



**TO:** Planning Committee (South)

**BY:** Development Manager

**DATE:** 21 March 2017

**DEVELOPMENT:** Proposed demolition of the existing Glebe Surgery, and erection of a new 1,400 sqm doctors surgery and 120 sqm pharmacy served by 59 associated car parking spaces and the erection of 9 No. dwellings served by 31 parking spaces, all accessed by adapted access to Monastery Lane and the creation of new public open space

**SITE:** Monastery Lane Storrington Pulborough West Sussex

**WARD:** Chantry

**APPLICATION:** DC/16/2108

**APPLICANT:** Mr Chris Pitchford

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

**RECOMMENDATION:** To approve the application, subject to conditions and to a Legal Agreement to secure delivery of the surgery building and transfer of the retained open space to public ownership prior to the commencement of the residential element of the proposal, to secure a financial contribution towards implementation of waiting restrictions on Monastery Lane and within the development and to secure financial contributions to local education provision.

## **1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT**

1.1 To consider the planning application.

### **DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION**

1.2 The application is made in full and seeks permission for a replacement and enlarged doctor's surgery building (including a pharmacy) with ancillary car park and a development of 9 dwellings, all served by an altered access from Monastery Lane. It should be noted that the proposal has been amended during consideration from providing a total of 24 dwellings to 9 dwellings. Given the scale of the proposed change and the public interest in the proposal, a full 21-day re-consultation exercise to publicise the amended proposal and give the public and consultees the opportunity to provide their comments on it has been carried out. This comprised written notification to those properties which were originally notified of the receipt of the application and to all those properties from which representations were received in connection with the original submission, re-notification of all consultees and amended press notice and site notices. For clarity, the Council is now

therefore considering the proposed 9-unit scheme only, and the 24-unit scheme has effectively been withdrawn by the Applicant. It is not open to the Council to consider the merits of both the 9-unit and 24-unit scheme.

- 1.3 The surgery building would be sited partly on the footprint of the existing surgery building, but extending further to the south east than the existing building. The surgery building would be part single storey, part two storey, with much of the roof space utilised to provide a third floor of usable space. The single storey section would be flat roofed, while the remainder would be formed from a number of different pitched roof sections, linked by a central section comprising mainly glazing. A variety of materials are proposed including flintwork, dark and light red brick, black weatherboarding, natural weatherboarding, red roof tiles and grey fibre cement tiles (imitation slate). The building would have a maximum height of around 9.8m.
- 1.4 In connection with the surgery, fifty-eight parking spaces would be provided in two areas- to the north and south of the surgery. A bicycle store is proposed to the rear (east) of the building. An attached refuse storage room is proposed to the northern side of the single storey (pharmacy) section.
- 1.5 The residential element proposes 9 dwellings, arranged in two pairs of semi-detached dwellings and 5 detached dwellings. All of the dwellings are proposed to be private market units. The size mix proposed is as follows:
  - 3 x 3-bed houses
  - 5 x 4-bed houses
  - 1 x 5-bed house
- 1.6 The dwellings are arranged in a fairly irregular and informal layout. Plots 1 and 2 would front the main access, with plots 3-7 arranged around a spur off the main access and plots 8 and 9 on a southern spur road facing the retained open space.
- 1.7 All of the residential dwellings would be two storey with the exception of plot 1 which would be 2.5 storeys with rooms in the roof served by dormer windows. The height of the dwellings range from between 8.9m to 9.5m in height. The elevations indicate a variety of materials for the residential buildings, including red brick, stonework, tile hanging, black and white weatherboarding, clay tiles and slate tiles.
- 1.8 Each of the semi-detached dwellings would be provided with a single garage and surface parking space and each of the detached dwellings would be provided with a double garage and two surface parking spaces. Three visitor parking spaces are provided within the residential part of the development.
- 1.9 The site plan shows existing public rights of way across the site retained, and an additional route provided through the development to link up with the existing north-south public footpath. The remaining un-developed land, comprising the southern part of the Glebe Field and the north-eastern part of the Glebe Field are intended to be retained as areas of public open space.
- 1.10 A number of supporting documents accompany the application, including:
  - Separate Design and Access Statements for the surgery and residential elements.
  - Planning Statement
  - Heritage Statement
  - Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
  - Transport Statement
  - Flood Risk Assessment
  - Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment

- Reptile Report
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report
- Statement of Community Involvement
- Air Quality Appraisal
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment

## DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

- 1.11 Part of the northern end of the site is currently occupied by a doctor's surgery building and car park, with temporary portacabins on part of the car park. The remainder of the site is undeveloped land. The area to the south of the existing surgery and to the west of the existing paths crossing the site is used for grazing of horses. The remainder, although private land, is publicly accessible via the existing public rights of way crossing the land. It should be noted that the trodden route of the public footpath on site does not follow the definitive route of the public right of way recognised by the County Council. The definitive route runs in an almost straight line north-south from the eastern edge of the existing surgery site to the corner of the churchyard at the southern edge of the site.
- 1.12 The part of the site occupied by the surgery and western part of the horse paddocks, fronting Monastery Lane and extending down to the adjacent dwelling Lady Place is relatively flat. The land slopes steeply up from the eastern edge of the surgery to a high point roughly to the rear of the adjacent dwelling Glebe House. The land also slopes up towards St Marys Church to the South.
- 1.13 The neighbouring dwelling Lady Place is a grade II listed building. St Marys Church is a grade II\* listed building. The Storrington Conservation Area lies to the east of the site, including the churchyard which adjoins the site. The dwellings fronting West Street, to the north of the site, lie within the Storrington Air Quality Management Area. The site itself lies within the Storrington built-up area boundary, as defined on the HDPF Policies Map.

## 2. INTRODUCTION

### STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

### RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

- 2.2. The following Policies are considered to be relevant to the assessment of this application:

#### **National Planning Policy Framework:**

- NPPF1 - Building a strong, competitive economy
- NPPF4 - Promoting sustainable transport
- NPPF6 - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
- NPPF7 - Requiring good design
- NPPF8 - Promoting healthy communities
- NPPF10 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- NPPF11 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- NPPF12 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

#### **Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF 2015)**

- HDPF1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development
- HDPF2 - Strategic Policy: Strategic Development
- HDPF3 - Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy
- HDPF13 - Town Centre Uses
- HDPF15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision

HDPF16 - Strategic Policy: Meeting Local Housing Needs  
 HDPF24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection  
 HDPF25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character  
 HDPF30 - Protected Landscapes  
 HDPF31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity  
 HDPF32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development  
 HDPF33 - Development Principles  
 HDPF34 - Cultural and Heritage Assets  
 HDPF35 - Strategic Policy: Climate Change  
 HDPF36 - Strategic Policy: Appropriate Energy Use  
 HDPF37 - Sustainable Construction  
 HDPF38 - Strategic Policy: Flooding  
 HDPF39 - Strategic Policy: Infrastructure Provision  
 HDPF40 - Sustainable Transport  
 HDPF41 - Parking  
 HDPF42 - Strategic Policy: Inclusive Communities  
 HDPF43 - Community Facilities, Leisure and Recreation

#### RELEVANT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

- 2.3 The Storrington, Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan progressed to submission version (Regulation 18), but the Examiner's Report found that the draft NP did not meet the basic conditions and should not proceed to referendum. As such, there is no NP in place in the area at this time and no current published draft for consultation.

