in Horsham.
- An underpass beneath the A264 should be provided; the proposed bridge is inaccessible for cyclists.
- Safe crossing the Horsham Riverside Walk north of the A264 should be provided.
- Insufficient detail regarding the Site Wide Framework Travel Plan to demonstrate how walking and cycling will be accommodated.
- Concern regarding impact on ancient woodland and hedgerows.
- Strong objection to re-routing access to the waste recycling plant due to detriment to quality of residents lives.
- Affordable housing must be secured.
- The absence of any CIL payments raises the question of how additional infrastructure will be funded.
- If the development takes place, it should be done sympathetically to the environment and be aesthetically pleasing.

3.35 North
Horsham
Parish Council

- Strong consideration should be given to re-routing the A264 north of the site and provision of a natural boundary to the development.
- The impact of additional traffic on rural routes is a concern.
- Additional access points on to the A264 should be required to ensure joining vehicles do not impede traffic flow.
- Strong concern that a new road will erode Bush Copse.
- As the existing line of trees to the south of the A264 will be breached, additional buffering should be considered.
- The outcome of the surveys undertaken is queried and a response from Highways England regarding the proposed road system is welcomed.
- The proposed new roundabout on the A264 at Langhurstwood Road is not supported. This would lead to congestion along that road and the A24.
- There is potential for a pedestrian and cyclist bridge over the A264.
- Northlands Road to Old Holbrook junction should become and access for pedestrians.
- Rusper Road is not suitable as a main access for the new development. Only pedestrians and cyclists should be permitted to cross the A264 Rusper Road.
- The rampart of the Motte and Bailey at Lemmington Way is archaeologically sensitive and should be preserved.
- Junction between Rusper Road roundabout and the Moorhead roundabout is a more suitable access point to the development giving direct access to proposed facilities.
- Moorhead roundabout is the most suitable route for traffic into Horsham with improvements to increase potential capacity.

- Concern regarding traffic turning from Earles Meadow from the Moorhead roundabout.
- Grade separated accesses for pedestrians and cyclists will facilitate access.
- A footbridge from Earles Meadow to Crawley Road would assist crossing of the A264.
- Improvements to the underpass close to the railway line are necessary to ensure this is used safely.
- Suitability of Wimlands Road as an emergency route is queried.
- Insufficient parking will lead to parking and blockages on the main arterial roads. Recommends there are no parking courts. Street lighting should be low level and unobtrusive. Provision for refuse collection should be considered.
- Housing along the access road should mitigate noise and vibration from heavy traffic movements. Landscaping could be used to provide separation.
- Potential to improve connectivity from North Horsham to Warnham Station.
- Identified railway station site should include a Park and Ride.
- Query over whether a new station at North Horsham is necessary.
- Littlehaven Station would need improvement to accommodate additional demand.
- Good public transport is necessary. Buses should be routed along Rusper Road to connect existing railway stations.
- The Phasing of the development should be clarified and secured to ensure employment land, affordable housing and other infrastructure are delivered.
- SUDS, contamination and impact on the water table require careful consideration.
- Existing and proposed green spaces should be preserved including future responsibility for maintenance.
- Impact on viability of existing sports facilities should be considered and both HDC and Sport England should be satisfied the proposed provision on site fulfils need.
- Concern regarding impact on Ancient Woodland and bats.
- Ancient Monuments on and near the site should be preserved.
- Sussex vernacular should be reflected in the design, good housing mix is required and care provision along with retirement accommodation should be considered. Lifetime homes should be provided.
- The distribution of affordable homes appears to be a reasonable match to the SHMA.
- Construction workers should not disrupt existing residents.
- The impact of the business facilities on existing facilities in Horsham is a concern and new jobs should match the skills market.
- Clarification regarding the proposed education facilities is required.
- Lack of commitment to health facilities is a concern.
- Community centre should complement existing facilities in Horsham.
- General concerns regarding Gatwick Airport, additional housing in the future, development deliverability and the format of public consultation.

Additional comments received 13th April 2017:

- A report into cycle and pedestrian crossings of the A264 was commissioned by the Parish Council and undertaken by Phil Jones Associates. This makes the following findings:
 - The character of the area of North Horsham would be fundamentally changed by the development, but the highway proposals do not reflect this. The Parish Council considers that this results in a 'severe residual impact' as referred to in the NPPF. There are concerns over cumulative effects of the developments at Broadbridge Heath, Southwater and Kilnwood Vale. The traffic modelling is not sufficiently robust.
 - An urban boulevard would better reflect the change of environment and enhance the quality of the development. A reduction in the speed limit of the A264 should be considered.
 - Rectilinear junctions that can accommodate 'walk with traffic' surface crossings should be considered at the Great Daux and Moorhead roundabouts.
 - There is concern that the Rusper Road/A264 roundabout works will impact upon the Motte and Bailey.
 - Additional non-motor crossings of the A264 should be considered. The proposed bridge at the Rusper Road/A264 roundabout would be improved the widened to 5m with cantilevered side fencing.
 - The proposed bus route doesn't appear to connect the centre of the site (station and foodstore).
 - A comprehensive plan to promote cycling between Horsham and Crawley would be beneficial.
- There remains a lack of clarity over phasing and infrastructure delivery and phasing. The land for a station car park should be provided as a park and ride facility in the first instance.
- The Parish Council recommends the use of natural physical restraints and low noise road surfaces to reduce noise pollution.
- Any trees removed, should be replaced with a similar native species on site.
- There remains concern over impacts on ancient woodland and, in particular, the fragmentation of Bush Copse.
- The application does not provide for retirement housing, nursing homes or life time homes to meet the needs of Horsham's population.
- The under-provision of affordable housing is unacceptable.

3.36 Rusper Parish Council

- Objection to the planning application.
- Negative impact of extra traffic in the Parish.
- Scale of development will change the rural character.
- The development should not add to the existing traffic problems.
- The Rusper Road roundabout should be changes to a crossroads and traffic lights added which do not allow turning to country roads to the north.

- Traffic calming measures should be extended to Rusper.
 - Details of the proposed traffic calming within the site are not sufficient at present to know if it will be effective.
 - The entire development should be 20mph zone.
 - No construction vehicles to be driven through the Parish.
 - Facilities should be available to residents of Rusper.
 - New bus routes should tie in with Rusper and Faygate.
 - Affordable Housing priority should be for Rusper's existing residents.
 - Footpath (passing Moathouse Farm and Old Holbrook) to be upgraded to a cycle path/ bridleway.
- 3.37 Warnham Parish Council
- Objection to the planning application.
 - Insufficient consideration in the TA to traffic impact, in particular the roads and lanes within Warnham Parish.
 - Increase in traffic will have negative impact on health and well-being.
 - Traffic calming measures have been discussed, but an increase in traffic means an allocation of funds should be offered to the PC to implement revised schemes.
 - The traffic analysis undertaken by the developer is overly casual, and is limited in scope.
 - Proposed roads are not wide enough for 2—way traffic.
 - Improvements to the A24 need to be included as part of the proposed development.
 - Accident analysis on the A24 is not sufficient.
 - Crossing points on the A24 have been reviewed by the PC. In recognition that the development will worsen the conditions for pedestrians the PC request the developer investigates options for crossing improvements and allocate funds for implementing these schemes.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

- 3.38 The application as originally submitted in August 2016 attracted 81 objections (58 households) plus a further two where there was no address given. In addition there were also some 22 comments from 15 households neither objecting nor offering support.

In summary the objections dealt with the following matters:

Highways:

- Additional pressure on the surrounding road network during construction and when built
- Increased traffic noise and air pollution levels as a result of more traffic on the roads
- Safety concerns relating to construction traffic
- Safety concerns relating to additional traffic on the roads
- Inadequate cycle, pedestrian and equestrian routes into and out of the development
- Inadequate consideration of where access points to the development have been proposed
- Inadequate modelling of the potential highways impact inter alia objections from Earles Meadow residents association
- Concerns that highways improvements proposed cannot be secured

Parkway Railway Station:

- The proposal for a new railway station is not realistic and is not in line with Network Rail's Policy
- Not providing Parkway Railway Station would have a negative impact on the capacity of surrounding stations to cope
- The proposed station discourages sustainable transport options by providing 600 car parking spaces
- The potential for the removal or reduction of train services from neighbouring stations if Parkway Station is built

Bus Route:

- Safety concerns relating to the ability of Pondtail Drive to accommodate a bus route
- Concerns relating to the frequency with which the buses would pass through Pondtail Drive
- Concerns that the character of Pondtail Drive will be altered from a residential road to an urbanised area
- The potential for parking restrictions on Pondtail Drive
- Concerns that Pondtail Drive cannot be properly managed to restrict usage to buses only
- The impact of the proposed bus route on the amenity of existing residents

Infrastructure and services:

- Lack of infrastructure proposed to support the new development – schools, medical services, public transport and emergency services
- The over stretching of existing services to accommodate the development
- Concerns that council tax will be raised to provide the services needed for the development
- Educational facilities proposed will not meet existing and future demand
- Concerns relating to the amendment of school catchment areas
- Proposed school is not appropriately located and should be provided elsewhere in the district
- Objections that the school is a proposed Free School
- Concerns that the school will not be delivered in time
- Concerns that appropriate funding for the school will not be provided by the developer
- Inadequate access to the allotments and cemetery

Environment and health

- Loss of countryside
- Loss of woodland
- Loss of ancient woodland
- Inadequate protection for trees with preservation orders
- Inadequate landscape buffer around the site
- Harm to wildlife and destruction of habitat
- Increased noise and air pollution
- Visual impact of the development
- The Environmental Statement does not properly consider the environmental impact of the development
- Concerns relating to the protection of existing watercourses on the site
- Concerns relating to flood risk
- Concerns relating to existing land contamination on site and the potential to cause future harm
- Negative impact on heritage asset – Motte and Bailey
- The landfill adjacent to the site will be a health hazard for prospective residents

- The location of the cemetery near Graylands may prove detrimental to future operations of SMEs and future development at this site
- There is concern over potential pollution arising from the cemetery to the adjacent business premises and occupiers

Character and amenity:

- Overdevelopment of Horsham
- Unnecessary development
- Adding to urban sprawl
- Inappropriate scale of development
- Concerns relating to the closing of the Horsham / Crawley gap
- The loss of Horsham's character and identity – rural and / or market town
- Loss of privacy for existing properties
- Loss of privacy and amenity for existing residents adjacent to the development
- The impact of the Gatwick flight path on prospective residents
- The development is separated from the rest of Horsham

Economic

- Loss of agricultural holding land
- Business and employment opportunities in Horsham town centre will be lost to the development of a business park
- There will not be enough demand for business units and change of use will be used to allow even more housing to be provided
- The business park should be replaced with more open and green space with sports and leisure facilities and a hotel
- Jobs created will not be long term or for local people

Housing:

- Concerns that suitable affordable housing will not be provided for those who are most in need
- Concerns that development will meet the needs of those living further afield rather than local need
- Only 30% social housing is proposed not 35% which is HDC's requirement and is what should be delivered
- Concerns that 5% of affordable homes will only be delivered if the overall development is successful
- Affordable housing is not true affordable housing
- Lack of provision for self-build homes
- Lack of variation in design of the development

Other

- Lack of trust in council and developer to deliver what will be secured in the S106
- Councillors are against the proposal so why would it proceed
- Concerns that land and planning permission will be sold on to another developer who is less experienced
- Viability figures are not available so the public cannot challenge them
- Concerns that the development is not viable
- Concerns that the developer is only interested in making a profit at the expense of the quality of life for local people who live in the area
- The site has been selected for political reasons not for objective planning reasons
- The proposed development does not meet policy requirements
- Landowners shown in the plans have not agreed to sell their land to the developer
- Inadequate community consultation
- Concerns relating to the length of time that the development will take and the impact this will have for local people

- The cumulative impact of the proposal for the Britannia Crest Incinerator
- Belief that more appropriate sites are available than the proposed site
- The east edge of the development is beyond that originally designated in the HDPF

3.39 Representations received as a result of submission of further environmental information in March 2017

Some 14 No. objections from fourteen households with one submission of comment neither supporting nor objecting from a single household and two comments from third parties where no address given submitted.

In summary these further objections raise the following issues:

Highways

- Highway safety concerns
- Increased pressure on local road network including minor roads surrounding the area
- Infrastructure for the business park needs to be provided before infrastructure for residential development
- The provision of a new station would negatively impact on existing stations in the area
- Lack of infrastructure for cycling, bridge link a deterrent to walking and cycling
- Unclear cycle links connecting the development to Horsham
- The location of the proposed link road (route 6) has not been properly considered and the developer has not properly considered the alternative routes
- The proposed western link road will have a negative environmental impact upon protected habitats and species
- Increased pressure on parking at Littlehaven Station
- Concern and objection to the diversion of Langhurstwood Road
- The Kilnwood Vale developers are actively promoting the positioning of a railway station within their site and the traffic impacts of no station at North Horsham should be considered
- Concern that the level of traffic movements along the A264 have been underrepresented
- There are concerns over the implications of the development on the Kilnwood Vale roundabout and the proposed improvements at Sullivan Drive

Bus Route:

- Pondtail Drive is an inappropriate road for the proposed bus route
- Change to character of Pondtail Drive
- Increased noise impact and pollution on Pondtail Drive
- Lack of enforceable restrictions for the proposed bus route on Pondtail Drive

Environment:

- Negative impact on protected trees
- Concerns relating to resulting surface water runoff and flood risk

Other:

- The development is separated for the rest of Horsham
- Loss of amenity for existing residents who live adjacent to the site
- Loss of character and appearance of Old Holbrook
- Insufficient consultation
- Insufficient provision of affordable housing for local people
- Developer is profit driven

- Lack of adequate health care facilities being provided which will create additional pressure on existing services
- Housing for local need does not conform to HDPF policy requirement
- Detrimental visual impact of Phase 3 housing on existing dwellings in Langhurstwood Road
- The deliverability of the commercial and retail offer would be reduced without a station

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 The key issues for consideration in relation to this outline proposal are:

- The principle of the development
- Transport Issues
- Impact upon the character, appearance and landscape of the surrounding area and biodiversity issues
- Impact on nearby heritage assets and their setting
- Leisure, open space and community facilities
- Environmental issues (air quality, contamination, noise & drainage)
- Legal obligations

These issues are examined below in the context of compliance with relevant, up to date policies of the Development Plan.

Principle of the development

- 6.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that this should run through both plan making and decision taking (paragraph 14). In terms of determination of planning applications this means the approval of development that accords with the Development Plan without delay, unless the policies within a given development plan can be considered to be out of date, most normally because the plan does not incorporate at least a 5 year land supply or does not reflect a more recent change to national policy.
- 6.3 The District currently has an up to date Development Plan, the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) was adopted by the Council in November 2015. The District currently has a housing land supply of some 5.4 years (equivalent to a 109% supply) and therefore the policies within the HDPF relating to housing provision are to be considered up to date. Therefore, as established in the NPPF and at paragraph 38(6) of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, development that accords with the Development Plan should be approved without delay unless material considerations, or specific guidance within the NPPF, indicate otherwise.

- 6.4 The application site is a key strategic commitment within the adopted Plan and was specifically considered and found to be sound by the Inspector. Paragraph 69 of his final report concludes that the Land North of Horsham *'allocation offers the opportunity to provide necessary housing, business development and community facilities at a sustainable location. Overall, the housing and employment benefits of the proposed allocation would significantly outweigh the disadvantages of the environmental impacts, which in my view would not be unacceptably severe.'*
- 6.5 Land North of Horsham forms one of the HDPFs strategic allocation, as set out in Policy 2. Policy SD1 then sets out the key principles of the allocation, with further Policies SD2 to SD9 giving further specific details of the Council's development policies for the North of Horsham site, as follows:
- SD2 Employment and Business Opportunities
 - SD3 Local Centre
 - SD4 Housing Needs
 - SD5 Open Space, Sport and Recreation
 - SD6 Landscape Buffer, Landscape Character, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure
 - SD7 Design
 - SD8 Education
 - SD9 Transport Infrastructure
- 6.6 The submitted application, whilst having a red line boundary that is not identical with the boundary as shown on the Land North of Horsham Concept Master Plan (which forms part of the HDPF) is broadly consistent with it and the disposition of land uses within that area to deliver a comprehensive mixed use development that meets the requirements of the allocation.
- 6.7 Policy SD1 sets some 13 general principles of development for the site against which the submitted proposals should be considered, this section identifies these and provides consideration as to whether the proposed development meets these requirements.
- *The development should form a high quality, sustainable, mixed use community which reflects the communities' needs. Through the planning, design, phasing and infrastructure provided the development should ensure that the future community has its own identity and character, but have strong, sustainable connections to Horsham.*

The scheme as submitted provides a mixed use scheme in compliance with this principle. The details of its sustainability are discussed elsewhere in this report however, it is relevant to note that it is broadly compliant with an allocation that was tested against the NPPF by an Inspector during the Examination of the HDPF. The design, phasing and infrastructure delivery are matters that are recommended later in this report to be dealt with by planning conditions, and a Section 106 agreement together with the provision of sustainable connections to Horsham.

