



**Horsham
District
Council**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT REPORT

TO: Development Management Committee (South)

BY: Development Manager

DATE: 18 October 2016

DEVELOPMENT: Erection of 1 x dwelling with vehicle access and demolition of existing detached garage and construction of new detached garage to serve Little Thatch

SITE: Little Thatch Veras Walk Storrington Pulborough

WARD: Chantry

APPLICATION: DC/16/1252

APPLICANT: Mr Watts-Williams

REASON FOR INCLUSION ON THE AGENDA: More than 5 letters of representation have been received contrary to the Officer recommendation and it has been requested to be heard at Committee by Cllr O'Connell

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

To consider the planning application.

1.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

1.2 The proposal concerns the erection of a new detached dwelling on land which currently comprises the garden of 'Little Thatch'. In addition, the proposal includes the provision of a new detached garage for the host property Little Thatch, and the creation of a new vehicular access onto Veras Walk to be shared by the new dwelling and Little Thatch, and the subsequent separation from the currently shared access with Pinehurst.

1.3 A new set of gates would be set some 28m back from the edge of the Veras Walk to the proposed new development. The new driveway is shown as being permeable, and includes a turning space with landscaping, and parking for two vehicles.

1.4 As the proposed new driveway to the new dwelling would be sited alongside the western boundary, the host property's existing timber garage would be demolished and a new double garage built to the front of Little Thatch. The new garage would be a timber-framed structure with hipped roof, some 5.4m x 6m in size and around 4.5m in height.

1.5 The new dwelling would be single-storey in nature and would comprise three bedrooms and an open-plan living area set in an L-shaped with habitable openings facing south and east, over its own garden area.

ITEM A03 - 2

Externally, the new dwelling would be clad in vertical Western Red Cedar with a minimal porch roof design to the western entrance elevation. Bin and cycle stores would be located alongside the northern elevation of the property.

- 1.6 The proposed new dwelling would be set some 3.68m off the northern boundary with Pinehurst, a distance of separation from the southern flank wall of Pinehurst of some 8.4m, and a distance to the southern boundary wall with Little Thatch of around 2.5m. Owing to the irregular plot shape and footprint of the proposed new dwelling, the rear building line would be about 1.8m off the nearest point of the eastern boundary whilst the garden depth would have an average depth of some 21m. Boundary planting to the southern and eastern plot boundaries would be maintained.
- 1.7 Amended drawings have been requested and received, pulling the proposed parking area back from the front of the new dwelling and including a planting strip alongside the shared new driveway.
- 1.8 DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE
- 1.9 The host plot is set on the eastern side of Veras Walk, a single-width dead-end lane that runs north off Sanctuary Lane. According to the Heath Common Design Village Statement, the area of Veras Walk has its origins in the early part of the 20th Century, when it was occupied by a group of 'free-spirited' individuals living in a collection of temporary structures including buses, shacks and caravans. These were gradually replaced by more robust, yet small, single-storey houses in the 1930's, in a haphazard layout with large wooded gardens.
- 1.10 The host site currently comprises a post-war thatched bungalow called 'Little Thatch' with white painted brick walls to the rear part of the house and black-stained weatherboarding to the front walls. The host property also includes a part thatched roof and part clay tiled roof to the rear part. A detached black-stained timber garage is located alongside the western site boundary adjoining Pinehurst.
- 1.11 The site's current driveway is shared with the adjacent dwelling Pinehurst. This shared driveway runs alongside another shared driveway to a further 5 properties. A landscaping strip containing a number of shrubs and trees separates the two driveways, whilst a post and rail fence defines the application boundary alongside the shared driveway.
- 1.12 Whilst the dense nature of boundary planting to the host site / east side of Veras Walk is noted, there are many other front boundaries in the immediate vicinity which are open, unplanted, have variously walled frontages or large expanses of paving. Examples of more open frontages are noted where the combined driveways serving Longbury Cottage and Tree Tops amount to some 15m, or the front boundary to Chilworth which is fenced with a post and rail style boundary, but otherwise largely open along its entire 15m length.
- 1.13 Wider development within Veras Walk varies significantly, with low-level bungalows built traditionally for their time of brick or render and tile, whilst more modern extensions and re-development have introduced timber cladding, deep soffits, flat roofs and large expanses of glass, with a multitude of styles and design features found in the vicinity. There is no overriding architectural form within the area, and dwellings vary from bungalows to chalet bungalows and two-storey dwellings. Building lines within the area also vary. Whilst there is a little more regularity in plot shapes and building lines along the southern side of Veras Walk, the northern side appears to have been subject to more sporadic subdivisions over the years, with several 'spur' driveways leading to multiple dwellings and irregular shaped plots. Dwelling footprints range from 76sq.m (Heatherdale) to 235sqm (Pinehurst), with plots ranging from around 278sq.m (Hamfield Cottage) and 796sq.m (Lobbs Cottage), to the larger sites of around 2143sq.m (Silver Glen), 2640sq.m (Heathside) and 1605sq.m