#### PLANNING HISTORY AND RELEVANT APPLICATIONS

SR/96/89	36 dwellings (6 for low-cost/social housing), doctors surgery, health centre, enlargement of car-park, new access & provision of public open space	Refused
SR/6/90	Erection of doctor's surgery	Withdrawn
SR/53/91	Doctors surgery	Permitted
SR/60/98	Single-storey extension to provide 2 consulting rooms	Permitted
DC/04/1068	Single-Storey extension	Permitted
DC/09/1748	Single storey side extension (2 consulting rooms)	Permitted
DC/14/1180	To retain a single storey Portakabin building to be used as additional medical treatment rooms currently sited on a portion of the existing car park.	Permitted for a temporary period to 05.08.2018
DC/16/0769	To install a temporary single storey Portakabin building to be used as additional treatment rooms.	Permitted for a temporary period to 05.08.2018

### 3. OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1 **Where relevant to provide background to the amended plans, the evolution of the scheme and the consultee's assessment of the current proposal for 9 dwellings,**

**reference is made to points raised in the original consultation responses provided in relation to the 24-unit scheme.** Where consultation responses have been summarised, it should be noted that Officers have had consideration of the full comments received, which are available to view on the public file at [www.horsham.gov.uk](http://www.horsham.gov.uk).

## INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

### 3.2 **HDC Conservation Officer: Objection.**

*The Conservation Officer objected to the original proposal including 24 dwellings. The comments in relation to the amended scheme for 9 dwellings repeat much of the original consultation response, which remains relevant to the amended scheme. The latest consultation response includes the following points:*

- The amended plans create a larger area of public open space and involves the development of a reduced area of Glebe land, however the principle of the development of the Glebe is still considered harmful to the setting of heritage assets, including the grade II\* listed Parish Church of St Mary, grade II listed dwelling Lady Place and the Storrington Conservation Area.
- The development of the Glebe is strongly resisted.
- The open, green land is considered to preserve the positive characteristics of the immediate locality, allowing the interpretation and understanding of sense of place and of the evolution of the historic context.
- The Glebe and its close association with St Mary's can be easily appreciated with good intervisibility between the application site and the Church, which is on raised ground.
- The loose grain of surrounding plots and buildings and the undeveloped field provides a rural backdrop, giving a pleasant landscape relief and softening the built form.
- The setting of Lady Place is significant in providing the character and context in which the heritage asset is experienced.
- Lady Place, a former farmhouse with associated outbuildings, was originally set in rural isolation and the Glebe land maintains the sense of its historic open and landscaped setting.
- While the vernacular architecture of Lady Place is its main significance, the setting and one's experience of the open, landscape setting beyond contributes greatly to the character and historic interest of the listed building.
- The introduction of built form on the field would urbanise the rural environment and the proposed development would be too intensive with the quantum of development and the proposed site layout conflicting with the character and appearance of the immediate context.
- The proposed housing development would adversely change the character of the site and its immediate setting, eroding the significant open field and its relationship with surrounding historic buildings.
- The Heritage Statement under-emphasises the significance of the Glebe land and the positive contribution it makes to the setting of the listed buildings and the Conservation Area.
- The undulating landform and rolling landscape is a key characteristic of the locality and the development would likely cut into this landscape, having an adverse effect on this positive characteristic.
- The latest housing development to the south of Lady Place is regrettable and does not set a desirable precedent for further incremental erosion of the historic Glebe land, which would subsume the once isolated setting of Lady Place.
- The Heritage Statement also underplays the relationship between Lady Place and the Glebe Land.
- There are trees, hedging and historic walling defining the boundaries of Lady Place. However, the dwelling and application site can be easily read together in short and wider views and there is good intervisibility between the two.

- When walking along Monastery Lane there are clear views and glimpses looking across the curtilage of Lady Place through to the open green field of the application site, and one can appreciate the relationship of the listed building and historic fieldscape.
- The Heritage Statement states that there would have been “a distinct historic dissociation” between the Glebe and Lady Place. However, it is considered highly likely that there was a reasonably strong visual link between the listed building and the open Glebe field.
- Views looking across the Glebe from the Conservation Area are considered to positively contribute to one’s understanding and appreciation of the historic significance of the immediate context.
- The views north-west from the church and looking south-east towards the church provide the attractive green and open setting.
- These views which take in the open fieldscape of the Glebe provide a sense of the historic relationship of the land with the Church and the rural character of the settlement.
- The Heritage Statement does not assess the grade II\* church in sufficient detail, and does not identify the impact of the proposed development on the setting of the heritage asset which is a landmark building.
- The revised proposal does include a looser grain to the proposed layout, reducing the intensive introduction of built form, but it is still considered that the existing views across the Glebe would be lost due to the presence of the housing development.
- The scheme would heavily rely on landscape buffer planting in an attempt to screen the proposed development. Due to the impermanent nature of planting, there is too much reliance on planting to try and reduce the presence of the development when viewing Lady Place.
- The residential development would adversely impact the setting of the listed buildings and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. One’s interpretation of the historic context would be obscured and the introduction of a rather intense quantum of development would appear as an incongruous and visually discordant addition which would detract from the locality.
- In terms of the erection of a surgery, by virtue of the large scale and positioning, this element would also harm the setting of the surrounding heritage assets.
- The development would therefore harm the setting of listed buildings and the Conservation Area.
- That harm would be less than substantial.
- However, any potential harm should be given considerable weight in the planning balance and whilst considered to be less than substantial, the harm to the setting of the listed buildings and conservation area would be permanent and irreversible.

*The Applicant provided a rebuttal to the Conservation Officer’s original response to the 24-unit scheme. In the Conservation Officer’s response to that rebuttal, the heritage value of the Glebe land itself is further assessed. The relevant points from that correspondence, which are not referred to above, include:*

- The Glebe land is a non-designated heritage asset. It maintains a strong connection with the Church and positively contributes to one’s understanding of the historic development of the area.
- The Glebe land is significant in promoting the scale and presence of the Church, which was originally designed to be a focal point and landmark building, enhancing and better revealing its immediate setting.
- The site is not defined as ‘countryside’, but Storrington is a rural settlement and the Glebe land positively contributes to the rural sense of place and provides an important visual transition between the built-up form within the settlement core to the looser grain development and countryside beyond.
- While settlements and developments evolve, the proposal would read as a negative phase of the settlement’s evolution which would be to the detriment of the sense of place.
- The planting within the buffer area proposed to provide screening between Lady Place and the development would in its own right adversely alter the character of the Glebe land,

which is an undeveloped and open piece of land. The proposed planting would appear at odds with the character and appearance of the historic Glebe.