- *The development shall be locally distinctive and unique through its architecture, urban and landscape design, where residents can become involved in their community and share the benefits of a high quality of life.*

The submitted design and access statement and parameter plans provide the details of proposed densities, building heights, green infrastructure, movement and access giving the Council considerable and effective powers to guide and control subsequent applications for approval of reserved matters to accord with those principles established at this outline stage.

A planning condition is also recommended that prior to the first submission of a reserved matters application for a particular phase or part thereof, an 'area or phase master plan' shall be submitted to and be approved by the Council, in order to ensure broad compliance with Policies 32, 33 and SD7 of the HDPF. It is envisaged that such master plans will expand upon the broad based parameter plans and character areas set out within the design and access statement to ensure that the overarching vision and proposals for the development remain policy compliant and, importantly, are followed through in detailed layout and design.

The submission of such phase or sub-phase master plans would also enable the high quality development proposed by the applicants to be ensured. The applicant's submissions include the use of high quality materials and finishes within the development, which have been reflected within the overall costings for the site. It is therefore necessary to require that such an appropriate finish and environment is achieved on site, which is to be secured by condition, as this will ensure compliance with Policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF.

- *The development shall have a legible layout that facilitates all modes of sustainable travel, both within the development area and to provide linkages to the existing urban area of Horsham, thus reducing the dependency on the car by providing suitable access to local facilities and services.*

The master plan submitted as part of the application is in material conformity to the master plan for the site within the HDPF. The public transport provisions within the site are to be secured through the Section 106 agreement, and will reflect the requirements of Policy and an appropriate mechanism for delivery.

- *The impact of the new development on the existing transport network shall be minimised – development will require new pedestrian and cycle crossing points of the A264; bus links and an internal network of bus routes; closure of Langhurstwood Road left in/left out junction onto the A264 and re-alignment of Langhurstwood Road to the east with a new roundabout junction on the A264; improvements to the Rusper Road roundabout; a new secondary junction into the development east of Rusper Road; improvements to the Great Daux roundabout. Old Holbrook is to be retained as a country lane and not as a vehicular access into the new mixed use community.*

The submitted Transport Assessment, master plan and the further modelling submitted within the most recent additional information has been carefully considered by West Sussex County Council, as Local Highway Authority, and Highways England, as per their individual consultation responses summarised above, and form the basis for recommended planning conditions and appropriate clauses within the Section 106 agreement. A detailed consideration of the Local Highway Authority and Highways England responses is set out below in consideration of the application's compliance with HDPF Policies 39, 40 and 41.

- *A business park shall be provided in order to enable the opportunity of working locally, to reflect the needs of the economy.*

The application includes a business park of a size and in conformity and location to principle 5 of Policy SD1 and Policies 7 and SD2 of the HDPF. The application includes a business park towards the eastern end of the site to provide 46,450 sqm of Use Class B1 floorspace. This location is in accordance with the HDPF Master plan and was considered by the HDPF Examination Inspector to 'have great potential to meet a need for modern space close to the area of highest demand, near Gatwick Airport.'

Use Class B1 incorporates offices, research and development facilities and light industrial uses. It is proposed that the business park would offer high quality modern spaces across a range of unit sizes in order to cater for a broad range of market sectors, from start-ups to

larger commercial operations. The applicants have calculated as part of their submitted Environmental Statement that the business park could, when fully occupied, provide work space for some 3,446 employees.

The Council's Economic Development department recognises the need for and strongly supports the proposed employment site. The new business park is also supported by Gatwick Diamond, a business-led partnership seeking to promote the area's strengths and drive the local economy. Gatwick Diamond comment that the development would help to address the shortage of high quality employment space, which will aid in retaining and attracting high value-adding business activity and related jobs. They also state that there is a pressing need for top-quality employment space in this area.

The development and broad form of the proposed business park would therefore provide considerable employment opportunities and significantly enhance the commercial floorspace offer within Horsham District and the wider Gatwick Diamond area. The detailed design, phasing and delivery of the business park will be controlled through conditions and the Section 106 legal agreement to ensure that sufficient provision is made early within the development. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policies SD1, SD2 and 7 of the HDPF.

- *Land to be safeguarded for a parkway railway station and associated uses, adjacent to the business park, to provide a sustainable form of travel to the wider area.*

The application site includes land which is to be safeguarded for a new railway station and associated parking and connectivity facility to conform with Policy SD9. The new railway station site and associated parking area will be safeguarded by a clause in the s106 to preserve the area for that use for an appropriate length of time. The railway station and associated parking is not a requirement in terms of highway capacity or overall sustainability for the business park or the residential development to come forward, as confirmed by the applicants Transport Assessment and WSCC's consultation response. It also should be noted that the provision of a railway station is not within the power of the Council or the applicant, as it lies within the control of the Department for Transport in consultation with Network Rail and the rail operator. It is also noteworthy that the HDPF Examination Inspector found at paragraph 60 of his report that;

"the location is sustainable at present but would be improved by the provision of a new station towards the eastern end of the allocated area. While noting the arguments about the deliverability of another station in close proximity to the previously planned station at Kilnwood Vale development, the wording of the Plan is suitably flexible in that the necessary land is safeguarded pending further consultation with the Department for Transport and Network Rail. The proposal cannot be considered unsound in this respect"

- *A Local Centre will be provided which comprises a mix of uses to reflect the needs of the land at North Horsham allocation area; including shops, health care and community facilities.*

In conformity with this principle of Policy SD1 a Local Centre together with food store retail floorspace (4,900 sq m) to serve the development and the population more generally of North Horsham is proposed on the applicants Masterplan. The supporting retail study, demonstrates that the effect of the new shopping provision will cause no material harm to the vitality and viability of Horsham Town Centre as a whole. The Council's retail study identifies a qualitative deficiency in convenience provision in the North Horsham area, finding that there is currently capacity for additional convenience floorspace. In this particular context it should be noted that the level of retail floorspace proposed is supported by the HDPF Examination Inspector at paragraph 62 of his report. The provision and potential impact of retail floorspace are considered below.

The Master Plan includes within the local centre a healthcare facility site as required by Horsham and Mid Sussex Clinical Commissioning Group. The safeguarding of this site, along with either the provision of a healthcare facility or contribution towards one, will be ensured through appropriate clauses within the S106 agreement. The detailed design and specification of this facility would also be required to be submitted for consideration, through the legal agreement. Similarly, the provision, size, specification and delivery of the community centre will also be set out in clauses of the S106 agreement.

- *Homes with a mix of housing sizes, types and tenures to meet local needs shall be provided.*

This policy is further expanded at Policy SD4 and Policies 15 and 16 of the HDPF. The mix of housing types, tenures and sizes to meet local needs are proposed as set out above in the description of development section, and in more detail below. It should be noted that the percentage of housing for local needs falls below the requirement as set out in Policy 16 of the HDPF, which is discussed further below.

- *Two primary schools and a site for a secondary school shall be provided together with provision for Special Education Needs places for 2-19 year olds.*

The application shows compliance with the HDPF Masterplan and Policies SD1 and SD8 in terms of the location of the education facilities on the site and is therefore Policy compliant in that respect. The application includes the following proposals:

1. A proportional financial contribution towards post 16 education facilities off site. To be allocated to The College of Richard Collyer;
2. A proportional contribution towards land and capital cost of a six form entry secondary school, phased in line with development need, or the provision of such a facility with a proportionate contribution from West Sussex County Council;
3. Land and capital cost to build a two form entry primary school on the education campus site, and a one form entry primary school on the western side of the site as, in line with the development need. The provision of additional land for a fourth form of entry, should this be required;
4. Land and capital cost to accommodate 65 early years places within the two primary school buildings;
5. Provision of land for a Special Educational Needs school, at an appropriate phase in the development.

Policy SD8 requires the developer to make land available for the education facilities and to meet the capital cost of construction of the primary schools, early years and special educational needs provision. The delivery of facilities is required to be phased to ensure early delivery of an appropriate amount of early years, primary and secondary provision. West Sussex County Council, as the Local Education Authority, are satisfied that the applicants proposals are acceptable and that subject to the incorporation of appropriate obligations in the s106 agreement the scheme is compliant with Policy SD8 of the HDPF. The form of the proposed education facilities is discussed further below.

Since the receipt of the consultation response from West Sussex County Council, a government announcement regarding new free schools was released on 12th April 2017. This announcement states that a bid for a new free school to the north of Horsham has been approved. If funding for a free school at the Land North of Horsham site becomes available through the Department for Education as a result of this approval, then the developer will be required to either make a proportionate contribution towards the construction of this facility (which would be to the Education Funding Agency rather than WSCC), or reallocate this contribution towards other appropriate community benefits. These options and possibilities will be controlled through the legal agreement.

- *Open space and sport and recreation facilities shall be provided to meet the needs of the new community and the wider area and to provide for a balance of development and landscaped open space.*

This site specific principle is further added to by Policy 43 of the HDPF which supports new community facilities. The supporting text to Policy SD5 requires that there is a provision of some 3.2 Ha of playing pitches for the development and that a wide range of activities should be able to be accommodated. This 3.2 Ha figure was derived for some 2500 dwellings but the application will need to deliver some 3.52 Ha for 2750 homes. The applicant's submitted Masterplan divides the open space into two functional types:

1. Formal Open space – sports pitches, multi-use games areas (MUGAs), allotments, kick about areas, skate park and children's play areas;
2. Informal open space – such as natural and semi natural open space, parks, amenity space and green corridors

The proposed form and quantum of open space and leisure facilities are considered further below.

- *A strong 'Landscape Buffer' shall be provided to the open countryside to provide a robust and long term, defensible boundary to the development and to avoid perception of coalescence and to maintain separation between Horsham and Crawley.*

The submitted masterplan is broadly compliant with the concept master plan, a constituent part of the HDPF, together with the applicant's parameter plans illustrating lower density or no development (cemetery) towards the northern edge of the site, which ensures compliance with the Development Plan Policy SD1 and this specific principle. It is also relevant in the context of compliance with Policies SD1, and in particular, SD6 to note that the applicant's master plan complies with all of the six sub criteria within that latter policy. Planning conditions are to be imposed ensuring that designated landscape buffers will be retained.

Policy 30 of the HDPF requires that major development proposals adjoining protected areas such as the High Weald AONB are required to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impacts. The applicants have submitted a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) as part of the submission. This, along with the overall consideration of landscape impacts is considered below.

- *The development shall take a sequential approach across the site to ensure the most vulnerable uses are placed in the lowest flood risk zone. This approach will ensure the most effective risk management measure is applied to the site as a whole. The development will also make the most of opportunities to manage and reduce flood risk overall.*

The Council's Drainage Engineer and the Environment Agency are satisfied, subject to the imposition of recommended planning conditions, that the application is in accordance with this requirement. Drainage and flooding issues are discussed in more detail below.

- *The development shall be delivered and laid out in accordance with the concept Masterplan Map.*

The submitted application masterplan is in accordance with this, both in the disposition of built land uses, safeguarded areas of green space and access arrangements.

Notwithstanding the submitted phasing plan, which covers only the residential parcels, the applicant will be required, through an appropriate condition, to submit an overall phasing plan for the site. This plan will cover the entirety of the application site and indicate which

phase and/or sub-phase each area of the business park, open space, community facilities or landscaping are to be associated with. Requiring this submission will ensure that the delivery of open spaces and the business park are brought forward at an appropriate time to serve the needs of the development, its future residents and the economic growth of the District. Subject to a phasing plan condition, the application is considered compliant with this aspect of Policy SD1 and delivery of the scheme will be tied to the submitted master plan.

Form and mix of proposed development

- 6.8 The overall mix and form of dwellings proposed as part of the development is set out above. The submission includes a range of ‘housing for local need’ as per the requirements of Policy 16 of the HDPF. This policy seeks to deliver a range of housing types, sizes and tenures in order to meet the needs of the District’s communities, as evidenced by the most recent Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Policy 16 expects that, on sites providing 15 or more dwellings, that 35% of these should be affordable. However, this policy also advises that the Council will assess each scheme’s viability in seeking this affordable housing provision. This approach follows that of the Planning Practice Guidance, which states that a site will only be *‘viable if the value generated by its development exceeds the costs of developing it and also provides sufficient incentive for the land to come forward and the development to be undertaken.’*
- 6.9 As established above, the applicant proposes a total of 30% of housing for local needs, with 18% constituting affordable housing of the form anticipated through the supporting text to Policy 16 (i.e. affordable rented units and shared ownership units). The remaining 12%, to make up the overall 30%, would be formed of a mix of private rented units, discount market units and custom/self-build units. These types of unit reflect the wider affordable housing definition currently being consulted on through the Housing White Paper. The breakdown of this is shown in the table below:

Housing for Local Needs (size and tenure)	Number
Affordable Rented units	350
- 1 bed apartments	41
- 2 bed apartments	91
- 2 bed houses	189
- 3 bed houses	29
Shared Ownership units	145
- 1 bed apartments	36
- 2 bed apartments	53
- 2 bed houses	35
- 3 bed houses	18
- 4 bed houses	3
Discount Market units	100
- 1 bed apartments	2
- 2 bed apartments	5
- 2 bed houses	12
- 3 bed houses	38
- 4 bed houses	38
- 5 bed houses	5
Private Rented units	200

- 1 bed apartments	90
- 2 bed apartments	102
- 3 bed apartments	8
Custom/Self-Build units	30
- 2 bed houses	3
- 3 bed houses	15
- 4 bed houses	10
- 5 bed houses	2
Total Housing for Local Needs	825

- 6.10 The applicant has submitted a viability appraisal for the proposed development in support of the reduced level of affordable housing provision. This appraisal has been independently reviewed, queried and assessed by the Council's appointed specialists. The result being that whilst the advisors highlight some areas of disagreement, as set out in their report on the applicants submitted viability, they acknowledge that the level of viability of housing for local needs on sites of this size and duration is an inexact science. It is also apparent that the applicant's appraisal accounts for a high quality development form and this will therefore need to be ensured in order for the appraisal to represent an accurate interpretation of development costs. This, along with the delivery of the affordable units, will be ensured through conditions and the s106 agreement, which will also contain mechanisms to review the development as it progresses such that the applicant's viability can be tested at appropriate intervals and any underspend on the provision of infrastructure or additional receipts for land sales or increased rental receipts on the business space on the development can be appropriately diverted into additional housing for local needs.
- 6.11 The affordable rented units and shared ownership homes will assist in meeting a clear need within the District for people who are unable to access housing through the open market. However, it is also recognised that the definition of affordable housing within the NPPF is intended to be amended (likely later this year following the Housing White Paper) to include a number of additional forms of housing tenure. The proposed provision of discount market units, private rented units and custom/self-build units will also assist to meet the needs of a proportion of the local population. The Council has a current register for those seeking a custom/self-build plot (totalling 145 No. at the time of writing, of which 87 No. are current residents of the District). The provision of 30 No. custom/self-build units within the development will therefore address part of this requirement.
- 6.12 There is also known to be a level of demand for private rented units for those who don't wish to purchase, such as the growing professional transient population. The provision of these forms of tenure are therefore considered to be appropriate and whilst not falling within the current definition of affordable housing, would assist in meeting the housing needs of the local population. The overall outcome of the viability assessment indicates that the total level and mix of affordable/local needs housing is not unreasonable given the scale of development, the very considerable infrastructure costs, provision of the business park and the promoted level of quality for the development. The Council's Head of Housing Services is in agreement that whilst a greater proportion of affordable rented and shared ownership units would be preferable, the proposal amounts to a reasonable position given the viability of the development and the current funding difficulties of Registered Providers.
- 6.13 The proposed mix of market housing units (set out above) does not completely accord with the needs assessment of market housing mix undertaken for Horsham District Council and Crawley Borough Council. Paragraph 7.15 and Policy SD4 of the HDPF requires a range/mix of housing sizes, types and tenures. Policy SD4 recognises that flexibility will be

required as the mix is likely to differ between phases and sub phases. The HDPF does not require a particular mix of market housing, however the subsequent report (the Chilmark Consulting 'Market Housing Mix' report November 2016) confirms the need across the District for a higher proportion of smaller 1 and 2 bedroom units rather than larger 4 and 5 bedroom units. It is acknowledged that this assessment is broadly based and it is the applicant's view that the market mix proposed in the application is based on specialist advice appropriate for the application site and relevant experience elsewhere, which lends itself to family housing, a form of development for which there is considerable demand. The applicants also draw attention to the growth in the use of permitted development rights to permit the re-use of office buildings in locations such as the town centre of Horsham to provide smaller homes, well located to transport, services and entertainment. In the period 2011 to 2016 the applicants have calculated that within Horsham town centre some 537 homes have been permitted of which some 95% were either studio, one or two bedroomed flats.