ITEM A03 - 3

(Pinehurst). In addition, not all properties on the northern side of Veras Walk have direct frontages onto the road.

- 1.14 The development of Veras Walk has evolved over the years since its inception in the early part of the early 20th Century, hence the varied architectural character and features found in the area. Whilst many properties have been extended from their original modest proportions, there are a number of 'recent' dwellings / plot sub-divisions noted, including Little Warren (2008), Uphill Cottage (2000), Chilworth (1999), Pinehurst (1996), Oakwoods and Heatherdale (1989). Both Chilworth and Pinehurst are plot subdivisions from the original host site of Little Thatch.

2. INTRODUCTION

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2.2 RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICY

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

NPPF1 - Building a strong, competitive economy

NPPF4 - Promoting sustainable transport

NPPF6 - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

NPPF7 - Requiring good design

NPPF11 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

NPPF12 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

2.3 RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICY

Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF 2015)

HDPF1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development

HDPF2 - Strategic Policy: Strategic Development

HDPF3 - Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy

HDPF4 - Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion

HDPF15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision

HDPF24 – Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection

HDPF25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character

HDPF31 – Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

HDPF32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development

HDPF33 - Development Principles

HDPF37 – Sustainable Construction

HDPF40 - Sustainable Transport

HDPF41 - Parking

2.4 RELEVANT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

The Storrington, Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Development Plan has been through the examination process but it has not been progressed to Referendum. The application site has not been identified as a possible site allocation.

2.5 OTHER DOCUMENTS

Storrington & Sullington Parish Design Statement 2010

Heath Common Village Design Statement 1999

ITEM A03 - 4

2.6 PLANNING HISTORY

WS/24/96	Erection of 1 bungalow and double garage Site: Little Thatch (Land Adj) Veras Walk Storrington	PER
WS/8/96	Erection of detached bungalow and garage Site: Littlethatch Veras Walk Storrington	PER
WS/37/99	Erection of detached bungalow and double garage Site: Little Thatch Veras Walk Storrington	PER

3. OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

The following section provides a summary of the responses received as a result of internal and external consultation, however, officers have considered the full comments of each consultee which are available to view on the public file at www.horsham.gov.uk

3.1 OUTSIDE AGENCIES

3.2 **Southern Water** - No Objection. Conditions and Informatives are advised

3.3 **West Sussex Highways** - No Objection. The proposal is for a single dwelling unit with access onto Veras Walk, which is unmaintained as public Highway, though it is maintained to a lower degree by West Sussex County Council as a Footpath Public Right of Way. The estate as a whole is served by several point of access onto the publicly maintained network. The most recently available verified accident records reveal there have been no personal injury accidents in the vicinity of the existing point of access, indicating a low risk of highway safety issues with this proposal. The Local Public Rights of Way Authority should be consulted on this proposal, should they have not already been.

As there are a large number of dwellings within this estate the Local Highway Authority does not regard the impact of an additional dwelling as severe, and subject to appropriate supply of secure cycle storage, the proposal accord with paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

There are no anticipated Highway safety concerns with this proposal

3.4 INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

3.5 **Arboricultural Officer** - No Objection.