### 3.3 **HDC Landscape Architect: Objection**

*The consultation response to the original scheme for 24-units included the following points:*

- The development would have an adverse effect on landscape character, particularly when appreciated from public footpaths 2656 running east-west along the southern boundary and 2657 running north-south across the site.
- Development would have an adverse effect on the appreciation and views towards the South Downs escarpment and in some locations, complete loss of views.
- The existing views contribute to the sense of place and the escarpment is considered a backdrop of value.
- The site retains a very rural character and sense of tranquillity.
- The site is of overall moderate landscape sensitivity due to its elevated position and its attractive middle-long distance views to the South Downs and the ridgeline to the south.
- The Horsham District Landscape Character Assessment, evaluates Storrington under the Settlement Character section at 5.8 and identifies key characteristics including a heavily indented settlement edge with woodlands, heathland and small hedgerowed fields making a distinctive contribution to setting, the small historic core of Storrington, built development widely visible from the South Downs, but considerably softened by woodland and mature trees, extensive low density residential areas with informal layouts, large plot sizes and a random pattern of dwelling sizes.
- The proposed doctor's surgery and car park should be positioned closer to the Monastery Lane boundary, as the proposed location sits within elevated ground and would lead to separation of the field into an isolated area.
- The doctors surgery car park should accommodate more trees to soften this area.
- Although buffer zones to St Marys Church and Lady Place are proposed, the change in the character of the site, the loss of openness and loss of sense of place would fundamentally change the context in which these heritage assets are appreciated and negatively impact upon their setting.
- The proposed development will exacerbate the urbanising form, damaging further the rural character of Monastery Lane.
- Views of the South Downs obtainable at the entrance to Monastery Lane will be lost or significantly reduced.
- The proposed development will increase noise and reduce the overall tranquillity of the area as experienced from the public footpaths within the site.
- The impact upon the visual amenity of the majority of representative views within the study area of the submitted Landscape Visual Impact Assessment, as a result of the proposed development would be Direct, Long Term, Permanent and Adverse as experienced by the public. These are mostly limited to close distance views from PRoW's within the site and immediate surroundings although the proposed development will also result in adverse effects when the site is appreciated from the elevated PRoW 2251 within the South Downs.
- The scheme fails to comply with Policies 25 (to protect and conserve landscape and townscape character), Policy 31 (Green Infrastructure) and Policy 33 (development principles) of the HDPF.

*The Applicant submitted a rebuttal to the Landscape Architect's initial consultation response. The additional information did not address all of the Landscape Architect's concerns. The Landscape Architect's further consultation response included the following points:*

- Notwithstanding the influence of surrounding built form and location within a built-up area boundary, the site retains a rural character and tranquillity.
- The built-up area boundary is a planning policy tool and does not preclude a site from being described of rural character.

- Although there are no policy designations on the site, an assessment still needs to be made of the character/appearance of the site and its contribution to landscape and townscape setting.
- Although the draft SSWNP lacked an evidence base supporting the designation of 'local green spaces', this site would appear to meet the criteria at paragraph 77 of the NPPF for designation of a local green space.
- Criteria for making a Tree Preservation Order is not likely to be met by a newly planted evergreen hedge.
- Accept that the proposals could comply with Policy 31 with regard to mitigation/compensation for the loss of green infrastructure.
- The site and its character can be enjoyed from existing public footpaths crossing the site, and these are considered to be of high amenity value.

*The Applicant then submitted the amended scheme for 9-units. The Landscape Architect has considered the plans, and the revised supporting information, including the Landscape and Visual Appraisal, and maintains an objection to the proposal. The Landscape Architect's further comments on the 9-unit scheme include the following points:*

- The reduction in number of dwellings and reduction in the amount of green space lost is positive.
- The organic arrangement of the dwellings is also a positive change.
- However, the development still fails to protect, enhance and conserve landscape and townscape character.
- Partial loss of open space still represents the partial erosion of the open attributes of the site, the loss of tranquillity, loss of rural character and the relationship of this piece of land with the historic core and rural surroundings.
- While views towards the countryside and the escarpment will be maintained within the eastern side of the site, the context in which these are appreciated will be considerably different.
- Previous comments regarding the location and positioning of the surgery building have not been addressed. The location of the surgery will affect one of the site's key landscape characteristics, the undulating landform and rolling landscape, and appreciation of the setting of Storrington and its conservation area from the South Downs.
- The surgery would interrupt the open link between rural countryside and the settlement when seen from the South Downs, and from West Street, and public footpaths within the site.
- The perception of a 'green finger' entering the settlement area would be lost.
- Footpath users can currently leave the urban environment of West Street, step into the Glebe and immediately feel a change in character and tranquillity, and connection with the countryside.

#### 3.4 **HDC Drainage Engineer: No objection, subject to conditions**

*The comments provided in respect of the 9-unit proposal advised that there were no further comments in addition to those raised in the original consultation. The original response included the following points:*

- No overall objection to the proposed drainage strategy.
- Detailed drainage design information should be provided pursuant to conditions.
- Conditions should also secure the long term maintenance of any Sustainable Drainage Systems.

#### 3.5 **HDC Environmental Protection Officer (Air Quality): No objection, subject to conditions**

*The comments provided in respect of the 9-unit proposal advised that the comments provided in the original consultation response remained relevant, but also provided additional comments. The overall points from both responses therefore include:*



- The applicant is referred to HDC guidance- Planning Advice Document: Air Quality and Emissions Reduction Guidance (2014), which is not referred to in the applicant's Air Quality Appraisal and an amended version should be provided.
- Therefore, appropriate mitigation measures should be proposed to mitigate/offset its contribution to the cumulative increase in emissions in the local area.
- The applicant should submit an Air Quality Mitigation Plan containing measures of Type 1 and Type 2 mitigation categories, as detailed in the HDC guidance. This can be required by condition.
- A construction mitigation plan should also be secured by conditions, and based on the IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction (February 2014)

**3.6 HDC Environmental Health Officer: No objection, subject to conditions**

*This consultee has provided comments on the 24-unit scheme only, but has verbally advised that these remain applicable to the 9-unit scheme. The main points include:*

- Conditions are necessary to ensure that any adverse noise impacts are suitably mitigated and any land contamination remediated.
- Facilities for charging low emissions vehicles (one charging point per unit) should be provided due to the proximity to the AQMA.

**3.7 HDC Housing Services Manager: Objection**

- Although affordable housing was provided in the earlier scheme for 24 dwellings, no affordable housing is now proposed for the 9 unit scheme.
- The scheme should deliver 20% affordable housing in accordance with Policy 16.