- 6.14 The applicant's response therefore asserts that the provision of larger family housing is more appropriate to this 'edge of settlement' site than smaller units. It is acknowledged that the Market Housing Mix report separates market need into only two categories, namely Horsham Town and Rural Areas/Smaller Towns. The location of the application site to the northern edge of Horsham does not easily fall within either category, with both areas displaying specific characteristics which would be unlikely to be replicated on a new large scale development to the edge of an existing town. It is Officer's view on this matter, having regard to the status, form and date of the evidence base, the longevity of the application site and the flexibility built into an outline application by use of planning conditions, coupled with the emergence of smaller housing units within the town centre, that strict adherence with the broad evidence based market housing mix is not necessarily appropriate in this instance and circumstances.
- 6.15 In terms of density of development, the submitted parameter plan indicates that the highest levels of residential density (up to 60 dwellings per hectare (dph)) would be located around the local centre and to the north of the A264, with the lowest density areas (up to 20 dph) set around the periphery of the site. The densities across the residential parcels would vary between the aforementioned highest and lowest, however, it should be noted that the densities shown on the parameter plan relate only to the residential parcels and not reflect the considerable areas of open space and landscaping both within and around the development. Whilst the highest density would be somewhat greater than those existing properties to the northern edge of Horsham (~35dph around the Ropeland Way/Meadow Farm Lane area), this is not considered inappropriate given the nature of the development proposed and the requirement to make efficient use of the land available. Furthermore, the existing dwellings to the northern edge of Horsham would not be seen in context with the proposed development, due to the A264 and landscape buffers, and as such it is not considered that the form and density of the proposal is unacceptable. For comparison, the Land West of Worthing Road, Southwater development shows a density of up to 59dph.
- 6.16 The proposed maximum building heights of the development is indicated on the submitted parameter plans. This shows that across the residential parcels, development is proposed to be restricted to a maximum of 15m in height (3-4 storeys max), but with the majority of the areas to be restricted to 12m in height (2.5 storeys) or 10m in height (2 storeys). The proposed educational facilities would also be limited to 12m, the local centre and retail elements to 15m and the business park limited to 16m. Whilst a sub-phase comprising all 4 storey dwellings could appear excessive, it should be noted that the parameter plan only sets the limitations and phases and sub-phases would be likely to be brought forward with a range of building sizes and styles in order to create an attractive and varied development. The scale of the proposed commercial and business units is considered to be appropriate given the nature of these uses and the potential need to accommodate specific internal arrangements. It is considered therefore that the parameters established here in respect of

building heights is not inappropriate and the full details of scale and associated context will be controlled through reserved matters applications.

- 6.17 As identified within Policy 15 of the HDPF, where the development renders the provision of 35% of dwellings as affordable housing unviable, this level can be reviewed. In addition, the PPG advises that planning obligations, and in particular affordable housing obligations (as these are often the largest single item) should not be sought without regard to individual scheme viability. Therefore, given the independently assessed level of viability across the proposed development, calculated on the basis of a 30% provision of housing for local needs (18% affordable rented and shared ownership), it is considered that the proposed affordable housing offer is, on balance, acceptable and accords with both the NPPF, the advice of the PPG and Policies SD4 and 16 of the HDPF.

Transport issues

- 6.18 The NPPF at section 4, together with Policy 39 of the HDPF requires 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 new development or that suitable necessary improvements can be provided to serve the development to safeguard new and existing local residents, to be brought forward at the relevant phase of the development, and secured by condition or legal agreement.
- 6.19 Policy 40 goes on to confirm a commitment to providing sustainable transport connections within new developments, and promotes an integrated transport network favouring non-car modes of transport.
- 6.20 Policy SD9 relates specifically to the application site, and confirms that the development should include the following:
- New and safer pedestrian and cycle crossing points of the A264;
 - Access for buses to ensure the site is linked with existing residential areas of North Horsham;
 - A comprehensive internal network of roads to accommodate bus routes across the site;
 - Safeguarded land for a new railway station and associated parking;
 - The closure and realignment of Langhurstwood Road to the east, together with new roundabout junction to the A264;
 - An upgraded Rusper Road roundabout;
 - A new secondary junction to the east of Rusper Road;
 - Improvements to both the Great Daux and Moorhead roundabouts; and
 - Other measures to specifically mitigate the impact of the development on the strategic and local road networks, including outside the District.
- 6.21 This policy goes on to require the submission of a comprehensive Transport Assessment as well as a Travel Plan Strategy discouraging through traffic along the rural roads.

Highway works

- 6.22 Access is being fully considered as part of this application, and as such this includes the connections to the strategic road network within the application site area; these are:
- A new roundabout where the re-aligned Langhurstwood Road meets the A264. This will be a signalised, multi modal junction, including a prioritised bus link into the development from the south and a footbridge providing pedestrian and cycle links into the development.

- A new 4 arm roundabout where the newly aligned Langhurstwood Road meets the existing at its junction with Mercer Road.
 - An upgraded roundabout where the Rusper Road meets the A264. This is to be signalised and will include a footbridge providing pedestrian and cycle links into the development.
 - A new signalised left in/left out junction to be located on the A264, approximately midway between the improved Rusper Road and the existing Moorhead roundabouts.
 - An access for emergency vehicles only (also to provide non-vehicular links into the site) on Wimland Road (just north of where this meets Chennells Brook).
- 6.23 As such, all of the above road improvements are being considered for full permission at this stage and any Reserved Matters submissions will be required to be in complete conformity with these layouts.
- 6.24 In addition to the above, the proposal also sets out the approximate location of the primary and secondary roads which will be located within the development. These are identified on the Parameter Plan: Movement and Access.
- 6.25 One of the proposed primary roads is to cross Rusper Road, approximately mid-way along this road, and it is proposed to install a 4 arm roundabout for which full permission is now sought, where these roads will meet. This same road will then link through the development to the west, and will cross Old Holbrook, where improvements are planned to limit this to an east/west crossing only, and features are to be installed to restrict turning north or south onto Old Holbrook, and likewise east/west through the development from Old Holbrook.
- 6.26 The Movement and Access Parameter Plan details the route of the main primary road throughout the site. In essence this begins at the new Langhurstwood/Mercer Road roundabout, with a link down to the new Langhurstwood/A264 roundabout, travelling east through the site, crossing Old Holbrook and further east to the new Rusper Road roundabout, where it also travels north/south along the existing Rusper Road to the A264 to the south and out of the development to the north. The primary road then continues to the east creating a loop through the eastern extremity of the site, and the business park, linking to the new left in/left out junction on the A264.
- 6.27 It is worth noting that the eastern link of the primary access also shows a north/south connection between two roundabouts, this is not forming part of this approval as it has not been adequately justified, to the satisfaction of Officers, that it is essential, and its route intersects a portion of ancient woodland, and as such a condition forms part of this recommendation detailing that permission is not given for this link.
- 6.28 This parameter plan also includes details of the secondary roads, which link the parcels of land to be developed to the primary road network, as described above.
- 6.29 Details of the proposed new bridleways, cycle and pedestrian routes through the site are also shown in order to demonstrate the level of connectivity across, and through the site. There will be more localised pathways and routes to come forward in addition to these strategic routes shown, the detail of which will be provided at the Reserved Matters stage of each phase.
- 6.30 Any further Reserved Matters submissions for each phase and/or sub-phase, will need to include road layouts through the site, both primary and secondary, that are in general conformity with those set out on the submitted parameter plan.
- 6.31 Policy SD1 of the HDPF requires the development to be constructed in general conformity with the concept Masterplan, which is included in the HDPF at Appendix 2.

- 6.32 The Movement and Access Parameter Plan includes the required features, including the new junctions and crossings of the A264, and the vehicular and pedestrian accesses are all in conformity with the concept Masterplan.
- 6.33 There are also a number of off-site highways works that are proposed to mitigate the anticipated impact of the development. These works include the following:
- Great Daux Roundabout (A24/A264) – a financial contribution to allow for the inclusion of an additional entry arm and circulatory lane on the roundabout)
 - Bewbush Manor Roundabout (A264) – a financial contribution to allow for traffic mitigation measures to be implemented, potentially signalling of the roundabout, to be monitored as per the requirements for the Kilnwood Vale development, who will jointly contribute to these improvement works.
 - Robin Hood Roundabout (A24) – a financial contribution to allow for traffic mitigation measures to be implemented, potentially signalling of the roundabout, to be monitored as per the requirements for the West of Horsham development, who will jointly contribute to these improvement works.
 - Traffic Regulation Order (A264 between Great Daux and Moorhead) – to enable the reduction of the speed limit to be agreed once the works to the A264 have been completed.
 - Moorhead Roundabout (A264) – signalling of the roundabout, as well as additional traffic islands along the B2195 to prevent queuing in the right turning lane
 - Hop Oast Roundabout (A24) – creation of additional lanes on both A24 arms and the B2237 Worthing Road arm
 - Rusper Road/Lemington Road Roundabout – increasing the flare on the Rusper Road north arm
 - Roffey Corner Traffic Signals – the Highways Authority are amending these traffic signals to use intelligent signals (auto adjusting to reflect traffic levels) which should improve traffic flow. However this is to be monitored to ensure that no additional works are required, and if so, these will be agreed with the Highways Authority and provided by the applicant through a Section 278 agreement
 - Faygate Roundabout (A264) – Improvements to be made to this, likely to increase the flares on the approaches, but full details to be secured following monitoring of the situation to ensure no undue impact on more localised traffic using Tower Road and Faygate Lane
 - Crawley Road Roundabout (adjacent Horsham Volkswagen) – increasing the flare on the approaches to the roundabout
 - Underpass under the A264 (adjacent to the Horsham/Crawley railway line) and Riverside Walk – surfacing and lighting improvements
 - A23/M23 Junction 11 – improvements to increase the flare of the approaches to the motorway
- 6.34 As such the submitted scheme meets the highways requirements set out by HDPF Policies SD1 and SD9 and the concept Masterplan.
- 6.35 The application has been supported by the required Highways documents, including a comprehensive Transport Assessment (TA), including associated Safety Audits and an overarching Travel Plan.
- 6.36 Following initial comments by West Sussex County Council Highways, and as a result of amendments to the scheme, the Highways documents have been amended to reflect these changes and to respond to initial comments raised.
- 6.37 The TA includes full details of the proposed trip generation arising from the development (together with all existing and committed developments), in association with national TRICS database standards, and the routing of these additional trips detailing how they

would impact on the local highway network. WSCC Highways have fully reviewed this document, and it is concluded that, with the full package of highway works proposed, that the impact on the highway would be acceptable. All of the measures set out above shall be appropriately secured through the permission, either relevant planning conditions or the legal agreement.

- 6.38 The is, therefore, no objection to the proposed development from WSCC Highways, the Local Highway Authority, acknowledging that the proposed mitigation measures secured will ensure that the local highway network can sufficiently accommodate the predicted increase in traffic arising from the development.
- 6.39 There is an acknowledgement that throughout the road network existing traffic means that it is operating with high levels. However, the development is not required to fix or remedy existing highways issues, only issues that arise as a result of the development proposed. However the mitigation works proposed will improve the existing situation, allowing for quicker journey times than experienced at present.
- 6.40 In addition to the above, additional monitoring works are to be required and these are also secured as part of this recommendation. These include the following:
- Traffic levels using the rural lanes to the north of the development, if increases are found, appropriate mitigation measure will be required.
 - Pedestrian crossing demands at Old Holbrook (commencing in Phase 3) and if required, implementation of pedestrian crossing improvements.
 - Parking demands around Littlehaven Railway Station, if increases are found, the applicant shall secure measures to mitigate any highway safety issues, for example the implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order.

Public Transport

- 6.41 The scheme includes land to be safeguarded for the provision of a new railway station within the development. A railway station itself is not being secured, as the applicant cannot secure the delivery of this, which rests with the Department for Transport, in association with Network Rail and the train service provider. The applicant is keen to secure such a facility, with associated parking, and as such the application allows for this to be delivered, with the land for this facility and associated car parking, to be safeguarded for 20 years.
- 6.42 In order to promote sustainable development, to integrate effectively with the main urban centre of Horsham to the south and to meet policy requirements, it is also important to secure a bus service into and out of the site.
- 6.43 In the early phases of the development, it is unlikely, due to limited passenger numbers, that such a service would be viable to be operated by the local bus service providers. However, it is important that such a service is implemented from an appropriate point during the development to allow for the earlier occupiers of the site to travel sustainably.
- 6.44 As such, a contribution is secured, which forms part of the s106 agreement, to subsidise the provision of a bus service in the initial periods, prior to it becoming commercially viable in its own right.

Pedestrian, cycle and other accessibility

- 6.45 The application site is crossed by a number of existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW), footpaths and bridleways. These are shown on the Movement and Access Parameter Plan, and are to be retained and extended.

- 6.46 In addition to these, the development would also create new footpaths and designated cycle routes throughout the development, which are to be linked to the existing routes surrounding the development, including across the A264 (as detailed above) to provide links into Horsham itself and also link into the existing Horsham to Crawley cycle routes.
- 6.47 These proposed alterations and enhancements are considered to be acceptable and no objections have been raised by WSCC in their capacity as the Local Highway Authority or in respect of PRow, on these matters.

Parking

- 6.48 This application is in outline form, and as such details for the car parking provision for each of the individual units are not provided at this stage, as these details would form part of any Reserved Matters submission.
- 6.49 It is considered that the proposed layout of the development is acceptable in terms of vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access and connectivity. It is also considered that the proposed off-site highway, cycle and connectivity improvement works would adequately address any impacts arising from the movements generated by the development and that the development would be appropriately integrated into the local transport network and would therefore be considered sustainable in this regard.
- 6.50 Paragraph 32 of the NPPF states that *‘development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe’* WSCC Highways have not raised any objection to the proposed development in terms of any impact upon highway capacity or safety issues. It is therefore considered that the proposal would accord with the requirements of the NPPF and with Policies 39, 40, SD1 and SD9 of the HDPF.

Impact upon the character, appearance and landscape of the surrounding area and biodiversity issues

- 6.51 Policy SD6 of the HDPF requires a strong landscape buffer to be provided between the development and the open countryside, not only to create a defensible boundary to the development, but also to avoid any perception of coalescence and maintain separation to Crawley. The HDPF Examination Inspector, at paragraph 64 of his report, notes:

‘The proposed development area on largely flat land below the wooded ridgeline to the north would create a defensible boundary, would not result in the loss of landscape of particularly high value... By and large the site is visually separate from the High Weald AONB to the south west... from my inspection of the surroundings, I consider the setting of the AONB would be protected. The distance between the new development and the western edge of Crawley would be reduced from about 3.5km to 3km but would be sufficient for the separate identities of both towns to be retained.’

- 6.52 The site lies within the National Character Area Profile No. 121 ‘Low Weald’ area and predominantly within the locally designated ‘Area K2 – Faygate and Warnham Vale’ character area of the Horsham District Landscape Character Assessment (2003). The immediate surroundings to the site fall within ‘Area I2 – Warnham and Rusper Wooded Ridges’, ‘Area L1 – St Leonards Forest’, ‘Area P1 – Upper Arun Valley’, and ‘Horsham and Broadbridge Heath Settlement Area’. A number of the key characteristics of the Area K2 are relevant to the application site, including *flat to gently undulating clay vale; medium to large scale field pattern of arable farmland; isolated patches of woodland; dominance of major road and rail communication routes; visual intrusion in parts from retail and industrial areas, housing and sand and gravel workings*. Area K2 is assessed as having a moderate

sensitivity to change, reflective of its mostly moderate intervisibility and only moderate intrinsic landscape quality.