A number of trees require to be felled to facilitate the development. These and other trees targeted for retention are classified and considered within the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been assessed to be accurate and compliant with BS 5837 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations' (2012). None of the trees to be removed is subject to TPO or any other constraint, or worthy of such. Their removal will have minimal long-term adverse effect upon the character and amenities of the area.

One tree (T18 - oak) requires minor surgery to trim branches away from the footprint of the proposed dwelling. The works required are minor, reasonable, and, in the longer term, beneficial to the tree. They are unobjectionable.

There is a reasonable degree of open amenity space around the dwelling unaffected by surrounding trees. The dwelling is not considered to result in inappropriate post-development pressures on the surrounding retained tree stock.

ITEM A03 - 5

3.6 PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

3.7 **Storrington Parish Council Consultation** - Objection:

- Development constitutes high density / overdevelopment of what is a small plot with limited space between it and the four surrounding properties and would create proximity / access issues - Significant number of trees would be removed
- Proposed driveway would extend the existing opening onto the narrow Veras Walk from the properties of Longbury Hill House and others, including Plnehurst next door, to a total splay of approx 18m, involving the destruction of trees and hedging, thereby severely impacting on the neighbouring amenities, street view and rural character of the area
- Site has been previously divided and sub-divided and does not lend itself to further infilling
- Heath Common heritage should be protected and proposed development would be detrimental to the preservation of the conservation area

3.8 **Public Consultations** - Letters have been received from 209 neighbouring and nearby properties. The letters express objections to the proposed development on the following grounds:

- Creation of an unsafe access – blind corner
- Danger to public footpath / right of way, used often by ramblers
- Detrimental impact to private roads / lanes
- Dangerous junction with Veras Walk as two spurs turn into one
- Creation of a single access point onto Veras Walk – some 18m wide
- Inconvenience to residents of Veras Walks and Sanctuary Lane
- Traffic in area increased during day owing to delivery vans / internet shopping

- Third house on plot formerly part of Little Thatch – cramming / overdevelopment
- Small resulting garden – become the smallest plot
- Set a precedent
- No new recent development, only extensions / re-development of existing plots / properties
- Little Thatch one of few remaining picturesque and original properties in Heath Common – important to special character of area
- Out of character – no pitched roof, disregard for traditional housing styles of Heath Common
- Contrary to Heath Common Village Design Statement / Policy DC15 (Heath Common) – what is status of HCVDS, and will it ever be referred to in planning decisions?
- Contrary to Para 126 of the NPPF
- Invasive construction

- Recent permitted development in area have already had significant impact on hedgerows, wildlife, banks and screening
- Loss of foliage and trees
- Change of character – existing lane is leafy, narrow and has charm and character

- Not sure what hatched area means alongside Veras Walk – shown on drawings
- Doubt over small scale of dwelling as shown – surely would be larger when on site
- Potential conflict of interest as applicant is a Mid-Sussex Councillor
- Disruption for vehicles leaving the property at night by way of headlights / light intrusion

ITEM A03 - 6

- Increased noise and pollution
- Loss of privacy – parking alongside kitchen
- Lanes already subject to flooding in wet weather – proposed driveway would result in a ‘river’ running towards properties opposite
- No definition of what ‘permeable’ surface would be
- Environmental Impact study is essential
- Adjacent to AONB and National Trust Forest
- Similarities with recent appeal dismissal in Bracken Lane (Patuca DC/15/1679)

Heath Common Residents Association - Objection

- Proposal does not take into account the Village Design Statement for Heath Common
- Little Thatch site previously been subdivided – thus leading to gross overdevelopment
- Proposed design, adjacent to a charming thatched cottage, would be an ‘industrial shed’
- Destruction of trees and foliage – cutting a swathe through site for new driveway
- Resulting two properties with virtually no garden
- Convergence of traffic at this point – blind spot and lane used by dog walkers and ramblers
- Highway Access report (section 2.4) totally unrealistic
- Bracken Lane (DC/15/1679) has been dismissed at appeal – Inspector referred to protection of character of Heath Common

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 It is considered that the main issues in the determination of the application are:

- Principle of the development
- Impact of the development on the setting of the area
- Impact on neighbour amenity
- Highways

Principle

- 6.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has a golden thread running through it which seeks to ensure a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The NPPF seeks to ensure that the planning system performs an economic, social and environmental role. The Framework requires applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan.