**3.8 HDC Ecology Consultant: No objection, subject to conditions**

*This consultee has advised that the original comments in relation to the 24-unit scheme remain applicable to the 9-unit scheme. The main points include:*

- Based on the submitted Preliminary Ecology Appraisal and Reptile Report, no objection is raised.
- Conditions are necessary to ensure that a reptile mitigation strategy and an ecological mitigation and enhancement plan are approved and implemented.

**3.9 HDC Archaeology Consultant: Comments awaited, and will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting.**

**3.10 HDC Strategic Planning:**

*This consultee raised objection to the original scheme proposing 24-units, due to conflict with Policies 25 and 34 of the HDPF. The further comments in respect of the 9-unit scheme highlight that the site lies within the built-up area boundary, wherein development is acceptable, and includes the following points:*

- Development is in accordance with Policy 3.
- Sensitive landscape and heritage issues should be assessed with regard to the specialist officer comments.
- The development does not provide affordable housing and is therefore contrary to Policy 16.
- The proposal accords with Policy 42 and 43 through the provision of community facilities.

**OUTSIDE AGENCIES**

**3.11 West Sussex County Highway Authority: No objection, subject to conditions**

*This consultee raised no objection to the original submission for 24 units. The consultation response in respect of the amended proposal for 9-units includes the following points:*

- Advice in respect of access for the 24-unit scheme remains acceptable to the 9-unit scheme.

- With a decrease in units, there would be a decrease in the impact on the local highway network in comparison to the 24-unit scheme, to which the Highway Authority raised no objection.
- Conditions recommended for the 24-unit scheme remain applicable to the 9-unit scheme.

*The original Highways consultation response included the following points:*

- Initial consultation response raised a number of concerns. Additional information has been submitted to address these.
- Increased on-site parking would assist in addressing on-street parking on Monastery Lane. A contribution should be secured through s106 towards implementation of waiting restrictions within the site and on Monastery Lane.
- Access road and footway are likely to remain private, to deter parking on the private section of the road.
- Tracking drawings show that larger and medium sized refuse vehicles can turn and manoeuvre on-site, although there is some over-running of the garden of plot 24.
- The highway authority are satisfied that a severe impact would not result from this development.

3.12 **West Sussex County Rights of Way Access Ranger: Comment and recommended conditions** in respect of the 9-unit scheme:

- Two footpaths are affected: FP2657 that runs north to south through the site and FP2656 that runs west to east on the southern border of the site.
- The proposed development would encroach over the definitive line of FP2657.
- Before this development can take place, an application to divert FP2657 will need to be made.
- This should be done at an early stage, as the diversion should be finalised before work commences.
- These paths are likely to have greater levels of use with additional residents adjacent. Improvements to the paths are therefore encouraged, as they would bring benefits from a sustainable transport point of view, and healthier living for residents.
- Construction of a stone surface to Public Rights of Way specifications is recommended.
- Routes should not be obstructed at any stage during development.
- Any damage to the rights of way as a result of construction processes should be made good by the developer.

3.13 **Southern Water: No objection, subject to conditions**

- There are no public surface water sewers in the area to serve the development.
- Alternative means of draining surface water are therefore required, which does not involve connection to a public foul sewer.
- Any sustainable drainage systems approved should include provision for long term management and maintenance, as these are not currently adoptable by sewerage undertakers
- A water supply to the site can be provided.
- Any public sewers crossing the site should be protected during construction.

3.14 **West Sussex County Flood Risk Management: No objection, subject to conditions.**

*The following points were included in the original consultation response. The consultee has advised verbally that the original comments on the 24-unit scheme remain applicable to the 9-unit scheme.*

- The majority of the site is at low risk from surface water flooding.
- The north-western boundary with Monastery Lane is at higher risk.
- Any existing surface water flow paths across the site should be maintained or appropriate mitigation strategies proposed.
- The site is at low risk from ground water flooding.
- No records of historic surface water flooding within the site, but there is a record from the early 1980s of properties at the northern end of Monastery Lane flooding.

- Conditions should prevent commencement of development prior to approval of detailed surface water drainage design, based on sustainable drainage principles.
- The drainage designs should clearly demonstrate that the surface water runoff generated up to and including the 100 year, plus climate change, critical storm will not exceed the runoff from the current site following the corresponding rainfall event.

3.15 **West Sussex County Strategic Planning:** A legal agreement to secure financial contributions to education (primary, secondary and sixth form) is necessary to mitigate the impacts of the increased population on these services.

3.16 **Coastal West Sussex Clinical Commissioning Group: Support**

*This consultee wrote in support of the original scheme for 24 units. That consultation response includes the following points:*

- Following closure of the Mill Stream surgery in 2014, the Glebe has been providing services from a considerably undersized practice supplemented by temporary portacabins.
- We are keen to see an urgent upgrade to the surgery premises in Storrington to enable the practice to continue to provide high quality care and to develop and expand the range of services provided to the community.
- The Glebe surgery proposals are one of the CCG's top three priorities.
- The size and scope of the new surgery will support the future development of healthcare in the local area, enable services to be provided in a more co-ordinated way across agencies and improve patient access to care.
- Without adequate accommodation and the additional capacity and flexibility provided by the new surgery premises, it will be difficult to develop primary care services in Storrington and the local area.
- Estates funding decisions are not made by the CCG, but by NHS England and we are still awaiting confirmation of investment proposals, but would wish to give full support to the current planning application.

*Officers subsequently contacted the CCG seeking further detail of funding arrangements for the new surgery and reasons for not proceeding with the Mill Stream site, in light of a number of representations received on these matters. The response includes the following points:*

- A GP has the remit of having to provide Primary Care from suitable premises.
- The Glebe is a rented premises. The NHS can reimburse rental costs where assessed as value for money.
- The majority of new premises will be as a result of Practices working with third party developers/landlords to provide accommodation under a lease held by the practice.
- GP practices are independent contractors, so arrangements around the ownership or rental of premises sits with them as an independent business.
- Patient list growth has led to the current premises being far too stretched.
- The Glebe application for central NHS funding from the Estate and Technology Transformation Fund (ETTF) was accepted, after meeting national standard requirements.
- The ETTF is there to part fund new builds. It cannot fully fund new builds.
- The funding awarded is a grant to be used to off-set build costs, and in this case the funding will reduce the rental charges for the duration of the lease, providing a lower revenue cost to the NHS for the medium term future.
- GPs can be deterred from coming into a region by having to buy a property. GPs can utilise affordable rented property to deliver their services.
- The CCG assess new plans and obtain valuations to determine if a site would constitute value for money to the NHS. This is being undertaken.
- The CCG supported the Glebe's proposal, subject to Due Diligence.
- The CCG also reviewed some options. Mill Stream was considered, but there were many factors that meant the site was not suitable for the total rural services to be delivered.

- The Mill Stream site is only 1/3 the size of the proposed new surgery and involved additional cost factors including sewerage, river bank enhancements, and additional land costs from multiple owners to expand the site.
- The current surgery site at the Glebe has a restrictive covenant.
- The Glebe surgery had done pragmatic site appraisals for their submission to NHS England for the grant award.
- At this stage, there could not be a re-working of the national funding request, as this has been approved in principle and is at the end of the Due Diligence phase.
- There is also a restrictive time for the NHS Grant.

## PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

### 3.17 **Storrington and Sullington Parish Council:** Object to both the 24-unit scheme and the 9-unit scheme.

*The consultation response to the 9-unit scheme advises that the amended proposals do not address any of the objections raised to the 24-unit scheme. The original response in respect of the 24-unit scheme included the following points:*

- The proposed new housing is neither needed, nor of the size required as indicated in the Parish's Housing Needs Survey.
- Sufficient housing is coming forward through Neighbourhood Plans.
- The proposed housing development is not 'enabling development' in planning terms, i.e. it would not secure a proposal for the long-term future of part of the historic environment that has heritage value.
- The site is a greenfield site, which is allocated as a Local Green Space in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.
- The site was submitted for consideration under the NP call for sites process, but was excluded due to unsuitability.
- The site is considered undevelopable in the recent SHELAA.
- The density of development is out of keeping with surroundings.
- Loss of amenity for neighbouring houses and the wider village would be considerable.
- Access is via a single track lane, leading to a mini-roundabout with limited sightlines and where the exit cannot be seen by traffic coming from the right.
- This mini-roundabout is located in one of the most polluted parts of the AQMA.
- The proposal conflicts with the implementation of the Air Quality Action Plan and would increase the number of people exposed to poor air quality.
- The submitted traffic study is inadequate.
- The Glebe field is one of only 2 green spaces left within Storrington.
- The development would destroy the setting of and views to and from Lady Place.
- Planting cannot be relied upon as a means of permanent mitigation of harm to the setting of heritage assets.
- The new pharmacy would be in direct competition with two existing in the High Street.
- The proposal would encourage further traffic along the High Street, through the AQMA.
- The proposed surgery building is not future-proofed, providing only for expansion to 2020.
- While the need for a larger surgery is acknowledged, it cannot be guaranteed through enabling development and this is not in the correct location.

*The Parish Council consultation response in respect of the amended scheme for 9-units included the following additional points:*

- The emerging Neighbourhood Plan requires a predominance of smaller houses, not larger 'executive' type houses.
- No affordable housing is not in accordance with local and national guidance.
- The access road has been left as a hammerhead leaving access into the remainder of the open space, indicating an intention to further develop the land.
- The field fulfils the criteria for classification as a Local Green Space.
- Density of development is out of keeping with surroundings.

- The amended scheme does not address the comments of the Landscape Architect and the Conservation Officer in respect of the 24-unit scheme.
- 3.18 In respect of the original proposal including 24 dwellings, the Council **received 207 letters of objection from 164 households** (including two letters from a consultant on behalf of 13 residents with unspecified addresses), **497 letters of support, from 389 households** and 3 letters of representation which neither supported nor objected to the proposal.
- 3.19 Following the publicity of the amended proposal involving 9 dwellings, the Council received **123 letters of objection from 104 households** (including two letters from a consultant on behalf of 13 residents with unspecified addresses), **97 letters of support from 85 households**, and two letters of representation which neither supported nor objected to the proposal. An additional six letters of support from unspecified addresses have been forwarded to the Council by the Glebe Surgery.
- 3.20 The **letters of objection** received in connection with the 9-unit scheme include the following points:
- The amended plans do not address previous objections, as the proposal has not been amended in a meaningful way.
  - While more doctors' facilities are needed, development of the Glebe Field is too high a price to pay.
  - The draft SSWNP seeks to designate the Glebe Field as a 'Local Green Space', and the space closely accords with the NPPF criteria for designation of Local Green Space.
  - The Glebe Field is an important green space, and one of the few green spaces left in Storrington.
  - The Glebe Field is popular with dog walkers and is also used as an alternative pedestrian route into town.
  - Although only part of the Glebe Field will be lost, this will totally change its character.
  - While the village is in need of a new/expanded surgery, this is a separate matter to allowing housing development on the Glebe Field.
  - There are plenty of sites on the perimeter of the village for house building. It would be a great shame to lose this well-used space in the centre.
  - The Glebe land should only be used for a surgery. There are plenty of other sites for new homes already identified in the SSWNP.
  - The Mill Stream site should be used for a surgery. This site is in a better, more central location.
  - Mill Stream has safer road access, existing parking and public transport links.
  - Mill Stream was purchased with public money and should be re-opened as a medical centre for the community.
  - If Mill Stream is not able to run as an independent surgery, it should be opened as a satellite surgery to the Glebe.
  - Mill Stream was only closed because of the practice manager, not the facilities or the building.
  - The Mill Stream site has space to expand in the future if necessary.
  - The surgery is being pushed into a small area.
  - There has been no public scrutiny of the need for a surgery of this size. It is not known whether this is based on sound demographic analysis.
  - The surgery is disproportionately large for the surrounding area and other buildings. It will dominate the land and is out of keeping with other buildings in Storrington.
  - It should be demonstrated that other sites have been considered. The development should only be considered when other sites have been discounted.
  - Now that plans for extending Waitrose are not going ahead, a new surgery could be accommodated at that site.

- Other sites suggested for a surgery include: field between north end of Water Lane and Downsview Avenue, Rydon College playing field, field to north of allotments off Ravenscroft and field to north of Catholic cemetery off Kithurst Lane
  - The church is holding the village and the doctor's surgery to ransom.
  - The Diocese will only release the existing surgery land from a restrictive covenant if they are granted planning permission for housing on the Glebe.
  - If the church needs revenue, they could sell/develop the vicarage which is currently under-occupied.
  - The Diocese plans to gift the land to the developer, Medical Centre Developments. However, there will be a considerable capital receipt from the housing development, should it be permitted.
  - It is not clear why the land for a surgery needs to be 'gifted' and who would be the beneficiary of this 'gift'. Should the land be gifted to Medical Centre Developments, there will be no public benefit, as this will accrue to MCD who will make additional profits.
- 
- A private company, Medical Centre Developments, will fund and construct the building and then lease it back to the practice, with the rent being paid by the NHS.
  - The CCG are intending to make a contribution to construction costs in return for a lower rental payment. There is no indication for the reason for making this payment and the amount.
  - There is no market evidence to suggest that such developments are not commercially viable and such developments are popular with investors due to security of rental income.
  - The housing development is not 'enabling development', as it is not necessary to ensure continued protection of a place or heritage asset. The Glebe Field itself is a local heritage asset and place.
  - Supporting information submitted with the application implies that the surgery development cannot proceed without the housing development being approved. However, the new surgery is viable and deliverable in its own right and is not financially or physically dependent on the housing development.
  - It is not clear what the precise nature of the legal agreements between key parties involved in this case is. This is highly relevant and material to this application.
  - The scheme should remain viable while paying market rate for the land. There are other examples in the District of this type of development and lease agreement.
  - The Applicant's argument for non-provision of affordable housing is flawed. Government guidance only exempts development from providing affordable housing where less than 10 units of less than 1000sqm total are proposed. This development is over 1000sqm. 2 affordable units should therefore be provided.
  - An affordable housing contribution should be calculated in accordance with the 2007 Planning Obligations SPD, and not the draft Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD.
  - The Applicant's case for non-provision of affordable housing relies on an alternative scheme for 6 houses on the surgery land. This is a flawed argument, as such a proposal would be contrary to planning policies and unlikely to receive local support.
  - The Applicant provides a valuation for a potential residential development on the surgery land, but this does not meet the RICS valuation professional standards and no methodology is provided.
  - The valuation of paddock land is not evidenced and is not carried out by a qualified valuer. The land is open space and would have a nominal value.
  - There is no evidence submitted to support the assertion that the doctor's surgery funding is dependent on the land being gifted to the owners.
  - There is no reason why affordable housing should not be provided on site.
  - The houses are aimed at the higher end of the market.
  - The need in the village is for smaller, cheaper houses for younger people.