- 6.53 As highlighted by the Council's Landscape Architect in their response, the creation of a large scale development in any location would be likely to give rise to harmful landscape impacts to some degree. As identified above by the HDPF Inspector and characteristics of the Area K2 categorisation, the generally low lying topography and gently undulating form of the landscape together with the expanses of woodland both within and adjacent to the site, serve to curtail middle and longer distance views of the site and provide a degree of enclosure.
- 6.54 Despite the large scale of the development proposed, the visual effects would be contained within a relatively limited area, with the vast majority of public views being from within the site itself. The assessment of surrounding areas provided by the applicant suggests that the proposal would have limited direct effects on these surrounding character areas or designation, with this restricted to small localised enclosed areas within the immediate vicinity of the site. The proposal includes the provision of landscape buffers, of up to 30m in width, around the edges of the site. These buffers would ensure an appropriate transition to the surrounding areas and provide screening of considerable parts of the site from the wider area. The landscape buffer areas will also provide open spaces, play areas, sustainable drainage features and earth mounding. The applicant's submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been reviewed by the Council's Landscape Architect, who considers that the overall approach and conclusions of this document are acceptable.
- 6.55 The development can be appropriately controlled through conditions to ensure that sufficient landscape buffers and mitigation measures are incorporated into the development. The development would not therefore result in any significantly adverse impacts upon the High Weald AONB or other surrounding landscapes and would be compliant with Policies SD6, 25 and 30 of the HDPF.
- 6.56 The Examination Inspector in his consideration of the HDPF found, at paragraph 65, that:
- 'There is no evidence of sensitive ecological habitat or protected species across the open farmland which comprises the majority of the site; other existing habitats along hedgerows and watercourses are safeguarded by the master plan and could be fully protected at the detailed design stage. Substantial areas of open space would be retained alongside Old Holbrook and a nature park, incorporating Bush Copse ancient woodland, would be created in low lying land liable to flood.'*
- 6.57 The application contains significant survey material and the Environmental Statement considers that the impact of development would not produce significant effects, including during construction. The applicant's assessment, mirroring the HDPF Examination Inspector's views, considers that the completion of the development will result in a number of ecological benefits. The applicants consider alterations to existing habitats, and effects on Ancient Woodland, will be minimised, and the woodland streams, the Sites of Conservation Interest and water bodies will be protected by means of landscape buffers as shown on the applicants Master plan and commented upon, referring to a broadly consistent HDPF concept Masterplan, by the HDPF Examination Inspector.
- 6.58 The creation of a nature park as well as an ecological network of green space throughout the site will ensure that wildlife can continue to utilise and move through these features.
- 6.59 A planning condition forms part of this recommendation to ensure compliance with the HDPF policy in these respects. The individual future applications for approval of reserved matters will need to be informed by the individual area master plans that are to be required by planning condition and will need to be compliant with any outline permission conditions relating to ecology, and provisions secured within the s106.

- 6.60 HDC's Consultant Ecologist has commented in some detail on the submissions and revisions. It is noted that some further on-going bat activity surveys are required as they previously could not be completed due to the seasonality of the survey period. These surveys are being completed during April and May this year, and will be submitted and fully considered prior to a final determination of the application. The outcome of the further survey work will also need to be incorporated into the applicant's 'Outline Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan' and recommended planning conditions may need to subsequently be updated to reflect any additional information provided at that stage.
- 6.61 As part of on-going discussions with the applicants the two areas on the site where the master plan shows internal roads cutting through existing ancient woodland have been the subject of further study by the applicants, producing an options appraisal in respect of each proposed road link (hereafter referred to as the eastern and western links). The document includes the applicants consideration of potential alternative routes, and the justification for using the routes originally proposed.
- 6.62 Turning first to the western link through ancient woodland (Morris' Wood) situated towards the north west of the site. This route follows an existing concrete track leading between two separate sections of designated ancient woodland through to two large commercial storage units. The existing track would only require limited widening to enable the provision of the western link, which at the point between the two sections of ancient woodland would be restricted to single file traffic with adjacent footway.
- 6.63 The creation of this western link would require the removal of a small number of trees which currently lie immediately adjacent to the existing track, but would also include a piece of land which is currently affected by Japanese Knotweed, an invasive species which will need to be dug out and removed. This removal would, in itself, constitute a significant environmental benefit.
- 6.64 It is considered that given the short length of the link that would be required, the existing separation of the ancient woodland into two parcels, the very limited impact upon existing vegetation to either side of the current track, and the beneficial removal of an invasive species the proposed western link is on balance acceptable. The road can be designed to utilise low impact construction methods, which can be ensured through the detailed design at reserved matters stage. The applicants have produced a plan illustrating that such an approach is achievable.
- 6.65 The proposed eastern link cutting through Bush Copse, the other area of ancient woodland affected, would result in the loss of some 885sqm of plantation on ancient woodland and some 135sqm of ancient semi natural woodland (ASNW). Having considered the applicants justification for this route, based on efficiency and the alternative routings considered, it is not considered that it has been appropriately and adequately demonstrated that there are no acceptable alternatives to the creation of this link route through a stretch of ancient woodland.
- 6.66 It is considered that in this particular area the proposals on the submitted master plan and parameter plans are not acceptable as they would fail to protect and preserve the ancient woodland and adjacent habitats, and it has not been shown that there is any overriding public benefit that would warrant this level of impact. Unlike the western link, this area comprises an intact expanse of designated ancient woodland and there are no indications of environmental improvements that would be delivered should this link be created. Therefore, whilst shown on the submitted plans, this eastern link is not considered acceptable and a planning condition is subsequently recommended to ensure that any permission granted does not include this feature. This view is consistent with the responses on this matter by Natural England and by the Woodland Trust.

- 6.67 From a consideration of consultation responses and the applicants submitted material under the auspices of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 it is clear that protected species, great crested newts, bats and dormice will be impacted to a degree. The submitted information shows that there is the potential for the site to support Barbastrelle bats, a very rare UK Biodiversity Action Plan species. Following discussions with the Council's consultant Ecologist further information relating to this species has been submitted by the applicant. The information confirms that whilst Barbastrelles were identified during bat surveys, no roosts have been found on the application site. The Ecologist is of the view that the submitted Masterplan provides a sufficient level of flexibility to ensure that appropriate buffers, lighting controls and dark corridors can be secured at the detailed Reserved Matters stage to ensure that the population of this species is maintained at a favourable conservation status.
- 6.68 However the tests that planning permission should be withheld are not met, namely:
- a) That the development is likely to result in a breach of the EU directive that underpins the UK regulation.
 - b) That a licence from Natural England is unlikely to be granted to allow development to proceed.

There is no reason to assume that such a licence would be withheld, as the following tests are passed:

1. The development must be for an overriding public interest – in this case the satisfaction of Development Plan policy.
 2. The development has no satisfactory alternative location – the HDPF Examination Inspector's consideration of the site and its subsequent designation in a Development Plan satisfies this test.
 3. That the development will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned – based on the information provided, it is considered that this criteria can be appropriately met.
- 6.69 It is considered that the three tests above are passed subject to appropriate conditions that are as recommended by the Council's consultant Ecologist and that the development is therefore acceptable and is compliant with HDPF Policy 31.

Impact on nearby heritage assets and their setting

- 6.70 The NPPF confirms (at paragraph 132) that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets (including listed buildings and scheduled monuments), as required by the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and that the more important the asset the greater the weight should be.
- 6.71 Paragraph 134 of the NPPF then goes on to confirm that *“where a development proposal will lead 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”*.
- 6.72 Policy 34 of the HDPF recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and as such the Council will sustain and enhance the historic environment through positive management of development. It goes on to require appropriate archaeological investigation, recording and reporting as appropriate to the scale of the associated impact.
- 6.73 The applicants have submitted a full Heritage Statement to accompany the application, and this concludes that the site:
- Has potential for archaeological deposits

- Contains a number of historic hedgerows
- Contains, or lies adjacent to designated heritage assets including scheduled monuments and listed buildings.

As such a range of measures, to be secured by condition, to mitigate any impact arising will be necessary.

Listed Buildings

- 6.74 There are 8 listed buildings that would be impacted by the development, these are:
- Brook House (Grade II)
 - Holbrook Park (Grade II)
 - Holbrook Park House (Grade II)
 - Hollywick Farmhouse (Grade II)
 - The Moated House (Grade II)
 - Hawksbourne Farmhouse (Grade II)
 - King's Farmhouse (Grade II)
 - Barn to the south-west of Brook House (Grade II)
- 6.75 The potential impact on the setting of these Listed Buildings, as their rural context will be partly lost, is reduced due to previous and existing development in the vicinity and alterations to the historic landscape and character of the area within which they are located. The settings of these assets have therefore lost much of their original and historic heritage significance.
- 6.76 The original setting of Brook House, its Barn and King's Farmhouse has been changed considerably. The application site will be separated from these buildings by a strip of farmland and a wide landscape buffer with tree planting.
- 6.77 Holbrook Park and Holbrook Park House's setting is limited to the designed landscape in which they are located, this is inward looking and their setting will remain unaffected by the development. In the case of Hollywick Farmhouse, the rural setting will be replaced by residential development immediately beyond the curtilage. However this former farmhouse has been degraded by its development as a well-appointed dwelling set in landscaped grounds with modern additions such as a swimming pool.
- 6.78 The Moated House's enclosure will be preserved as will its open environs to the south and north. Although this asset lies in the centre of an open landscape, this is a modern landscape replacing a more intimate field pattern. The existing modern agricultural buildings do not add to the setting, reducing the historic character of the asset.
- 6.79 Hawkesbourne Farmhouse is now a dwelling separated from its former farmstead setting, the immediate setting of this asset will be protected in a buffer zone with views southward into the open playing fields of the school campus.
- 6.80 It is also noted that the detail of the development, at this stage, is high level, being in outline form only. The more detailed consideration of any potential impacts upon the setting of these listed buildings will be undertaken at Reserved Matters stage where the precise relationship will then be known between the listed buildings and the built form of the proposed development. Whilst the detail of the relationship between heritage assets and the development is not finalised at this stage, the Heritage Statement and submitted details indicate that appropriate and acceptable levels of buffers, screening and separation can be achieved to ensure that any harm to these assets is less than substantial. Whilst less than substantial harm to a designated asset must be given great weight in the consideration of a proposal, the strategic importance and public benefits of delivering development on this

allocated site attract very significant weight. It is considered that the proposed development of up to 2,750 homes, a business park and associated uses on this site outweighs the limited, less than substantial harm to the setting of heritage assets that would arise, and can be satisfactorily controlled and minimised through Reserved Matters applications.

Scheduled Monuments

- 6.81 There are three Scheduled Monuments either within, of adjacent to, the application site boundary. These are:
- The Castle Moated Site (just outside the northeast site boundary)
 - The Motte and Bailey Castle (just outside the southern site boundary, adjacent to the Rusper Road/A264 roundabout)
 - Moated Site to the West of Graylands Copse (within the western extremity of the application site)
- 6.82 The Castle Moated Site to the east is located outside the application site itself. The Parameter Plan: Land Use confirms that there is to be a significant landscape buffer on the inside of the development boundary, together with other green infrastructure immediately to the west of the monument. In addition, an open play area is located beyond this which allows for a significant piece of open space to ensure that there would be no harmful impact on the setting of this Scheduled Monument.
- 6.83 The Motte and Bailey Castle is located outside the application site, just south of the Rusper Road/A264 roundabout. This roundabout is to be significantly enhanced and enlarged as part of the scope of the application. These works are all located to the north of the existing A264 and existing roundabout, thus will be located further from the Scheduled Monument. There is to be a footbridge over the roundabout for pedestrian and cycle use, and this has been designed and located as to ensure no harmful impact on the monument also. As such, there would be no harmful impact on the setting of this Scheduled Monument.
- 6.84 The Moated Site to the West of Graylands Copse is the only Scheduled Monument that is located within the application site. This is situated to the western site boundary, alongside the existing Langhurstwood Road. The Parameter Plan: Land Use confirms that a large portion of land surrounding this will be dedicated to green infrastructure, with the proposed cemetery located to the north. As there will be no built form surrounding this, it is considered that there would be no undue impact arising from the development.

Historic Parks

- 6.85 There are two historic parks within the application site, these are:
- Graylands
 - Holbrook Park
- 6.86 The impact on these parks will radically alter their appearance, as part of these will be given over to developable area. This is as per the concept Masterplan which forms part of the site allocation as designated in the HDPF, and the Parameter Plan: Land Use is in conformity with that. As such this alteration to the character was set in principle at that stage.
- 6.87 It is acknowledged that in making the site allocation, consideration was given to this impact, and this position remains unchanged now. The parkscape of both of the above areas does not survive as any readable historic feature or interest and as such the development of these is considered to be acceptable.

Archaeology

- 6.88 The application site contains 4 areas of archaeological importance. These are:
- A rectangular area within existing fields to the west of The Castle
 - The wider area around the west of Graylands Copse

- The area around The Moated House
 - An alleged moat at Bush Lane
- 6.89 The application has been supported by a desk based archaeological assessment. This indicated that there is potential for buried archaeological deposits to be present within the site. This may include:
- Early prehistoric date artefacts, Mesolithic and Palaeolithic in relation to former river terrace gravel deposits
 - Later prehistoric and Romano-British deposits across the site
 - Medieval and post-medieval deposits in proximity to known areas of historic settlement
- 6.90 As such, and in order to meet the requirements of the NPPF and the HDPF, conditions form part of this recommendation to require a programme of test pitting and trial trenching to provide further information on unidentified archaeological deposits, to be undertaken prior to each sub-phase commencing.
- 6.91 The proposal will have an impact on some of the designated heritage assets that lie within the site. This is inevitable for a development of this scale. Much of this impact was assessed and considered in detail during the course of the Examination in Public associated with the site allocation as part of the HDPF.
- 6.92 This application is in outline form only, and thus the main impact arises from how the site could be laid out, particularly in relation to the larger designated assets. In these cases the layout has confirmed that there would be no undue harm, commensurate to the scale of the public improvements arising from the development.
- 6.93 The more detailed impact, for example in relation to existing listed buildings, will be considered at Reserved Matters stages within each sub-phase submission, where the full detail of the relationship will be known, and thus can be fully considered.
- 6.94 As such the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of its relationship with the designated historic assets and is in full accordance with the NPPF and the HDPF.