ITEM A03 - 7

Since the adoption of the HDPF in November 2015, the Council is able to demonstrate a full 5-year supply of housing land sufficient to meet the needs of the District to 2031, with a forecast that some 750 residential units will come forward by way of windfall sites (Policy 15).

- 6.3 According to the defined settlement hierarchy as set out in Policy 3 of the HDPF, the site is located within the 'small town' / larger villages' category which includes Storrington and Sullington. Development under Policy 3 is directed towards towns and villages which have defined built up area boundaries, according to the hierarchy of Policy 3.

There is no objection to the principle of additional residential development in this location in accordance with Policy 3 of the HDPF, subject to conforming to other development management considerations which are considered in detail below.

Design & Appearance

- 6.4 The NPPF (para 53) allows for Local Authorities to include policies which resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example, where development is considered to cause harm to the local area. The 2015 HDPF does not include any specific policies regarding infill development or garden / plot sub-divisions, and as such each must be considered against whether the development meets the criteria of the other policies.

- 6.5 Furthermore, paragraph 58 of the NPPF sets out that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit;
- optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks;
- respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation;
- create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and
- are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

- 6.6 Reference is made within several representation letters to the Heath Common Village Design Statement (1999) and policy DC15 (Heath Common and West Chiltington Character Areas). This policy (DC15) stated that planning permission would only be granted for proposals which retained the unique character of the area, which was further noted to be predominantly low density development set in woodlands and commons.

Policy DC15 was one of the policies within the General Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2007), which has since been replaced by the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015, and thus is no longer a material planning consideration. However, HDPF policies 32, 33 still require any proposed development to complement locally distinctive character and therefore this is still a strong consideration.

ITEM A03 - 8

- 6.7 It is noted, however, that a policy has been included within the Storrington, Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Development Plan to addresses localised design criteria:

Policy 16: Design

The scale, density, massing, height, landscape design, layout and materials of all development proposals, including alterations to existing buildings, will be required to reflect the architectural and historic character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape, as defined in the Storrington & Sullington Parish Design Statement and Washington Parish Plan, and of the South Downs National Park.

- 6.8 The Storrington & Sullington Parish Design Statement, as referred to in Policy 16, was adopted as supplementary planning guidance by HDC in 2010. The Washington Parish Plan was published by the Parish Council in 2004 and the Heath Common Village Design Statement was adopted by HDC in 1999. These documents help define the specific characteristics of their respective areas, including the designated Conservation Areas, to inform the design of planning applications and the Consideration of those applications by HDC and will be incorporated into any reviews of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 6.9 At this stage, it should be noted that the policies within the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) carry limited weight as they have not been progressed to Referendum, although the intentions of policy 16 within the NP are recognised, requiring new proposals to reflect the architectural and historic character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape.
- 6.10 Furthermore, the Heath Common Village Design Statement (HCVDS) seeks to minimise the impact of traffic on the character of the lanes, which are noted to be without pavements and used by vehicles and pedestrians alike. As such, one of the criteria is that the character of the Lanes be maintained. Proposals to remove or alter hedges, banks, fences or verges are not acceptable, according to the HCVDS. This document also carried limited weight, as it is a guidance document only.
- 6.11 Turning to the assessment of the proposed plot sub-division, proposed development and the likely impact on the area's character, it is noted that the site would not be readily appreciated from the private lane, and would be accessed along a shared driveway, replicating the use of shared driveways that are common in the area and reflecting the patchwork pattern of development that has evolved in this area with numerous examples of 'backland / infill development'.
- 6.12 The resulting plot, although smaller than the host site 'Little Thatch' after development, would correspond to other plots in the locality, such as 'Hamfield', 'Bethany', 'Heatherdale' and 'Oakwoods'. The proposed development would provide for a qualitative area of private amenity space, achieving a garden depth of some 21m, and providing off-street parking to both the host dwelling and the new development.
- 6.13 Furthermore, the use of a contemporary flat roofed and Cedar-clad structure achieves a subtle addition to the patchwork development in the area that has evolved, and continues to evolve. The use of Cedar cladding and a low-pitch contemporary design is noted at 'Laneside' opposite the application site, whilst the use of large expanses of glazing and flat-roof is evident further to the north along Veras Walk at 'Downs View'. Other properties will continue to be extended and re-clad and be subject to other alterations and modernisations which result in changes to the original pre-war fabric of development along Veras Walk.