- Consideration in the SHELAA does not mean that planning permission will be granted for development on a site, and the current SHELAA assesses this site as 'not currently developable'.
- Not against a surgery, but Monastery Lane is not the right place.
- The building will contain more facilities than just a GP surgery, bringing extra traffic into the area.
- The backways of Fern Road, Monastery Lane, School Lane and Church Street are used by drivers to avoid lengthy queues at the Tesco roundabout. These roads have no pavements and pedestrian movement around the village will be challenging and unsafe.
- The development will add to congestion around the Tesco roundabout, which is already over-busy and dangerous.
- It can take 15-20 minutes to get 1.5 miles through the village in rush hour.
- Monastery Lane is a quiet, narrow lane and visibility is poor at the junction with the Tesco roundabout.
- The significant number of parking spaces will mean an unacceptable number of cars.
- 9 houses should not need 31 parking spaces.
- The village is an Air Quality Management Area and the pollution problem recently made the news.
- Additional traffic and pollution situation in Storrington will be made worse, with negative consequences for the environment and residents' health.
- The large dwellings would be out of context with the village.
- Development would erode a green finger in the village.
- Storrington is a countryside village, but there is very little countryside left.
- Development of the Glebe will harm wildlife and habitats.
- Proposal would cause light pollution.
- Concern that the retained open space would still be under pressure for development.
- Provision of a new pharmacy will have a detrimental impact on existing pharmacies in the village.
- There are already two pharmacies in the village. We do not need another.
- Loss of privacy to nearby residents.
- Development will impact the setting of the Conservation Area and listed building Lady Place.
- Lady Place was one of the first buildings to be listed in Storrington. It is one of the most historically significant houses in the village. Its documented history dates back beyond 1540.
- Historic connection between Lady Place and the Glebe Field will be lost.
- Buffer proposed to Lady Place is not adequate. Views of Lady Place must be preserved.
- Insufficient school places and other services to provide for the new residents.

3.21 The **letters of support** received in connection with the 9-unit scheme include the following points:

- The doctors are brilliant, but overworked and overstretched, with the current situation at breaking point.
- The surgery will not be able to continue without expansion.
- A new surgery is absolutely essential for the wellbeing of this community.
- Primary care services need to improve in order to avoid unnecessary admissions to hospital and over-burdening of hospitals.
- Patients find it extremely difficult to get a parking space at the Glebe, which is especially problematic for the elderly.
- New houses are being built/have been built recently in Storrington and this will stretch local medical services further.
- Building on the Glebe Field is regrettable, but it is a means to an end, as healthcare provision is a priority.

- The revised plans are an excellent compromise between the provision of a modern medical centre and the preservation of the Glebe.
- The Glebe Field would not be completely lost. Inclusion of public open space should be applauded.
- Loss of the Glebe has been over-exaggerated. Rarely see more than one or two people walking through it. Some local people do not even know it is there.
- 9 dwellings will not adversely affect the nature of the village, but not building a surgery will have huge implications for the area.
- The original scheme for 24 units had a better mix of housing.
- Support the application, in spite of the greed of the Glebe field owners, but the medical needs of a growing population trumps other considerations.
- The plan is imperfect, but objection would add to the stress placed on the practice.
- It makes sense to expand on the existing surgery, rather than start from scratch elsewhere.
- New medical facilities are desperately needed, particularly with an ageing population.
- Do not understand why the Mill Stream practice stands empty.
- There is not sufficient land at the Mill Stream site for this development.
- The public car park at the Mill Stream site is already heavily used and could not be relied upon to provide parking for an expanded surgery.
- Impact on Lady Place is minimal.
- Houses on the west side of the village will have less impact on the AQMA.

3.22 The **letters of representation** received in connection with the 9-unit scheme include the following points:

- No satisfactory answer has been given as to why the Mill Stream site cannot be used for a surgery.
- The re-designed scheme is more in keeping with local developments.
- The remaining fields should be protected for future generations and not developed at a later date.
- Concern regarding vehicle access- the mini roundabout must be upgraded to improve visibility.
- A 20mph speed limit should be enforced through the village.
- A pedestrian crossing is necessary on Amberley Road.
- Bus services in Storrington are appalling.

#### **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**

##### Introduction

6.1 The application site is located within the built-up area boundary of Storrington. Within such an area, the principle of development is acceptable, subject to compliance with the relevant Policies of the Development Plan. The provision of community facilities, such as a new



surgery, within the built-up areas is supported by Policies 43 and 42 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF), and the spatial strategy for the District seeks to focus new development within the built-up areas, including Storrington which is included in the 'small towns and larger villages' category of the settlement hierarchy at Policy 3. However, development proposals also need to meet the requirements of other relevant planning policies in order to be acceptable in planning terms, even where the Policy designations do not preclude the principle of development. In this case, the main considerations are the landscape and townscape impacts of the proposal, the effect on the setting of heritage assets (listed buildings and conservation area), highway safety and parking provision, ecology, flooding and drainage and any community benefits arising from the development.

### Landscape

- 6.2 The HDC Landscape Architect objects to the proposal, due to the extent of development resulting in an adverse effect on the landscape character and appearance of the area, as well as an adverse effect on the appreciation and views towards the South Downs.
- 6.3 The Landscape Architect makes reference to the *District Landscape Character Assessment (2003)*, which includes an assessment of the characteristics of settlements within the District. Key characteristics of Storrington identified in the Landscape Character Assessment include:
- Heavily indented edges with woodlands, heathlands and small hedgerowed fields making a distinctive contribution to setting
  - The small historic core of Storrington, centred around Church Street (to the west of the site, St Marys Church fronts this road) and High Street.
  - Built development widely visible from South Downs, but is considerably softened by woodland and mature trees.
  - Extensive low density residential areas with informal layouts and large plot sizes and a random pattern of dwelling sizes

Figure 7.10 of the Landscape Character Assessment includes the southern and eastern parts of the Glebe Field as a 'Key Open Space'.