Leisure, Open Space and Community Facilities

- 6.95 In addition to the principle established in Policy SD1, Policy SD5 of the HDPF seeks to provide high quality formal and informal open space that is comprehensively designed and varied in scale and form to complement the development as a whole. Furthermore, Policies SD6 and 31 of the HDPF set out to maintain or enhance green Infrastructure.
- 6.96 The proposed development would include the following in terms of open space, green infrastructure and leisure facilities:
- Formal sports pitches;
 - Sports changing facilities;
 - Multi-use games areas (MUGAs);
 - Skate park;
 - Youth activity facility;
 - 3 No. Neighbourhood equipped areas of play (NEAPs);
 - Landscaped local area of play (LLAP);
 - Open access ball courts;
 - Teen adventure play;
 - Green corridors with trim trails;
 - Informal pitches;

- Parks;
 - Natural green space;
 - Allotments;
 - Cemetery.
- 6.97 The overall level, provision and variety of sports, open space and leisure facilities accords with the requirements established through the HDPF Masterplan and are supported by the Council's Community and Culture department.
- 6.98 The Council's Sport, Open Space and Recreation Assessment (February 2014) indicates that a total provision of 22.52 hectares should be provided, based upon 2750 dwellings and an anticipated population of 6600 people. The application proposes a total of 45.28 hectares of space, with the requirement for each category being met or over-provided for. Sport England have confirmed that the detailed design of the development should meet the requirements of the national governing bodies for tennis, cricket, hockey and football in order to most appropriately meet the needs of local amenity groups and an expanding population. Sport England do not raise an objection to the proposal and appropriate specifications and timings for delivery of the sports facilities will be secured through the legal agreement.
- 6.99 Policy SD3 relates to the local centre to be provided within the site. This policy seeks to control the form and scale of the local centre, which would be situated around the Ruser Road junctions, to ensure that retail elements do not adversely impact upon footfall to Horsham town centre, and to ensure appropriate facilities to serve the new community. Policy 43 seeks to encourage new and improved community facilities or services, particularly where these meet identified local needs.
- 6.100 The first criteria of Policy SD3 states that retail provision of no more than 6,000 sqm of sales floorspace, together with other appropriate local shopping facilities will be included, subject to it being demonstrated that there would not be a significant adverse impact on Horsham town centre. The NPPF seeks to locate 'town centre uses' to existing centres, edge of centre locations and then out of centre locations, through a sequential approach. However, the NPPF also goes on to state, at paragraph 26, that an impact assessment for larger scale retail uses should be required when an application seeks retail uses outside of a town centre and not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan (Officer emphasis).
- 6.101 The application proposes a total of 6,400 sqm of retail floorspace (Use Class A1). Of this, 4,900 sqm is shown as food retail floorspace (anticipated to be broken into two stores of 3,400 sqm and 1,500 sqm) plus 1,500 sqm of local retail units. This level of larger scale and local level shopping facilities accords with Policy SD3, provided that it is demonstrated that there would not be any significantly adverse impact upon Horsham town centre.
- 6.102 The applicant has submitted a Retail Statement to consider the potential impact of the proposed retail provision. The Retail Statement refers to the Council's Horsham Retail Needs Study (HRNS) of June 2010, which concludes that there is a capacity for up to 11,604 sqm of additional convenience goods floorspace across the District up to 2026, not accounting for population growth arising from strategic growth areas, including the application site. The Retail Statement also contends that there is a food retail deficiency to the north of Horsham, with three small convenience stores (all under 1,000 sqm) and no facilities suitable for a main food shop. In addition the submitted Statement indicates that the proposed retail provision at Land North of Horsham would be likely to lead to an estimated 3.5% impact on Horsham town centre in 2021, reducing to 3.1% by 2026.
- 6.103 Given that the provision of retail (i.e. a town centre use) floorspace is allowed for within Policy SD3 of the HDPF, there is no requirement for the proposal to meet the sequential test for town centre uses located outside of town centres, as set out in the NPPF. However,

Policy SD3 does require a demonstration that the up to 6,000 sqm of retail floorspace, plus local shopping facilities, would not significantly impact upon Horsham town centre. The proposed level of facilities (at 4,900 sqm for food retail and 1,500 sqm for local shops) meets the requirement of Policy SD3 and the detail contained within the Retail Statement shows that there are existing convenience goods deficiencies in the District and that the total provisions proposed would not lead to a significantly detrimental impact on the town centre. It is therefore considered that the proposed retail aspects of the local centre are appropriate and acceptable.

- 6.104 The local centre is also indicated to provide 300 sqm of floorspace for professional and financial services (Use Class A2) and 400 sqm for restaurants (Use Class A3). Horsham and Mid Sussex Clinical Commissioning Group (the CCG) have commented that they either wish to be provided with a site and building for healthcare facilities of up to 2,000 sqm, or an equivalent financial contribution to provide or improve healthcare facilities within the locality. The applicant has set aside the appropriate space for such a facility adjacent to the local centre and the provision of either the building or contributions will be secured through the legal agreement, in consultation with the CCG. The proposal therefore accords with the second criteria of Policy SD3.
- 6.105 A multi-use community centre is also proposed. The details of space to be provided here and its proposed uses would be controlled through the legal agreement, however, it is noted that the Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner seeks to utilise some space at such a facility for neighbourhood level policing. It is also considered that this facility could be utilised by a number of local community and amenity groups. Whilst the specific details for this facility will come forward at the detailed design stage, it is considered that its broad location, overall form and specification can be appropriately controlled through the legal agreement to ensure compliance with the third aspect of Policy SD3 and the requirements of Policy 43 of the HDPF.
- 6.106 Policy SD8 requires an appropriate provision of educational facilities to serve the development to be provided. This includes early years provision, primary schools, a secondary school and expansion land, sixth form education and special educational needs (SEN) facilities. The policy goes on to state that the *'the developer will be expected to make land available for the facilities and meet the capital cost of construction of the primary school, early year's and Special Educational Needs provision.'* The application proposes the provision of early years facilities, a 2FE primary school and 43% of a 6FE secondary school across a campus site towards the centre of the development, with additional expansion land adjoining this. Land and a contribution for a second 1FE primary school, with additional early years provision, within the later western part of the site is also proposed. A financial contribution of around £1.9M is proposed towards Sixth Form education, which would be allocated to The College of Richard Collyer.
- 6.107 Although Policy SD8 requires the provision of a SEN school for up to 60 children to be provided, further discussions with West Sussex County Council, as Local Education Authority, during the consideration of this application, have established that a proportionate contribution towards SEN provision is appropriate. This results from an agreed assessment that the Land North of Horsham development would not, in itself, generate a need for a 60 place SEN school. The contribution will be used towards on-site provision within the larger campus site.
- 6.108 The recent government announcement that the Horsham area has been approved for a new free school, may alter the funding arrangements for secondary education provision across the site. At this stage the full details of this funding is unknown and therefore a range of measures to ensure that the above facilities are appropriately provided for as a result of the development will be secured through the legal agreement. Should funding for a free school be available from government, the developer would be required to make the contribution to the Education Funding Agency rather than the County Council. Similarly, if

funding from the developer is not required to the same extent, due to government funding arrangements, then an equivalent contribution will be required towards other community benefits, including affordable housing provision, across the development. Each of these possible funding arrangements will be accounted for and secured through the legal agreement.

- 6.109 The level of educational provision proposed is considered to be appropriate to meet the needs that are anticipated to arise from the proposed development and would accord with the principles of Policies SD1 and SD8.

Environmental Issues

- 6.110 The NPPF states, at paragraph 109, that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing both new and existing development from contributing to, or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability; and by remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate. This is reiterated in Policy 24 of the HDPF, which confirms that developments will be expected to minimise exposure to, and the emission of, pollutants including, noise, odour, air and light pollution.
- 6.111 The NPPF goes on to state, at paragraphs 121 and 122, that planning decisions should ensure that the site is suitable for its new use, taking account of ground conditions and land stability and any proposals for mitigation. Following any remediation, the site should (as a minimum) not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, should be presented. In determining proposals, Local Planning Authorities *'should focus on whether the development itself is an acceptable use of the land, and the impact of the use, rather than the control of processes or emissions themselves where these are subject to approval under pollution control regimes.'*
- 6.112 The application site largely comprises of open fields, which have historically been used as farmland or pasture. There are defined uses peppered throughout the development for residential or small scale commercial uses.

Contamination

- 6.113 The application has been supported by a preliminary risk assessment to deal with any potential contamination issues arising from the site.
- 6.114 The Council's Environmental Health Officer has advised that the site has not been designated as having any defined contaminated land and raises no objection to the development on these grounds, due to the submission of additional information by the applicant.
- 6.115 The information submitted to support the application is considered to be at an appropriate level and to have been carried out by competent persons and therefore it is considered that the potential for contamination across the site has been duly investigated at this outline stage.
- 6.116 Further investigations and remediation strategies, where they may be necessary, are controlled by satisfactorily worded conditions, requiring further information to be provided prior to the commencement of each relevant sub-phase.
- 6.117 Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would accord with the requirements of the NPPF and Policy 24 of the HDPF.

Noise, air quality and odour

- 6.118 The application has been supported by information on these matters as part of the comprehensive Environmental Statement.
- 6.119 In terms of air quality and odour, it is acknowledged that due to the increase in traffic, the proposed development will have an impact on these matters. This is to be addressed through the provision of on-site mitigation measures, which are to be worked up and agreed at the relevant sub-phase of the development. This will ensure that the impact is addressed on site where possible. It is also noted that it is not possible to mitigate all of the impact and as such, and in accordance with the Council's 'Planning Advice Document: Air Quality & Emissions Reduction Guidance' that a financial contribution is also secured to monitor and, if necessary, mitigate the impact of the scheme outside of the site boundaries.
- 6.120 The layout of the proposed development means that residential parcels of land are not located adjacent to existing roads, and that there are landscape buffers between these. That said, as part of the Reserved Matters submissions additional mitigation measures to protect against noise would be considered at that stage, when the precise relationship between the proposed built form of the development and any noise sources are known.
- 6.121 In terms of noise and vibration, air quality, dust and odour arising from the construction and implementation phases of the development, these impacts are well known and are likely to relate to site levelling, clearance, excavation, construction, road laying, and the associated traffic arising from such activities.
- 6.122 In order to mitigate these impacts, and ensure there is no harm caused to existing, and proposed (when the development is part complete) residents, conditions will require the submission of an overarching Construction Environmental Management Plan for the development as a whole and then details of how each phase and/or sub-phase will be constructed in accordance with this plan. This will ensure the impact is considered at each level, and will be different depending upon the phase and level of development that has already taken place.

Drainage

- 6.123 The majority of the site, and all of the residential parcels, lie within Flood Zone 1, which is land with the lowest probability of flooding. An area categorised as Flood Zone 2 and 3 lies within the eastern part of the site, around Chennells Brook. This area includes the area of Bush Copse ancient woodland and the proposed open land of the sports hub.
- 6.124 No built development is proposed within Flood Zone 3. Residential development is considered to be appropriate development within Flood Zone 1, as established in the Technical Guidance to the NPPF. The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) as part of the Environmental Statement and supplemented this with a further Technical Note, submitted in March 2017. The Technical Note seeks to address initial concerns raised by the Environment Agency regarding allowances for climate change and culvert blockages.
- 6.125 Policy 38 of the HDPF requires that development proposals follow a sequential approach to flood risk management, giving priority to development sites with the lowest risk of flooding and making required development safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Similarly, the NPPF states, at paragraph 103, that local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. The HDPF Examination Inspector notes, in his final report at paragraph 66, that *'the allocated area is large enough to provide for the suggested amount of development without recourse to those areas liable to flood, which could be kept as open space and small nature reserves'*.

- 6.126 The most recently submitted Technical Note from the applicant shows that all built development would be contained within Flood Zone 1, including use of an updated climate change allowance of 45% (previously reviewed at 30%). The Environment Agency has now advised that they raise no objection to the principle of the development and are satisfied with the conclusions of the Technical Note in relation to climate change allowances and allowances for blockage scenarios. The proposed development would not increase run-off rates over existing greenfield rates and would not therefore lead to any increase in flood risk elsewhere.
- 6.127 The applicant's submitted Drainage Strategy indicates that the development will utilise a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) to manage both on and off-site flood risk through design and topography. The SuDS will incorporate a number of attenuation measures, including basins and ponds, to ensure that surface water from the site is both attenuated to be released at an appropriate speed and filtered to assist water quality. In relation to foul sewerage, the applicant proposes the use of pumping stations where necessary to lower peak flows.
- 6.128 The Council's Drainage Engineer raises no overall objections to the proposed development and recommends that an appropriate SuDS, and its on-going maintenance, can be ensured through a specific condition on any approval. Southern Water do not object to the development, but advise that existing infrastructure, including water supply, does not have sufficient capacity to cater for the needs of the development. The developer will be required to ensure sufficient capacity for both supply and sewerage under the Water Industry Act 1991, outside of the planning process.
- 6.129 It is considered that the proposed development can be appropriately controlled, through conditions and the legal agreement, to ensure that the site is adequately drained, that the implemented SuDS are sensitively landscaped and satisfactorily maintained, and that there is no increase in flood risk, on the site or elsewhere. It is therefore considered that the proposed development is in accordance with both the NPPF and Policy 38 of the HDPF.
- 6.130 It is considered that the potential for noise and air pollution can be satisfactorily mitigated by a Construction Environmental Management Plan (by condition) as well as a financial contribution to air quality mitigation arising from the development itself. The impact on individual occupiers will be considered in the details design stages for the reserved matters submission of each sub-phase which will ensure that their amenity is adequately protected. In addition, the applicant has demonstrated that there would be no undue flood risk implications on site, and that sufficient on-site mitigation can be provided without having an impact on flooding outside of the site.
- 6.131 Therefore the proposal accords with the requirements of the NPPF and Policies 24 and 38 of the HDPF.

Legal Obligations

- 6.132 In order to ensure that there are sufficient facilities, services and infrastructure capacity to serve the proposed development and to ensure that all necessary works are delivered there is a requirement to enter into a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). This requirement is implicit in compliance with Policy SD1 of the HDPF.
- 6.133 The legal agreement at the time of this report's production is being discussed and drafted by the applicant's legal advisors and the Council and will, in brief, seek to secure the following:
- Overall on site provision of 30% of housing for local needs, together with minimum and maximum percentage of units within each residential sub phase.

- Periodic review of development viability to identify potential underspends to be devoted to increasing the percentage of affordable housing.
- Contribution towards off-site sixth form education provision.
- Contribution (land and capital cost) towards a 6FE secondary school and land further future expansion.
- Land and capital cost to build a 2FE primary school on combined campus site and a 1FE primary school to the western side of site.
- Land and capital cost to accommodate 65 early years places within the primary schools.
- Provision of land and contribution towards SEN school places.
- Details of management companies, their responsibilities, funding and 'step in' arrangements.
- Library contribution as agreed with WSCC
- Improvements by the applicant to the A264 Moorhead Roundabout (in accordance with latest drawing).
- Improvements by the applicant to A24 Hop Oast Roundabout (in accordance with latest drawing).
- Changes by the applicant to Rusper Road/Lemington Road Roundabout (in accordance with latest drawing).
- Upgrades to Roffey Corner traffic signals if deemed necessary following monitoring effect of development.
- Changes to Crawley Road Roundabout (adjacent Horsham Volkswagen) (in accordance with latest drawing).
- Changes to Pondtail Drive/Pondtail Road (in accordance with latest drawing).
- Surfacing /lighting improvements to the underpass below the A264 and the Riverside Walk to the south of the A264, and to use reasonable endeavours to secure the creation of a continuous route to Bartholomew Way.
- Wimland Road emergency access to be provided to a standard and specification to be agreed by the Local Highway Authority (LHA).
- Contributions by the applicant to allow the LHA to improve the following:
 1. A24/A264 Great Daux Roundabout.
 2. A264 Bewbush Manor Roundabout.
 3. Traffic Regulation Order to enable the reduction of the speed limit along the A264 between Great Daux and Moorhead Roundabouts.
- Monitoring, at the applicants expense, any increase in traffic using the rural lanes to the north of the development, to include Langhurstwood Road, Old Holbrook and Rusper Road. In the event that monitoring indicates any significant increase in traffic movements, the applicant shall provide suitable proportionate measures to resolve development related impacts.
- Monitoring of traffic growth on Tower Road and Faygate Lane, including the operation of Faygate Roundabout. In the event that monitoring indicates it necessary and in agreement with the LHA the applicant shall either implement works shown on the latest drawing or make a contribution towards a highway improvement scheme to the equivalent cost of those works.
- Monitoring of pedestrian crossing demands at Old Holbrook (to commence annually from the first occupation of the 100th dwelling within Phase 3). Subject to the results of the monitoring the LHA will then determine whether pedestrian crossing improvements are needed at Old Holbrook.
- Monitoring of parking demands in and around the vicinity of Littlehaven Station. In the event that monitoring indicates increased demand for parking the applicant shall contribute towards the cost of reasonably proportionate and relevant measures to mitigate any resultant highway safety issue arising from the development.
- The provision by the applicants of a bus service via an appropriate subsidy or by an alternative means to provide a minimum service during hours to be agreed of two services per hour to serve each and every phase of the development following the

occupation of an agreed level of residential development and or employment floorspace.