ITEM A03 - 9

- 6.14 In conclusion, the proposed design is considered to echo the original modestly-proportioned dwellings of Veras Walk, whilst the use of Cedar cladding would not appear unduly out of character, owing to the very wide ranging architectural styles and character features found in the immediate area. The site would retain a large proportion of its boundary hedgerow and screening, and would introduce new landscaping opportunities to the public frontage. Furthermore, the proposed new dwelling would not unduly impact on the public-facing street-frontage of Veras Walk, as it would be set behind existing dwellings

Neighbour Impact

- 6.15 Policy 33 of the HDPF (2015) seeks to avoid unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity. Officers acknowledge a number of comments raised by neighbouring properties including additional noise owing to proximity of the dwelling and the location of new parking area, loss of privacy, light intrusion arising from the new driveway, invasive character of new dwelling on outlook.
- 6.16 The siting of the proposed new dwelling, along with its height and massing, and location of habitable / clear-glazed windows are not considered to result in an adverse level of harm to the occupants of the host dwelling Little Thatch. Furthermore, the proposed development would not lead to detrimental harm to the occupants of Chilworth to the south-east on account of the siting, single-storey nature, orientation and general distance between the proposed development and adjacent property. Similarly, there would be no adverse harm occurring to the occupants of West Winds or Woodcote, both to the east, on account of the boundary screening, the intervention of the access drive serving these adjacent properties and the height and position of habitable windows to the proposed development.
- 6.17 The immediately adjacent property to the north of the boundary, where some screening and an existing greenhouse would be removed to facilitate the proposal, is Pinehurst. Original planning drawings indicate a flank door to a utility room and a secondary window to the breakfast room of the adjacent dwelling, both of which face onto the newly created front 'yard' of the proposed dwelling. Whilst the distance, angle of off-set and proposed height of the new dwelling is not considered to impact adversely on light, outlook and privacy of the adjoining property, there is some concern regarding the proximity of the forecourt parking area to the adjacent amenity area.

Accordingly, an amendment to the forecourt layout of the proposed new dwelling has pulled the parking area back from this northern boundary, thus alleviating any adverse and direct impact. Furthermore, the existing greenhouse, located alongside and abutting the common boundary would be removed as part of this proposed development.

- 6.18 Further reference is made to the potential for headlights shining into the front windows of properties situated on the western side of Veras Walk, particularly at the new and amended driveway intersection. Some impact would already occur to the occupants of the replacement dwelling at Laneside, on account of its siting, nature of the glazed windows to the front and new elevated position in relation to the lane. The concern regarding light intrusion arising from potential headlights is noted. However, the potential issue would be intermittent and would not lead to a level of sustained harm that would warrant a reason for refusal on its own grounds.

Trees, Biodiversity & Landscaping:

- 6.19 The site adjoins an area which is subject to a group Tree Preservation Order, made in 1985 and covering 'several trees of whatever species in the area'.

However, the trees within the application site are not subject to any level of protection and can be pruned and felled at the current owner's discretion, including the tall conifer trees along the front boundary.

- 6.20 An Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application. This document, the site and the adjacent area of protected trees have been assessed by the Council's Arboricultural Officer. Accordingly, it has been found that the Arboricultural Impact Assessment is compliant with the relevant British Standard in relation to trees. Furthermore, the trees set to be removed as part of the proposed development are not found to be worthy of being included within a new Tree Preservation Order, and their removal is considered to have no adverse long-term effect on the character and amenities of the area. Neither would the proposed development lead to any inappropriate post-development pressures on retained tree stock.
- 6.21 Amendments have been sought to increase the landscaping potential at the front of the site, alongside the shared driveway. These amendments create an additional landscaping strip between the application site and the neighbouring driveway and help to re-address the loss of front boundary planting to the site.