- 6.4 The Glebe Field is one of the small fields that contribute to the 'indented' edge of the settlement, which is identified in the Landscape Character Assessment as making a distinctive contribution to the setting of Storrington. The Landscape Architect concludes that the proposed development would result in the loss of the openness of the site, and with it part of one of the key characteristics (the heavily indented settlement edge), which makes a significant positive contribution to the setting of the settlement. The Applicant disputes this assessment in their letter of 16th November 2016, suggesting that the characteristic indented edge of the settlement would be maintained as the development would be viewed entirely within the context of existing built form.
- 6.5 The undeveloped Glebe Field is visible in distance views from the South Downs. Although it only forms a minor part of such views, the Landscape Architect advises that its open qualities are still discernible and the development would result in the loss of this 'green finger' entering the settlement, and with it the indented settlement edge characteristic. In addition, the open nature of the site and the fact that it is very close to the village centre and crossed by public footpaths allows the indented edge to be experienced by users of the public rights of way crossing the site, providing a tranquil space with a rural character in close proximity to the urban area.
- 6.6 In addition to the impact on the 'indented edge', the proposal would result in adverse effects on landscape character when viewed from the existing footpaths crossing the site, as a result of the nature and magnitude of the change. Harm would arise as a result of the loss of views of the backdrop of the South Downs from the site, as well as the impact on

views from elevated points from the South Downs. As noted in the response from the WSCC Rights of Way Access Ranger, the proposed development encroaches onto the definitive line of the public right of way. However, the definitive line does not follow the existing trodden path across the site, which is the route proposed to be retained, running along the edge of the developed area. Therefore, the definitive route would be affected by the development, but the existing footpath access would be retained. The Applicant's Landscape and Visual Appraisal concludes that while the visual amenity of the majority of representative views would have a direct, long term and permanent, but neutral effect, it does acknowledge that the adverse impacts of the development in landscape terms would be limited to the public rights of way within the site, and from Rectory Road and Monastery Lane. The Applicant's assessment of the impact on views from the public rights of way concurs with the Council's Landscape Architect's assessment, i.e. that the development would result in an adverse impact on the existing high amenity value of the site as experienced from the existing footpaths, be those the existing trodden paths, or the definitive route of the public right of way.

- 6.7 The site slopes up towards the north east, and the Landscape Architect raises concern regarding the impact of development on the existing topography of the site, with development in the northern part of the site cutting into the landform and changing one of the key characteristics of the landscape. The design and layout of the development, including the proposed surgery building, does not appear to have had sufficient regard for the topography of the site, and this adds to the landscape harm identified above.
- 6.8 Clearly, the development of a currently open field will have some landscape impact. In considering the acceptability of a planning proposal, the extent of landscape harm needs to be weighed against the benefits arising from the proposal. In this case, it is acknowledged that the site lies within the built-up area boundaries and currently has no restrictive landscape designations covering it, although open land such as this in close proximity to the settlement edge does make a contribution to the setting of the settlement. The reduction in the scale of the proposal from 24 dwellings to 9 dwellings also significantly reduces the landscape impacts of the proposal. While the Landscape Architect's comments regarding the indented edge of the settlement are noted, this will still be experienced on the ground as a result of the retention of an area of public open space between the surgery and existing buildings to the east, and the larger area of public open space to the south of the site. The area to be occupied by new dwellings is to the north of Lady Place and Priory Close, and therefore would not be as visible in wider views as the original 24-unit proposal would have been. However, the surgery building has not been amended to address the Landscape Architect's original comments. The surgery building and its parking area is sited on a part of the site which slopes up from the lower, and flatter, area of ground immediately adjacent to Monastery Lane. The Landscape Architect had sought the re-siting of the surgery building and its parking area to better respect the site topography, and therefore reduce its landscape impacts. The surgery element however is unchanged in the amended scheme, and the Landscape Architect's concerns in this respect therefore remain unaddressed. The eastern side of the surgery building would dominate the western side of the public footpath emerging from West Street, with a length of around 39 metres, eaves at around 6.5m and ridge to 9.8m.
- 6.9 Taking into account the various assessments of landscape impacts carried out by Officers, the Applicant, the Council's Landscape Architect and in letters of representation, the Officer's conclusion on the main landscape issues is as follows:
- Residential and surgery element result in permanent harm to the visual amenities of the site in near views including those from public rights of way, Monastery Lane, St Mary's Church.
  - The residential element would result in very limited landscape harm in distance views from the SDNP.
  - The surgery element would result in landscape harm in distance views from the SDNP.

- The development would harm the characteristic ‘indented edge’ of the settlement in distance views, particularly as a result of the surgery building, but this characteristic would remain apparent on the ground, due to the proximity of retained open space to the urban core.
- 6.10 The landscape impacts identified above are considered in the overall planning balance later in this report. However, on the matter of landscape impacts there is harm arising, and this is contrary to Policies 1, 2, 25, 31 and 33 of the HDPF.

### Heritage

- 6.11 The site is adjacent to listed buildings at Lady Place and St Marys Church, and to the Storrington Conservation Area. As the Glebe Field itself is not covered by any policy designations, the appraisal of this planning proposal is assisted by an understanding of the historic context of the Glebe Field and its links with adjacent heritage assets. The site is a ‘glebe field’, which is commonly defined as land associated with the church and used by the clergyman to provide income, often for agricultural purposes. ‘Glebe fields’ are therefore normally found close to churches or rectories and their presence and layout can often assist in the understanding of the historic development and evolution of settlements.
- 6.12 St Marys Church is medieval in origin. The WSCC *Storrington Historic Character Assessment Report* (2005) examined the character of the urban area. Although this Report looked only at the urban area (the Report forms part of the Sussex Extensive Urban Survey), and therefore excluded the Glebe Field from detailed assessment, it provides a comprehensive description of the appearance and historical evolution of the Glebe’s surroundings, identifying character areas to the west and south of the site as *Historic Urban Character Area (HUCA) 1 (Church)* and the area to the north and east of the site as *HUCA 3 (West Street)*. These character areas are recognised as being part of the medieval town. Although many of the medieval plot boundaries in the ‘West Street’ character area have been lost through redevelopment, it is suggested that the existing irregular historic boundaries in the ‘Church’ character area may be of medieval origin.
- 6.13 *HUCA 1 (Church)* is described as encompassing the southern half of the likely extent of the medieval settlement of Storrington, and includes St Marys Church and Lady Place. The area is identified as having moderate to high archaeological potential due to lack of intensive 19th and 20th Century development. To address this potential for undisturbed archaeological remains at the site, if development were to be permitted, conditions would require the site to be subject to pre-commencement archaeological investigation.
- 6.14 The Historic Character Assessment Report assesses the vulnerability of each HUCA. The intention of such assessment is to focus conservation guidance. HUCA 1 (Church) is assessed as having a high vulnerability to change. The conversion, subdivision and infill of formerly extensive grounds are highlighted as the main threats to historic character. The report states that “*Nowhere is this more apparent than in the case of the Premonstratensian monastery and (outside the EUS study area itself) the fields between this and the church*”. This is a reference to the Glebe Field, and highlights its importance as a historic feature of the townscape. In concluding that the area has a high Historic Environment Value, the Report makes reference to “*the visibility of the historic fabric*” and “*the partly preserved historic interface of the settlement and the countryside*”. This reflects the characteristic indented settlement edge referred to by the Landscape Architect and the value that the Glebe Field has in terms of contributing to the setting of the settlement, and in particular its historic core.
- 6.15 The listed building St Mary’s Church lies within the Storrington Conservation Area, adjacent to the site. The Conservation Area encompasses much of the medieval core of the village, and parts of the later expansion on the fringes of the core. In light of the historic links