- The implementation of phase specific public travel plans prior to submission of any application for approval of reserved matters for any part of that phase of development, to include the business park and the schools to be established on site.
- Contribution to monitor and if necessary mitigate the effect of development on air quality,
- Delivery of phases of the business park linked to occupation of residential dwellings.
- The provision, at the applicant's expense, either by contribution or by physical construction of a medical centre being at least 2000 sq metres gross internal area, to an agreed specification.
- The provision, at the applicant's expense, of a community centre/hall to a minimum size and specification.
- The provision of an appropriate number and quantum, in accordance with the approved parameter plans, of informal and formal play spaces (to include NEAPs, a LLAP, MUGAs, open-access ball courts).
- The provision of sports pitches to a specification to be agreed with the Council within the sports hub as shown the approved master plan and parameter plans.
- The provision of a sports changing room and pavilion to an agreed specification at the sports hub. Provision of land for allotments adjacent to Wimlands Road and near Langhurstwood Road as defined on the adopted master plan to an agreed specification.
- Provision of youth activity areas to a specification to be agreed to provide facilities for a skate park and mountain bike trail.
- Provision of and specification and management details of nature conservation areas as depicted on the approved master plan and parameter plans.
- Payment to the Council of a contribution towards providing off site indoor sports facilities.
- Safeguarding of land from alternative development for a railway station and associated parking as depicted on agreed drawing.
- Safeguarding of land for the planned Cemetery from alternative development, unless consistent with and of a temporary nature as depicted on the approved master plan.
- Provision of a contribution towards local policing infrastructure to ensure sufficient policing at a neighbourhood level.

6.134 A list of Heads of Terms is attached to this report at Appendix 1.

Summary and conclusion

- 6.135 It is acknowledged that a significant number of representations have been received in relation to this proposed development. These have been reviewed and considered in detail and where relevant to material planning considerations they have been reflected within the detail of this report.
- 6.136 The allocation of the site for a mixed use development to accommodate at least 2,500 homes, a business park, leisure and community facilities and associated infrastructure and the strategic importance of this site in delivering the identified 5 year supply of housing land to meet the objectively assessed needs for the District, means that the principle of development on this site is acceptable.
- 6.137 It is considered that the overall quantum of development, residential, commercial and community uses, will also fit within the confines of the site, as has been demonstrated through the submitted information and parameter plans.
- 6.138 The mix of dwelling sizes, forms and densities indicated at this outline stage, would be appropriate with regard to the housing needs of the District. Furthermore, whilst the

provision of affordable housing would be lower than the target level set out in Policy 15 of the HDPF, this policy allows for an assessment of the development's viability in order to determine the appropriate level of provision. The viability of the scheme has been independently assessed and it is considered that the 30% level of housing for local needs, is both reasonable and appropriate, particularly given the government's intention to broaden the scope of the affordable housing definition.

- 6.139 Whilst it is acknowledged that the development would alter the character of the application site, including historic parkscapes and, to a degree, the setting of heritage assets, the site is well contained within the wider landscape and makes considerable land available to provide effective screening and buffer areas to the surrounding areas, including to the rural edge to the north of the site.
- 6.140 In addition, although the development, in this outline form, has been assessed as having a 'less than substantial' impact upon the setting of nearby heritage assets, it is considered that the great weight to be applied to this impact is outweighed by the significant benefit of delivering both residential and commercial development, for which there is a clear and evidenced need across the District. Furthermore, the relationship between the built form of the development and the nearby heritage assets will be assessed in full detail at the Reserved Matters stage, when specifics of location, orientation, design, screening and separation can all be controlled. In these respects it is considered that the development would accord with the NPPF and Policy 34 of the HDPF.
- 6.141 The proposed development provides an appropriate level of leisure and recreational facilities and a welcome overprovision of informal open and amenity space throughout the development. In addition, the applicant states that the form of the development shall be of a high quality and this can be ensured through the requirement for character areas and masterplanning through conditions and at the Reserved Matters stage.
- 6.142 Significant on and off-site highway works are to be delivered to ensure appropriate capacity on the local highway network to serve the development, together with the provision of or contributions towards educational infrastructure to meet the needs of the predicted additional population that will arise from the development. These aspects, along with those above, will be secured through conditions or the s106 legal agreement to ensure compliance with the NPPF and Policies SD1, SD5, SD6, SD8 and SD9 of the HDPF.
- 6.143 As the application is outline in form at this stage it is accepted that the development can be satisfactorily controlled through either appropriate conditions or the consideration of detailed design matters at forthcoming Reserved Matters stages, to ensure that there are no adverse impacts upon local ecology, drainage and environmental considerations.
- 6.144 The site is identified within the HDPF as an allocation for a mixed use development comprises at least 2,500 homes. The proposal would therefore be in accordance with the adopted Development Plan and can be considered sustainable development, as required by the NPPF.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 To delegate the application for approval to the Director of Planning, Economic Development and Property, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Committee (North) subject to a Legal Agreement to secure the details as set out in the attached Heads of Terms and appropriate conditions. Both the Legal Agreement and planning conditions may be added to, removed or varied.

Suggested conditions:

1. Approved Plans and Documents Condition

Time Limit

2. Details relating to the layout, scale, appearance, means of access and landscaping associated therewith (hereafter called the Reserved Matters) for each phase of the development (or part thereof) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before that phase of the development (or part thereof) is commenced.
Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail and to comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
3. Applications for the approval of reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of 12 years from the date of this permission.
Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail and to comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
4. The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.
Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail and to comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Strategy and Design

5. No development shall commence until a Phasing Plan covering the entirety of the site and detailing the timing, and sub-phasing, of the works to be carried out in each Phase of development on the site has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Phasing Plan and timing unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: As this matter is fundamental to control the development in detail in the interests of amenity and visual impact and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
6. A) No development shall commence until a Site Wide Design Strategy has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The Site Wide Design Strategy shall demonstrate how the development will comply with the design principles set out in the Design and Access Statement (prepared by Liberty, March 2017), including details of individual character areas, placemaking objectives, indicative layout, mix, materials and finishes.
- B) Each Reserved Matters application shall be accompanied by a design document which demonstrates how the Reserved Matters application is in compliance with the approved Site Wide Design Strategy (hereafter called the Compliance Design Documents).
Reason: As this matter is fundamental to control the development in detail in the interests of amenity and visual impact and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Construction Requirements

7. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Site Wide Design Strategy and Compliance Design Documents.
Reason: As this matter is fundamental to control the development in detail in the interests of amenity and visual impact and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

8. A) No development shall commence until an overarching Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for the entire site has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. This overarching CEMP shall demonstrate general compliance with the list below.

B) Each Reserved Matters application shall be accompanied by a detailed CEMP which shall demonstrate compliance with the approved overarching CEMP document with specific details of all elements listed below.

C) Prior to the commencement of each construction access a detailed CEMP relating to that specific access shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This detailed CEMP shall demonstrate compliance with the approved overarching CEMP document with specific details of all elements listed below:

- (a) the phased programme of demolition and construction works;
- (b) the anticipated number, frequency and types of vehicles used during construction,
- (c) the method of access during construction
- (d) the routing of vehicles during construction
- (e) the provision made for the parking of vehicles by contractors, site operatives and visitors,
- (f) the loading and unloading of plant, materials and waste,
- (g) the storage of plant and materials used in construction of the development,
- (h) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding,
- (i) the location of any site huts/cabins/offices,
- (j) the provision of road sweepers, wheel washing facilities and the type, details of operation and location of other works required to mitigate the impact of construction upon the public highway (including the provision of temporary Traffic Regulation Orders),
- (k) details of public engagement both prior to and during construction works, including a named person to be appointed by the applicant to deal with complaints who shall be available on site and contact details made known to all relevant parties,
- (l) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction, to include where relevant sheeting of loads, covering and dampening down stockpiles and restriction of vehicle speeds on haul roads. A dust management plan should form part of the CEMP which includes routine dust monitoring at the site boundary with actions to be taken when conducting dust generating activities if weather conditions are adverse,
- (m) measures to control the emission of noise during construction,
- (n) details of all proposed external lighting to be used during construction and measures used to limit the disturbance of any lighting required. Lighting shall be used only for security and safety,
- (o) appropriate storage of fuel and chemicals, in bunded tanks or suitably paved areas,
- (p) measures to reduce air pollution during construction including turning off vehicle engines when not in use, plant servicing and transport reduction,
- (q) waste management including prohibiting burning of construction waste,
- (r) measures to prevent the discharge of water or other substances to ground or surface waters without the prior written approval of the Environment Agency,
- (s) measures to be taken in the event of emergency spillages.

The Construction Environmental Management Plan documents shall demonstrate how the construction site management, including the above criteria, will be implemented in accordance with the agreed Phasing Plan unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Thereafter the approved CEMP documents shall be implemented and adhered to throughout the entire construction period.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental in order to consider the potential impacts on the amenity of the surrounding environment and residents during construction and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

9. No development shall commence nor any plant, machinery or equipment brought onto the site within any sub-phase until an Ecological Construction Management Plan (ECMP), comprising a schedule of management measures and accompanying plans for that sub-phase has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The ECMP shall be prepared in accordance with the approved Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (EMMP) prepared by Bioscan (December 2016) and include a plan showing in detail existing hedgerows and trees. Thereafter the approved ECMP shall be implemented and adhered to throughout the entire construction period unless any alternative is agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The ECMP shall provide details of the following:

- (a) full details of wildlife buffers and protective fencing to be erected around all retained hedgerows and planted areas. The buffer areas shall be undisturbed at all times during the construction period and the fencing shall be retained until all equipment, machinery, surplus materials and soil have been removed from the site,
- (b) specifications of protective and construction fencing to ensure suitability for wildlife,
- (c) ecological and environmental safeguards for any works required within the buffer areas or to existing trees, hedges or vegetation, including details of timing of works and any requirements for additional surveying or an ecological watching brief on site during works,
- (d) protection of all retained trees and hedges in accordance with BS5837:2012,
- (e) details of how any lighting required for construction purposes will be designed and installed to minimise disturbance to wildlife,
- (f) management of the development area prior to works commencing to minimise disturbance to wildlife,
- (g) mitigation measures to be carried relating to each sett, roost, hedgerow and reptile habitat,
- (h) measures to mitigate the potential impact on local ecology including those set out in chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement prepared by Liberty Property Trust March 2017.

The Ecological Construction Management Plan shall demonstrate how the site will be managed in accordance with the criteria set out above and shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed Phasing Plan. All fencing and other protection measures shall be maintained as agreed until all equipment, machinery, surplus materials and soil have been removed from the site unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to safeguard the ecology and biodiversity of the area in accordance with Policy SD6 and Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Ecology

10. No development within each Phase, including any plant, machinery or equipment being brought onto site, shall be commenced until details setting out how the conclusions and recommendations set out in the approved Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (EMMP) contained in the Environmental Statement prepared by Bioscan December 2016 have been submitted to and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The EMMP shall provide details of the following:

- (a) full details of wildlife buffers and protective fencing to be erected around all identified retained hedgerows and planted areas. The buffers and fencing shall be retained at all time during development until all equipment, machinery, surplus materials and soil has been removed from the site;
- (b) ecological and environmental safeguards for any works required within the buffer areas or to existing trees, hedges or vegetation, including details of timing of works and any requirements for additional surveying or an ecological watching brief on site during works,
- (c) protection of all retained trees and hedges in accordance with BS5837:2012;
- (d) details of how any lighting required during development will be installed to minimise disturbance to wildlife;
- (e) management of the development area prior to works commencing to minimise disturbance to wildlife;
- (f) mitigation measures to be carried relating to each sett, roost, hedgerow and reptile habitat.

The EMMP shall demonstrate how the site will be managed in accordance with the criteria set out above and shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed Phasing Plan. All fencing and other protection measures shall be maintained as agreed until all equipment, machinery, surplus materials and soil have been removed from the site unless otherwise agreed in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to safeguard the ecology and biodiversity of the area in accordance with Policy SD6 and Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

11. A) No development shall be commenced until an overarching Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP shall establish the principals of how different areas of open space will be managed and maintained within the site.

B) Prior to the commencement of each sub-phase a detailed LEMP shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall demonstrate compliance with the approved overarching LEMP and shall include the following:

- a. A description of ecological and landscape components within that Phase;
- b. Details of how each component will be managed and maintained;
- c. Details of maintenance operations including timing and frequency of when those measures will be carried out;
- d. Details of the parties / organisation who will manage and maintain the site, to include a plan delineating the areas that they will be responsible for;
- e. Measures setting out how the LEMP will comply with the EMMP included at condition 12 above.

Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved LEMPs, including timing and phasing arrangements, unless otherwise agreed in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to safeguard the ecology and biodiversity of the area in accordance with Policy SD6 and Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

12. No development within any sub-phase shall be commenced until up to date ecology survey reports have been submitted to and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The surveys shall be completed by a suitably qualified ecologist, recognised by a relevant professional body such as CIEEM and in accordance with current survey guidelines. The survey reports shall include up to date information regarding the potential of the site to support protected and notable species and measures to avoid, mitigate and compensate for any identified impacts.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to safeguard the ecology and biodiversity of the area in accordance with Policy SD6 and Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and in accordance with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended), The Badger Act 1992, NERC Act 2006 and NPPF.

13. Any Reserved Matters application submitted for the western link road shall be accompanied by a detailed ecological mitigation strategy which shall include and consider, but shall not be limited to, dark corridors, cross sections, fencing and landscaping to guide wildlife.

Reason: Any Reserved Matters application submitted for the western link road shall be accompanied by a detailed ecological mitigation strategy which shall include and consider, but not shall be limited to, dark corridors, cross sections, fencing and landscaping to guide wildlife

Landscape

14. No development shall be commenced until a comprehensive Landscape Strategy for the development has been submitted to and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The Landscape Strategy shall set out the overarching landscape design approach to the site and sustainable landscape construction principles to be followed for all landscape proposals including details setting out how the approach and principles shall be implemented on a phase or sub-phase basis. The Landscape Strategy shall include the following:

- a. Landscape design principle for green corridors, open spaces, streets, mews and lanes, squares and car parking areas;
- b. Sustainable design principles and themes for street trees, amenity, naturalistic and native species, structural planting and wildflower seeding;
- c. A site wide soil re-use and conservation strategy in accordance with codes of landscape best practice;
- d. Hard landscape palette for surfacing, fencing, walls, street furniture, lighting columns/ lanterns;
- e. Sustainable sourcing of hard and soft landscape materials;
- f. Approach to be adopted to equipped play areas to include opportunities for provision of natural play features; and
- g. The timing of provision of measures contained within the Landscape Strategy.

Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Landscape Strategy, including timing and phasing arrangements, unless otherwise agreed in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development and in the interests of visual amenity and nature conservation in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

15. Each Reserved Matters application shall be accompanied by a scheme of landscaping which shall be in accordance with the Landscape Strategy approved pursuant to condition 17 and shall include the following:

- a. Location of existing trees, hedges, shrubs and other vegetation;
- b. The layout and character of the proposed planting, together with a schedule of planting species and a planting specification;
- c. The layout and type of all hard landscape features, including paving, walls, fences and street furniture;
- d. Details of any earthworks proposed, including details of levels and contours to be formed and representative cross/long-sections;

- e. Details of any water features (such as SuDS) including details of the size and location of any such feature;
- f. Timing of provision of the landscape features set out in a. to d. above.

Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timings unless otherwise agreed in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development and in the interests of visual amenity and nature conservation, to avoid endangering the safe movement of aircraft and the operation of Gatwick Airport through the attraction of birds and the increase of bird hazard risk at the application site and to accord with Policy 33 and 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

16. A) Prior to the first occupation (or use) of any part of the development hereby permitted, an overarching landscape management plan (including long term design objectives, management responsibilities, a description of landscape components, management prescriptions and maintenance schedules) for communal landscape areas shall be submitted to and approved, in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

B) Prior to the commencement of each phase or sub-phase a document shall be submitted demonstrating how each phase or sub-phase is in compliance with the approved overarching landscape management plan and shall include details of the landscape components of that phase or sub-phase and an accompanying plan delineating areas of responsibility. The landscape areas shall thereafter be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development and in the interests of visual amenity and nature conservation in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

17. Prior to the commencement of each sub-phase details of the general layout and specification for each area of open space associated with that sub-phase, as shown on the phasing plan approved pursuant to condition X, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The areas of open space within each sub-phase shall be implemented in accordance with a timetable approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development and in the interests of visual amenity and nature conservation in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Tree Protection

18. No development shall commence within any phase or sub-phase, including demolition pursuant to the permission granted, ground clearance, or bringing equipment, machinery or materials onto the site, until the following preliminaries have been completed in the sequence set out below:

- A plan shall be submitted to show all trees on the site to be retained as well as those off-site whose root protection areas ingress into the site, such trees shall be fully protected by tree protective fencing affixed to the ground in full accordance with section 6 of BS 5837 'Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations' (2012).
- Once installed, the fencing shall be maintained during the course of the development works for that phase or sub-phase and until all machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site.