Parking, Traffic and Highways

- 6.22 Local Policy 40 supports proposals which provide safe and suitable access for all vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders, public transport and the delivery of goods, whilst Policy 41 requires adequate parking facilities within developments. Chapter 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out that 'development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe'.
- 6.23 Accordingly, the Highways Authority have assessed the proposed development on highway capacity, safety, and policy grounds. The most recently available verified accident records reveal there have been no personal injury accidents in the vicinity of the existing point of access, indicating a low risk of highway safety issues with this proposal. As there are a large number of dwellings within this estate the Local Highway Authority does not regard the impact of an additional dwelling as severe, and subject to appropriate supply of secure cycle storage, the proposal would satisfactorily accord with paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and local policies.
- 6.24 In terms of proposed parking levels at the property, it is noted that the development would provide for parking and turning space within the property for two vehicles. This would also be the situation for the host property and the provision of the new replacement garage.

Other Issues

- 6.25 The site is not designated as being within an area at risk of flooding, according to the Environment Agency. This applies equally to identified surface water flooding risks as well as risks associated with rivers. The use of permeable surfacing to the new driveway would assist in alleviating any adverse surface water run-off during wet weather. For clarification,

ITEM A03 - 11

the term 'permeable' surfacing applies to a number of different materials and construction techniques, but which all are capable of reducing or slowing excessive surface water run-off.

- 6.26 Reference has been made to the appeal decision at Patuca, Bracken Lane (DC/15/1679), and a proposal for a large 5-bed, detached, two-storey house at the side of the host dwelling, and fronting the lane.

In reaching his conclusions, the Inspector noted that the proposal reflected the average built density of the locality, and would accord in principle to the policies as it lies within the built-up area. However, the proposal was dismissed on account of the following:

"In the context of the immediately surrounding housing, the proposal would not reflect the character of well-proportioned dwellings set in spacious plots. The dwelling would be of bulky proportions, providing for the appearance of substantial mass, and due to the relatively short distances to the boundary to either side, would appear cramped and visually over-dominant in comparison with the spacing and design of the nearby surrounding housing."

- 6.27 By contrast, another appeal decision dated 24th May (DC/15/0756), also in a low-density residential area of Storrington, allowed an infill dwelling on a backland plot. In this instance, the Inspector found that:

"The footprint and scale of the illustrative proposals may be larger than that of the host dwelling and some other dwellings in the vicinity, but there is a variety in the size and scale of surrounding dwellings and some are larger than that shown."

The Inspector also noted that the host and proposed dwellings are hidden behind other properties when viewed from Melton Avenue and that gaps between dwellings in the locality varied.

- 6.28 Whilst it is noted that the latter property does not fall within the Heath Common area, it is also noted that neither the HCVDS document, nor the Parish Design Statement, were referred to.

There are sufficient differences between the current application and the quoted appeal decision to warrant a differing view being taken on the development.

Conclusion

- 6.29 In conclusion the proposal has been considered within the context of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development, and Local Policies set out within the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015). Officers consider that the proposal would lead to an acceptable form of development and would not lead to material harm in terms of its impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties and the character of the surrounding area.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 That the application be approved, subject to the following conditions:

- 1 Approved plans list

ITEM A03 - 12

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 3 No development above slab level, including the replacement garage, shall be commenced unless and until a schedule of materials and samples of such materials and finishes and colours to be used for external walls and roofs of the proposed building(s) have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing and all materials used shall conform to those approved.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail in the interests of amenity by endeavouring to achieve a building of visual quality in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 4 Prior to the occupation of any part of the development, full details of the hard and soft landscaping works shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The approved landscape scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details within the first planting season following the first occupation of any part of the development. Any plants, which within a period of 5 years, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

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

- 5 Full details of means of surface water drainage to serve the development shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to works commencing on development. The scheme agreed shall be implemented strictly in accordance with such agreement unless subsequent amendments have been agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development is properly drained in accordance with Policy 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 6 Full details of the permeable driveway surfacing shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to works commencing on development. The scheme agreed shall be implemented strictly in accordance with such agreement unless subsequent amendments have been agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development is properly drained in accordance with Policy 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 7 No part of the development shall be first occupied until covered and secure cycle parking spaces have been provided in accordance with plans and details submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To provide alternative travel options to the use of the car in accordance with current sustainable transport policies and in accordance with policies 35 and 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