- Areas so fenced off shall be treated as zones of prohibited access, and shall not be used for the storage of materials, equipment or machinery in any circumstances. No mixing of cement, concrete, or use of other materials or substances shall take place within any tree protective zone, or close enough to such a zone that seepage or displacement of those materials and substances could cause them to enter a zone.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure the successful and satisfactory retention of important trees and hedgerows on the site in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

19. No development shall commence within any phase or sub-phase, including demolition pursuant to the permission granted, ground clearance, or bringing equipment, machinery or materials onto the site, until a Arboricultural Method Statement relating to that phase or sub-phase detailing measures to protect and retain trees to be retained on that site and adjacent to the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall provide for the long-term retention of the trees. The development shall be implemented strictly in accordance with agreed details.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure the successful and satisfactory retention of important trees and hedgerows on the site in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

20. No trees, hedges or shrubs on the site, other than those the Local Planning Authority has agreed to be felled as part of this permission, shall be wilfully damaged or uprooted, felled/removed, topped or lopped without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority until 5 years after completion of the development hereby permitted. Any trees, hedges or shrubs on the site, whether within the tree protective areas or not, which die or become damaged during the construction process shall be replaced with trees, hedging plants or shrubs of a type, size and in positions agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure the successful and satisfactory retention of important trees and hedgerows on the site in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Drainage

21. A) No development shall be commenced until details of an overarching scheme to demonstrate safe management of critical storm water storage across the site up to the 1 in 100 year storm event, plus 45% climate change allowance, have been submitted to and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the timing of implementation of the scheme.

B) Each reserved matters application shall be accompanied by a document demonstrating how it complies with the approved overarching scheme.

The critical storm water storage schemes shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timing unless otherwise agreed in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure that the development is properly drained and to comply with Policy 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

22. No development within a Phase or sub-phase shall be commenced until a foul water drainage scheme for the phase or sub-phase has been submitted to and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The foul water drainage scheme shall include plans and longitudinal sections of the main sewers with supporting calculations and details of the proposed outfall, including the new wastewater treatment plant where appropriate. The approved foul water drainage scheme shall be implemented for each Phase unless otherwise agreed in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. No development in that Phase shall be occupied until the foul water drainage system has been carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in

writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure that the development is properly drained and to comply with Policy 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

23. No development within any sub-phase shall be commenced until details of a surface water drainage scheme, following the principle of SuDS, for that sub-phase have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter development within that sub-phase shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. No development in that sub-phase shall be occupied until the surface water drainage system has been carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure that the development is properly drained and to comply with Policy 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

24. No infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground is permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approval details.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure that the development is properly drained and to comply with Policy 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

25. A) Prior to the commencement of any part of the development hereby permitted, a SuDS drainage strategy for the site, which shall include the SuDS basins and their catchment areas, shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

B) Prior to the occupation of any part of the site within each SuDS catchment area verification report demonstrating that the SuDS drainage system has been constructed in accordance with the approved design drawings for that particular catchment area shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a SuDS drainage system has been provided to an acceptable standard to the reduce risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, improve habitat and amenity, and ensure future maintenance in accordance Policies 35 and 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

26. No development within a Phase or sub-phase shall be occupied until details demonstrating that adequate wastewater treatment facilities have been provided have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure that the development is properly drained and to comply with Policy 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Contamination

27. Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure that any pollution is dealt with in accordance with Policies 24 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

28. Prior to the commencement of each phase or sub-phase the following components of a scheme to deal with the risks associated with the contamination of the site shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

- (a) A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
 - All previous uses
 - Potential contaminants associated with those uses
 - A conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors
 - Potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site
- (b) A site investigation scheme based on (a) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected including those off site.
- (c) The site investigation results and the details risk assessment (a and b) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
- (d) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in (c) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Any changes to these components require the express consent of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure that any pollution is dealt with in accordance with Policies 24 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

29. A verification report shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any dwelling within a phase or sub-phase of the development. The verification report shall:

1. Demonstrate the completion of the works set out in the approved remediation strategy.
2. Demonstrate the effectiveness of the remediation strategy.
3. Include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.
4. The plan for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action (i.e. a long-term monitoring and maintenance plan) as identified in the verification plan, and for the reporting of this to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure that any pollution is dealt with in accordance with Policies 24 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

30. In the event that unsuspected contamination is found at any time during development, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of (1) below, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of (2) below. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied unless and until approval is granted for the verification report.

- (1) A site investigation shall be carried out by a competent person to fully and effectively characterise the nature and extent of any land and/or groundwater contamination, and its implications. The site investigation shall not be commenced until:
 - A desk-top study has been completed, satisfying the requirements of the Local Planning Authority.
 - The requirements of the Local Planning Authority for site investigations have been fully established, and

- The extent and methodology have been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Two full copies of a report on the completed site investigation shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority without delay upon completion.
- (2) A written method statement for the remediation of land and/or groundwater contamination affecting the site shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement, and all requirements shall be implemented and completed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority by a competent person. No deviation shall be made from this scheme without the express written agreement of the Local Planning Authority. Two full copies of a verification report confirming the objectives, methods, results and conclusions of all remediation works shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

(NB: the above requirements shall be carried out in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR11.)

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure that any pollution is dealt with in accordance with Policies 24 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Highways

31. No development within any Phase shall commence until details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority:
- a. The principle of the highway hierarchy and internal access arrangements;
 - b. The principles of pedestrian, cycle and equestrian movements through the site;
 - c. Construction traffic routes and associated signage; and
 - d. Access arrangements and visibility splays to individual development parcels and vision splays to individual buildings.

Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To encourage and promote sustainable transport and in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

32. No access to the site shall be implemented other than in accordance with the following plans and details and unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority:

- Langhurstwood Road Roundabout (Drawing No. 25216-5506-010D)
- Highway Mitigation scheme East to West Corridor (Drawing No 25216/5506/008B)
- Old Holbrook Crossroads (Drawing No. 25216-5506-007B)
- Western A264/Langhurstwood Road Access (Drawing Nos. 25216-5506-0026 and 25216-5506-100-001F)
- Central A264/Rusper Road Access (Drawing Nos. 25216-5506-0027 and 25216-5506-100-002C)
- A264 Left-in, Left-out Access (Drawing Nos. 25216-5506-0028 and 25216-5506-100-010A)
- Rusper Road Roundabout (Drawing Nos. 25216-5506-0029 and 25216-5506-100-021E)
- Wimland Road Emergency Access (Drawing Nos. 25216-5506-012B)
- A264/Western Site Access, Langhurstwood Road and Pondtail Road Bus Gate (Drawing No. 25216-5506-100-020)
- Rusper Road Traffic Calming (Drawing No. 25216-5506-100-032)
- Langhurstwood Road Roundabout (Drawing No. 25216-5006-033)

Reason: To encourage and promote sustainable transport and in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

33. Notwithstanding the details shown on drawing no. 2153A-103P (Movement and Access: Parameter Plan) and other parameter plans, no development will be undertaken to construct the road dashed blue running north/south through Bush Copse Ancient Woodland, between the two roundabouts along the primary road.
Reason: To preserve the Ancient Woodland in the historic and ecological environment and in accordance with Policies 31 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework: November 2015.
34. No development shall be occupied until the works at Ruser Road Roundabout and Central A264 Ruser Road Signalised Roundabout have been constructed in accordance with the details shown on drawing nos. 25216/5506/100/021E and 2516/5506/100/002C unless otherwise agreed in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To encourage and promote sustainable transport and in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
35. No development within Phase 1 (to be confirmed) shall be occupied until the pedestrian and cyclists bridge has been completed in accordance with the details shown on drawing no. 25216/5506/100/037 unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To encourage and promote sustainable transport and in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
36. No development within Phase 2 (to be confirmed) shall be occupied until the access works at the A264 Eastern Signalised junction and Wimlands Road have been completed in accordance with the details shown on drawing nos. 25216/5506/100/010A and 25216/5506/012B unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To encourage and promote sustainable transport and in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
37. The Wimland Road access shall be used by emergency services, pedestrians and cyclists and for no other purpose (including construction and construction delivery vehicles) unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To encourage and promote sustainable transport and in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
38. No development within Phase 3 (to be confirmed) shall be occupied until the access works at the A264 Western Signalised Roundabout and Langhurstwood Road Roundabout have been completed in accordance with the details shown on drawing nos. 25216/5506/100/001F and 25216/5506/100/033 unless otherwise agreed in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To encourage and promote sustainable transport and in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
39. The vehicular link between Phases 1 and 3 (to be confirmed) shall not be brought into use until the highway improvement works to the Old Holbrook Crossroads have been completed in accordance with the details shown on drawing no. 25216/5506/007B unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To encourage and promote sustainable transport and in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
40. Each reserved matters application shall be accompanied by plans and a document demonstrating the number and location of car, motorcycle and cycle parking spaces to serve that phase or sub-phase. The details shall be in accordance with the parking strategy set out in the Transport Statement (prepared by Peter Brett and dated July 2016). The car, motorcycle and cycle parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of each dwelling to which they serve,

and permanently retained for those purposes at all times thereafter unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To encourage and promote sustainable transport and in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

41. No development within a Phase or sub-phase shall be commenced until details of how Public Rights of Way to be retained within that Phase or sub-phase shall be improved with regard to surfacing, drainage and lighting. The details shall include a timetable for the completion of the improvement works. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To encourage and promote sustainable transport and in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

42. A) No development shall commence until an overarching Green Travel Plan for the entire site demonstrating compliance with the principles set out in West Sussex County Council's Draft Travel Plan Policy (or as subsequently revised) and the Framework Travel Plan accompanying the Transport Assessment submitted in support of this application has been submitted to and approved, in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This overarching Green travel plan shall demonstrate general compliance with the list below.

B) Each Reserved Matters application shall be accompanied by a detailed Green Travel Plan which shall demonstrate compliance with the approved overarching Green Travel Plan document with specific details of all elements listed below.

The Green Travel Plans shall include:

- objectives and targets for promoting sustainable travel;
- appointment and funding of a Travel Plan Coordinator;
- details of an annual monitoring and review process;
- details of annual reporting to the Local Highway Authority;
- means of funding the Travel Plan; and
- an implementation timetable including the responsible body for each action.

Thereafter the Green Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the measures contained in the Green Travel Plan including approved monitoring unless otherwise agreed in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To encourage and promote sustainable transport and in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

43. No development within residential phase 2 (to be confirmed) shall be occupied until completion of the highway improvement works on drawing no. 25216/5506/019C unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the M23 and A23 Trunk Road continue to be an effective part of the national system of routes for through traffic in accordance with Section 10 of the Highways Act 1980 and to satisfy reasonable road safety requirements.

Heritage

44. No development within a Phase or sub-phase shall be commenced until a programme of archaeological work following the principles set out in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement prepared by Liberty Property Trust and dated July 2016 has been secured in accordance with a Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation which has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental as the site is of archaeological significance and it is important that it is recorded by excavation before it is destroyed by development in accordance with Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

45. No development within each phase or sub-phase shall be commenced until the archaeological site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in

accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved pursuant to condition and that provision for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental as the site is of archaeological significance and it is important that it is recorded by excavation before it is destroyed by development in accordance with Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

46. No development above slab level shall be carried out to the phase or sub-phase containing Grayland Copse until a Conservation Management Plan for Grayland Copse Scheduled Monument and interpretive material for the Scheduled Monument, including a timetable for the implementation of measures, has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental as the site is of archaeological significance and it is important that it is recorded by excavation before it is destroyed by development in accordance with Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

47. No development above slab level shall be carried out to the phase or sub-phase adjacent to the 'Castle' moated site Scheduled Monument (situated 500m ESE of Hawkesbourne Farm) until a written Heritage Asset Mitigation Strategy for this phase or sub-phase of development has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The strategy shall include details of the intended mitigation of the impact of the development on the Heritage Asset, including but not limited to:

- a. Details of proposed measures for enhancement (improved access) and interpretation of the Scheduled Monument; and
- b. A timetable for the implementation of measures.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental as the site is of archaeological significance and it is important that it is recorded by excavation before it is destroyed by development in accordance with Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

48. No development above slab level shall be carried out to the phase or sub-phase adjacent the Motte and Bailey Castle Scheduled Monument (situated north of Chennells Brook Farm) until a written Heritage Asset Mitigation Strategy for this phase or sub-phase of development has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The strategy shall include details of the intended mitigation of the impact of the development on the Heritage Asset, including but not limited to:

- a. Details of proposed measures for enhancement (improved access) and interpretation of the Scheduled Monument; and
- b. A timetable for the implementation of measures.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental as the site is of archaeological significance and it is important that it is recorded by excavation before it is destroyed by development in accordance with Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Lighting

49. No development within a phase or sub-phase shall be commenced until details of street lighting, footway or footpath or other lighting serving public areas, including a timetable for implementation and how the lighting strategy has been designed to minimise disturbance to ecology on and around the site, including bats, and the North Weald AONB 'dark skies' has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the locality and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

50. No development of the Sports Hub shall commence until details of the ambient light levels of surrounding vegetation at night to demonstrate existing baseline light levels have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the locality and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

51. The Sports Hub shall not be brought into use until details of a scheme and measures to ensure lighting serving the same does not impact harmfully on the ability of the surrounding vegetation to provide ecological habitat, has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The measures shall include;

- a. include provision for further measurements to be carried out following the implementation and operation of any proposed lighting;
- b. the placement of baffles where necessary and any additional measures necessary to obtain lighting levels satisfactory to the Local Planning Authority.

Thereafter the development shall be operated in accordance with the approved measures unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the locality and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

INFORMATIVES

- A. A formal application to requisition water infrastructure is required in order to service this development. Please contact Southern water, Sparrowgrove House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne , Hampshire SO21 2SW
- B. Follow the risk management framework provided in CLR11, Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, when dealing with land affected by contamination.
- C. Refer to the [Environment Agency Guiding principles for land contamination](#) for the type of information that is required in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site. The Local Authority can advise on risk to other receptors, such as human health.
- D. Refer to the [contaminated land](#) pages on GOV.UK for more information.
- E. Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts Network Rail Asset Protection London South East at AssetProtectionsussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site adjacent to the Horsham – Crawley link railway, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.aspx.
- F. The scope of the bat surveys must be agreed with the Local Planning Authority at least 4 months in advance of the survey season, and may include advanced surveys for example for rare bat species, if considered necessary by a suitably qualified ecologist. The surveys must be completed in accordance with the agreed scope, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Background Papers: DC/16/1677

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1: DC/16/1677 – Land North of Horsham s106 Heads of Terms

Area of Obligation	Obligation	Description/Quantity
Open Space	MUGAs	Multi Use Games Areas – (0.5 ha)
	NEAPs	Neighbourhood Equipped Areas of Plan – 3 across the site at least 1.07 ha including buffers
	LLAP	Landscaped Local Area of Play – minimum 0.09 ha
	Formal sports pitches	3.66 ha including Natural Turf Pitches and 3G football pitch
	Youth Activity Facility	0.45 ha including bike track, skate park and kick about areas
	Open Access Ball Courts	0.15 ha
	Indoor Sports Contribution	£1.1m
	Allotments	1.32ha (to east and west)
	Greenspace Amenity	Minimum 3.12 ha
	Greenspace Natural	Minimum 15.01ha
	Greenspace Parks	Minimum 8.76 ha
	Community Centre	To be a minimum size and be built to an agreed specification
	Sports changing room/pavilion	Land of 0.8ha. Specification in line with FA design standards as set out in Football Foundation Data Sheets for Changing Accommodation
	Nature Conservation Areas	Specification and management details
Cemetery Land		10.0ha Safeguarding for a specified period, with the exception of a suitable temporary use.
Housing for Local Need	Affordable Rent	12.73%
	Shared Ownership	5.27%
	Build to rent	7.27%
	Discount Market Units	3.64%
	Custom or Self Build	1.09%
Total housing for local need		30%
Review mechanism		To ensure clawback of any uplift in value across the site, to be reviewed every 5 years
Business Park		The provision of 46,450 square metres of business floorspace
		The provision of specified areas of the business park, in a fully serviced condition, linked to the occupation of a specified number of dwellings
Safeguarded Land(Railway)		Safeguarding of railway station land and associated parking for a specified period.

Appendix 1: DC/16/1677 – Land North of Horsham s106 Heads of Terms

Medical Centre		Provision of medical centre on site of at least 2000 sqm or a financial contribution to be used off-site (which would be used by occupiers of the development site).
Management company		Full details of their responsibilities, funding and 'step in' arrangements
Library		Library contribution as agreed with WSCC
Education		<p>A £1.9m contribution towards post 16 education facilities off site (The College of Richard Collyer).</p> <p>A proportional contribution towards land and capital cost of a six form entry secondary school (43%), phased in line with development need, or the provision of such a facility with a proportionate contribution from West Sussex County Council.</p> <p>Land and capital cost to build a two form entry primary school on the education campus site, and a one form entry primary school on the western side of the site as, in line with the development need. The provision of additional land for a fourth form of entry, should this be required.</p> <p>Land and capital cost to accommodate 65 early years places within the two primary school buildings.</p> <p>Provision of land for a Special Educational Needs school, at an appropriate phase in the development with a proportionate contribution towards the number of places arising from the development.</p>
Air quality		Contribution to monitor and if necessary mitigate effect of development on air quality.
Sussex Police		<p>Contribution £117,690 towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Start up costs for 5 officers Horsham fleet capacity Three ANPR cameras Increasing radio cover/control room capacity

Appendix 1: DC/16/1677 – Land North of Horsham s106 Heads of Terms

		Increased on-site CCTV capacity.
Retail Provision		Provision of a minimum of 4,900 square metres.
Commercial Leisure Facilities		1,900 square metres of space
Community Maintenance Account		A sum to be held should the management companies either fail or do not meet the required standards
Highways Obligations	Traffic signals	Install traffic signals on existing roundabout – A264 Moorhead Roundabout. Trigger 1,292 dwellings or 21,831sqm of employment
		Alter timing of traffic signals at Roffey Corner. Trigger 1,375 dwellings and 23,225sqm of employment
		Alter timing of traffic signals at Kings Road/Harwood Road Roundabout. Trigger 2,200 dwellings and 37,160sqm of employment
	Junctions	Additional approach and circulation lanes around A24 Hop Oast Roundabout. Trigger 2,200 dwellings and 37,160sqm of employment
		Increase in flare length/arm width at Rusper Road/Lemington Road Roundabout. Trigger 1,375 dwellings and 23,225sqm of employment
		Crawley Road Roundabout. Trigger 2,200 dwellings and 37,160sqm of employment
		Increase width of Pondtail Drive arm to accommodate two way movement of buses. Trigger Prior to occupation of any use within any phase or sub phase forming Phase 3
		WSSC Improvement Scheme at A24/A264 Great Daux Roundabout. Trigger 1,237 dwellings and 20,900sqm of employment
		WSSC Improvement Scheme A264 Bewbush Manor Roundabout. Trigger 1,787 dwellings and 30,192sqm of employment
	Traffic Regulation Order	To enable a Traffic Regulation Order to enable the reduction of the speed limit on the A264 between Great Daux and Moorhead Roundabout. Trigger TBA, although this needs to be linked ideally to the various works proposed on the A264
	Underpass	Surfacing/lighting improvements to the underpass below the A264 and Riverside Walk to the south of the A264. Trigger Needs to be linked to a relevant sub phase of phase 2
	Monitoring	Scheme to monitor the increase in traffic using the lanes to the north of

Appendix 1: DC/16/1677 – Land North of Horsham s106 Heads of Terms

		the development – rural lanes north of the site. In the event that monitoring indicates an increase, the applicant shall propose suitably proportionate measures to resolve any development related problems.
		To monitor traffic growth on these two arms, and the impact upon the operation of the Faygate Roundabout – Tower Road and Faygate Lane arms of A264 Faygate Roundabout. If the monitoring determines it necessary then in agreement with the LHA, the applicant shall either implement the works as shown on drawing number 25216/5506/015B or make a contribution towards a highways improvement scheme to the equivalent cost of those works shown on the above drawing. Trigger 1,760 dwellings and 29,728sqm of employment
		To monitor pedestrian crossing demands at Old Holbrook (to commence in conjunction with Phase 3). Monitoring is to commence annually from the first occupation of the 100th dwelling within Phase 3. Based on the monitoring, it shall then be determined whether pedestrian crossing improvements are needed at Old Holbrook. Trigger Monitoring is to commence annually from the first occupation of the 100th dwelling within Phase 3
		The applicant shall monitor parking demands in and around Littlehaven railway station. If monitoring indicates increased demands, the applicant shall contribute towards the cost of reasonably, proportionate, and relevant measures necessary to mitigate any resultant highway safety issue.
	Travel Plan	Trigger Varies as related to delivery of specific uses within the development
Bus Subsidy		Provision of a bus service via an appropriate subsidy or by an alternative means to provide a minimum service during hours to be agreed of two services per hour to serve each phase of the development.

Highways infrastructure	North of A264 on Rusper Road	North of A264 Rusper Road Roundabout - Construction of new roundabout. This includes the provision of a signalised crossing over
-------------------------	------------------------------	--

Appendix 1: DC/16/1677 – Land North of Horsham s106 Heads of Terms

secured by condition		Rusper Road. Trigger Prior to occupation of any use within any phase or sub phase forming Phase 1
	Rusper Road/A264	A264 Rusper Road Roundabout - Construction of new signalised roundabout. Trigger Prior to occupation of any use within any phase or sub phase forming Phase 1
	Rusper Road/A264 pedestrian and cycle bridge	To the east of Rusper Road Roundabout. Delivery of new pedestrian and cyclist bridge. Trigger Prior to occupation of any use within any phase or sub phase forming Phase 1
	Wimlands Road emergency Access	Wimlands Road - New emergency, pedestrian, and cyclist access. Trigger Prior to occupation of any use within any phase or sub phase forming Phase 2
	Langhurstwood Road/A264	A264 Langhurstwood Road Junction - Construction of new signalised roundabout and bus gate onto Pondtail Drive. Trigger Prior to occupation of any use within any phase or sub phase forming Phase 3
	Langhurstwood/Mercer Road	Langhurstwood Road and Mercer Road - Construction of new signalised roundabout and bus gate onto Pondtail Drive. Trigger Prior to occupation of any use within any phase or sub phase forming Phase 3
	Left in/Left Out on A264	Mid way between A264 Rusper Road and Moorhead Roundabouts - New signalised left in, left out access on northbound A264. Trigger Prior to occupation of any use within any phase or sub phase forming Phase 2 or any phase of the Business Park
	Old Holbrook Crossroads	Old Holbrook Crossroads - New access where development link road crosses Old Holbrook. Trigger Prior to the link road between Phase 1 and 3 coming into first use.
	M23 Junction 11	Mitigation to Junction 11 to ensure M23 and A23 continue to be an effective part of the network by increasing the flare of the approach filter lane

This page is intentionally left blank

This page is intentionally left blank



ADDENDUM

RECOMMENDATION

AMENDED RECOMMENDATION:

'To delegate the application for approval to the Director of Planning, Economic Development and Property, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Committee (North), the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Committee (South) and the Cabinet Member for Planning & Development, subject to a Legal Agreement to secure the details as set out in the attached Heads of Terms and appropriate conditions. Both the Legal Agreement and planning conditions may be added to, removed or varied.'

OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

- 3.9.1 HDC - Economic Development
- Strong support for the proposal.
 - The proposed business park is a key element of the emerging Economic Strategy offering an excellent opportunity to increase skilled, higher paid jobs in the District.
 - Timing of delivery must be secured to ensure the business park comes forward.
 - The branding and identity of the business park should be secured through the Reserved Matters application.
 - Proposal presents opportunities to assist home based and micro businesses.
 - Links to the Town Centre must be secured including a new entry sign and information points.
 - The S106 should seek to secure:
 - Opportunities for apprenticeships and work experience placements relating to construction;
 - Procurement opportunities advertised with local traders and suppliers; and
 - Job opportunities advertised locally.
 - No additional comments to make. The issue of the phasing of the business park is still to be addressed.
- 3.9.2 HDC - Air Quality
- The development would be classified as a 'Major' proposal through the Horsham District Council Planning Advice Document: Air Quality & Emissions Reduction Guidance and a quantitative air quality assessment is therefore needed (this should focus on the Horsham Gates area of North Street).
 - Concern that the traffic flow data appears inaccurate in terms of where traffic arising from the development is likely to be directed.
 - There is some uncertainty over the calculation of the required contribution arising from the traffic flow data.

- Both an operation and construction phase mitigation plan are required.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

Letters of representation received from the following organisations are summarised here separately for clarity.

- 3.31.1 CPRE (Campaign to Protect Rural England) – Sussex Branch
- Objection to the planning application. Main concerns include:
1. Inadequate provision of affordable housing, and not policy compliant.
 2. Inadequate consideration for biodiversity and ecology. Lack of appropriate surveys and mitigation proposals.
- Supplementary representation to the previous objection. Concerns are:
 1. Results obtained by the applicant's Integrated Magnetometry and Fieldwalking Survey are not sufficient to identify areas of particular archaeological interest or sensitivity.
 2. LIDAR data should be used to find and identify archaeological features North of Horsham.
 3. Determination as to whether there are archaeological features in the area of Ancient Woodland that could be destroyed or damaged by road construction.
 4. Potential for presence of Romano-British settlements and activity on this site should not be underestimated.
 - Further objection. 30% offer for affordable housing (AH) is not policy compliant (policy 16 requires 35%). This would result in a shortfall of 137 affordable homes. The applicant proposes that 5% of the AH will be conditional on the performance of the business park; therefore there may be less than 30%. The Objectively Assessed Needs for the District will not be met if this development provides less than 35% AH. This site was included in the HDPF on the understanding it would provide 35% AH.
- 3.31.2 Horsham Town Community Partnership
- HTCP neither object nor support the planning application. Main reasons for comment include:
- HTCP welcome the inclusion of the Riverside Walk project team in discussions relating to this planning application.
 - Rather than the installation of a new footbridge over the A264 the HTCP would rather see improvements to the existing PRoW pathway running alongside the A264 and railway line.
 - If a footbridge is installed, a better location would be on the A264 section near Wimland Road.
- 3.31.3 The Horsham Society
- Objection to the planning application. Main concerns and reasons for objection include:
- The principle of the development.
 - Lack of clarity on what the development will offer.
 - Lack of consideration for retention of ancient woodland/hedgerows. The proposed road through Bush Copse should be rerouted to avoid destruction of the woodland.
 - Inadequate consideration and assessment of wildlife habitats.

Mitigation only covers selected species.

- The Environmental Assessment is far from acceptable and is challengeable.
- Wildlife corridors need to be created and enhanced, with a funded management plan.
- The A264 is a dividing line; more thought is needed on how the site will integrate with the existing town.
- A speed restriction of 40mph will impact on traffic flow.
- Proposed footbridge is unsightly, and will not aid pedestrians and cyclists. Underpasses should be included instead.
- Route for waste recycling vehicles through the new development will be dangerous and will pose a health risk.
- The parkway station is not guaranteed, and an existing station is likely to be closed as a result.
- Impact on traffic on A24 is unknown.
- The design and layout of the proposed commercial/business space is unknown, so comment cannot be passed on its quality. Take up of these units will be slow, and dependant on railway station/Gatwick expansion.
- Inclusion of a major supermarket will encourage out-of-town shopping – harming the existing town centre, and increasing traffic on A264.
- Little information about leisure facilities.
- It is not clear that the Education offer is compliant with HDPF policies.
- Healthcare provision is not clear.
- Insufficient affordable housing offer (not policy compliant). 35% must be achieved. The AH contribution should be secured in the s106 to ensure it is enforceable.
- CIL – no CIL contribution is offered. How will the council fund required 'off site' infrastructure?
- Plot references on the Phasing Plans and the Framework Plan-Development are different which is confusing. Clarification is required.
- A statutory Design Panel should be appointed to monitor design of the development.
- The density plans are confusing. High density development near the A264 will reveal the undesirable intensity of the development.
- The proposed road at Morris Farm should be re-routed.
- No account taken of the West Sussex Strategy for Walking and Cycling.
- Few routes for cycling are indicated on the Movement and Access Plan.

Further Objection received. Main concerns include:

- No justification for loss of Ancient Woodland
- Inadequate number of proposed road crossings to link the development to the existing town. An underpass should be included.
- No footbridge design. HS would like to be involved with the design of this feature.
- The method of allocation and design of each building parcel is unclear.
- A Design Panel should be set up for the development.

- No further information is available on Landscape Management Companies.
- Affordable Housing offer remains too low.
- HDC should re-assess the decision not to require a CIL contribution.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

3.38.1 A total of 91 letters of representation objecting to the development have been received along with 25 letters of representation which neither object nor support the proposal. The comments raised within these letters are summarised within the main report.

PLANNING ASSESSMENTS

Transport Issues

6.22 CORRECTION - Replace first bullet point with:

- 'A new roundabout where the re-aligned Langhurstwood Road meets the A264. This will be a signalised, multi modal junction, including a prioritised bus link into the development from the south and at grade pedestrian and cycle links into the development.'

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.2 Since the publication of the main report a few alterations and additions are proposed to some of the suggested conditions. In relation to time limits, it is proposed to break these down such that the submission of details for Reserved Matters applications and the commencement of the main phases are controlled (see Conditions 3 and 4 below).
- 7.3 Given that the application site spans a number of different land ownerships, further conditions and obligations are proposed to ensure that all of the land is appropriately bound into the Legal Agreement at the appropriate time. This will ensure that the provisions of the Agreement are secured and that infrastructure costs are appropriately shared across the development to safeguard a timely delivery of approved details and phases.

Suggested conditions:

Time Limit

3. Applications for the approval of all of the Reserved Matters for all phases of the development shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of 12 years from the date of this permission and shall be made in respect of the following phases before the expiration of the following timescales:
 - Phase 1: within 2 years from the date of this permission
 - Phase 2: within 5 years from the date of this permission
 - Phase 3: within 10 years from the date of this permission
 Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail and to comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
4. The development hereby permitted shall be begun in accordance with the following:
 - Phase 1 of the development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the Reserved Matters to be approved in respect of Phase 1 of the development, whichever is the later.

- Phase 2 of the development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of 7 years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the Reserved Matters to be approved in respect of Phase 2 of the development, whichever is the later.
- Phase 3 of the development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of 12 years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the Reserved Matters to be approved in respect of Phase 3 of the development, whichever is the later.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail and to comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Land Ownership & S106

Further conditions and obligations to be included covering:

52. No development shall commence within a relevant sub-phase under the Planning Permission unless and until all parties with a legal or equitable interest in the land forming part of the relevant sub-phase, as identified on the approved Phasing Plan (“a Third Party”), have been satisfactorily joined as parties to the S106 Agreement.

Reason: To satisfactorily secure the necessary infrastructure and other S106 Agreement requirements for the development in accordance with the NPPF and Policies SD5, SD6, SD7, SD8, SD9 and 39 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

53. The development within each sub-phase under the Planning Permission shall be fully carried out and completed prior to development commencing on a further sub-phase unless:

- an amended Phasing Plan has been approved accordingly; and
- unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Council, satisfactory public road access and all mains services have been provided to the edge of the boundary of any part of the relevant sub-phase where any Third Party land has not yet been joined into the S106 Agreement, subject to an agreement (which the Developer shall use reasonable endeavours to achieve) with the relevant Third Party in respect of appropriate cost sharing in relation to overall S106/equivalent infrastructure costs and any other appropriate costs sharing in relation to the overall Development.

Reason: To satisfactorily secure the necessary infrastructure and other S106 requirements for the development in accordance with the NPPF and Policies SD5, SD6, SD7, SD8, SD9 and 39 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

54. In respect of land comprising the following title numbers: WSX200825, WSX65325, WSX63427, WSX205794, WSX87009 and WSX201293 (“Third Party Developer Land”), no works shall be carried out on the Third Party Developer Land under the Planning Permission unless and until all parties with a legal or equitable interest in the Third Party Developer Land have satisfactorily entered into a cost sharing agreement with those owners (or their successors in title) of land which is bound by the terms of the s106 Agreement and satisfactory evidence of such agreement has been provided to the Local Planning Authority. Such cost sharing agreement shall address overall S106/equivalent infrastructure costs sharing and any other appropriate costs sharing in relation to the overall Development.

Reason: To satisfactorily secure the necessary infrastructure and other S106 requirements for the development in accordance with the NPPF and Policies SD5, SD6, SD7, SD8, SD9 and 39 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

This page is intentionally left blank