ITEM A03 - 13

8 No development, including works of any description, including demolition pursuant to the permission granted, ground clearance, or bringing equipment, machinery or materials onto the site, shall take place until the following preliminaries have been completed in the sequence set out below:

(a) All required arboricultural works, including permitted tree felling and surgery operations and above ground vegetative clearance within such areas set out for development as indicated on the approved site layout drawing to be completed and cleared away;

(b) All trees on the site targeted for retention, as well as those off-site whose root protection areas ingress into the site, 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 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. No alterations or variations to the approved tree works or tree protection schemes shall be carried out without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: 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).

9 Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No2) (England) Order 2008 (or any order amending or revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development falling within Classes A and E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the order shall be erected constructed or placed within the curtilage(s) of the dwelling(s) hereby permitted so as to enlarge improve or otherwise alter the appearance or setting of the dwelling(s) unless permission is granted by the Local Planning Authority pursuant to an application for the purpose.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

10 No work for the implementation of the development hereby permitted shall be undertaken on the site except between 08.00 hours and 18.00 hours on Mondays to Fridays inclusive and 08.00 hours and 13.00 hours on Saturdays, and no work shall be undertaken on Sundays, Bank and Public Holidays unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of nearby residents in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

11 No burning of materials in connection with the development shall take place on the site.

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

NOTE TO APPLICANT

Please be advised that there are conditions on this notice that will require formal discharge. In order to secure the discharge you will need to submit an "Application for approval of details reserved by condition" application form and pay the appropriate fee, guidance and the forms can be found at www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/paperforms

NOTE TO APPLICANT

Statement pursuant to Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

NOTE TO APPLICANT

Due to changes in legislation that came in to force on 1st October 2011 regarding the future ownership of sewers it is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the above property. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its condition, the number of properties served, and potential means of access before any further works commence on site.

The applicant is advised to discuss the matter further with Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119) or www.southernwater.co.uk".

NOTE TO APPLICANT

Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the public foul sewer to be made by the applicant or developer. We request that should this application receive planning approval, the following informative is attached to the consent:

"A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development, Please contact Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119) or www.southernwater.co.uk".

NOTE TO APPLICANT

The planning application form makes reference to drainage using Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS).

Under current legislation and guidance SUDS rely upon facilities which are not adoptable by sewerage undertakers. Therefore, the applicant will need to ensure that arrangements exist for the long term maintenance of the SUDS facilities. It is critical that the effectiveness of these systems is maintained in perpetuity. Good management will avoid flooding from the proposed surface water system, which may result in the inundation of the foul sewerage system.

Where a SUDS scheme is to be implemented, the drainage details submitted to the Local Planning Authority should:

- Specify the responsibilities of each party for the implementation of the SUDS scheme
- Specify a timetable for implementation
- Provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.

This should include the arrangements for the adoption by any public or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

ITEM A03 - 15

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO THE PARISH COUNCIL'S VIEWS?

Yes

Plans list for: DC/16/1252

(The approved plans will form Condition 1 on the Decision Notice of all Permitted applications)

Schedule of plans/documents **approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location & Block plan		2.01 B	01.06.2016
Roof plan	Layout	2.02 C	03.08.2016
Design & Access Statement		NONE	01.06.2016
Supporting Statement	Planning	NONE	01.06.2016
Supporting Statement	Arboricultural method	NONE	01.06.2016
Supporting Docs	Arboricultural impact assessment	NONE	01.06.2016
Supporting Docs	Highway access report	NONE	01.06.2016
Supporting Docs	Arboricultural survey	NONE	01.06.2016
Plans	Proposed access	2.05 B	03.08.2016
Plans	Topographical survey	1.01 A	01.06.2016
Elevation & Floor plan		2.04 C	03.08.2016
Elevation & Floor plan	Garage	2.03 A	01.06.2016

Background Papers: DC/16/1252