between the church, the pattern of development of the early settlement and the Glebe Field, the site provides an important contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area. The boundary of the Conservation Area does not include the full extent of the churchyard, and therefore does not directly abut the Glebe Field. However, the Conservation Area was designated in 1974 with the boundary drawn tightly around the churchyard at that time. The Conservation Area boundaries do not appear to have been reviewed since designation in 1974, but in 1996 a planning application permitted the change of use of part of the Glebe Field to burial ground (SR/43/96), thereby extending the churchyard.

- 6.16 Although there are strong connections between the Glebe Field and St Mary's Church (a listed building), the Applicant's Heritage Statement does not consider the impact of the proposal on this heritage asset, concluding that "*It is not considered that the development proposed at Storrington Glebe could materially affect the heritage significance of [the church]*". The Applicant's Heritage Statement concludes that the effect on the Conservation Area would be "*peripheral and so marginal as to border on the inconsequential*", informed by their assessment of the visibility of the Glebe from the Conservation Area, views of the Conservation Area from the Glebe and the absence of heritage designations on the land. The Conservation Officer's comments recognise the historic link between the Church and the Glebe Field and therefore the contribution that it makes to the setting of St Mary's and the Conservation Area, including the former Rectory. The Conservation Officer advises that the open, green land is considered to preserve the positive characteristics of the immediate locality, allowing the interpretation and understanding of sense of place and of the evolution of the historic context, and that the glebe land and its close association with the grade II\* listed Parish Church of Saint Mary can easily be appreciated with good intervisibility between the application site and the Church which is situated on raised ground to the south-east. As a result, the Conservation Officer advises that the views looking across the glebe land are considered to positively contribute to one's understanding and appreciation of the historic significance of the immediate context, and that this interpretation of the historic context would be obscured as a result of the introduction of an intense quantum of built form.
- 6.17 In addition to the heritage assets to the east of the site, the site is also adjacent to the listed building Lady Place, a former farmhouse with associated historic outbuildings. The Applicant's Heritage Statement focusses on the impact of development on this heritage asset. The Applicant concludes that Lady Place stands in a very different context to that of the 17th century and that there has been considerable change to the once rural surrounding landscape, which has been supplanted by residential development. The Applicant's view is that Lady Place is now best appreciated from its garden and close surroundings, given surrounding development and intervening structures and vegetation. The Applicant's Heritage Statement acknowledges that open views of Lady Place from the footpath and higher ground of the northern end of the Glebe would be obscured as a result of the proposal, but that the effect on the significance of the listed building would be very limited, as these views are mainly of the roofscape and the special interest of the building is not obvious in these views. While the Applicant notes that it is likely that the Glebe would always have been separate from the Glebe in ownership and association, and that there is no associative interest or historic functional relationships or connection between the two, the Conservation Officer advises that the Glebe field retains a sense of the historic open, rural and landscaped setting of Lady Place, and therefore is important in providing the character and context in which the heritage asset is experienced.
- 6.18 The Conservation Officer considers that the Applicant's Heritage Statement underplays the relationship between the site and Lady Place, and that the listed building and application site can easily be read together in short and wider views and there is good intervisibility between the two, including views from Monastery Lane across the curtilage of Lady Place to the open green field beyond. It is therefore considered that the application site does form part of the setting of Lady Place, allowing an appreciation of the relationship of the

listed building and the historic fieldscape of the Glebe, depicting the rural isolation that the listed building was originally set within. The two sites are read together in short and wider views and there is good intervisibility between the two. The proposal would result in the loss of this relationship and harm to the setting of Lady Place.

- 6.19 The Conservation Officer notes that the proposal relies heavily on landscape buffer planting in an attempt to screen the development from the listed building. In their additional information, the Applicant suggests that the additional planting could comprise evergreens and be protected by a Tree Preservation Order. However, it is unlikely that such planting would meet the requirements necessary to make a TPO. The PPG advises that in order to make a TPO the relevant tree(s) must be visible from a public place as well as being important by reference to characteristics including size, form, future amenity potential, rarity or historic value and contribution to the character of a conservation area. It is unlikely that newly planted trees forming part of a development proposal would meet these criteria. In addition, a TPO cannot be made on a hedge, and the planting of evergreens along the boundary with Lady Place is likely to result in the appearance of a dense hedge. Even if it were possible to place a TPO on the proposed new planting, landscaping should be used to enhance development which is not harmful, and cannot be relied upon to screen that which is harmful. Historic England's Good Practice Advice in Planning 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets does not rule out the use of screening landscaping to reduce the harm arising to a listed setting, but states that *"As screening can only mitigate negative impacts, rather than removing impacts or providing enhancement, it ought never to be regarded as a substitute for well-designed developments within the setting of heritage assets. Screening may have as intrusive an effect on the setting as the development it seeks to mitigate, so where it is necessary, it too merits careful design"*.
- 6.20 In addition, the Conservation Officer has advised that the proposed planting itself would result in an adverse impact on the character of the Glebe land, which is historically an open piece of land not heavily treed. The area of buffer planting is shown as an isolated parcel of land directly abutting the residential curtilages of proposed dwellings and Lady Place. It is not clear how this land would be accessed for management and maintenance of the planting, and who would undertake such tasks in the long term. Given the level of harm arising due to the scale and amount of development, it is considered that the proposed landscaping does not negate the harm arising to the setting of Lady Place.
- 6.21 The Applicant's supporting documents refer to the change in character of the area already implemented as a result of the Priory Close development, to the south of Lady Place. Although the development of Priory Close has introduced a higher density, more suburban element to the locality, it would appear from historic maps that this land was detached from the main Glebe land, with a field boundary shown on maps from 1788, and it was a more discreet component of the landscape. The majority of the Glebe Field remains intact. Furthermore, the presence of a development which encroaches on the setting of Lady Place and the setting of the Glebe land does not set a precedent for the further encroachment of development on the historic setting, which results in further harm to that setting and significance to the extent that the relationship of the Glebe and Lady Place would be entirely lost. The presence of the Priory Close development therefore adds weight to the concern raised regarding the loss of the majority of the remaining open land in this location.
- 6.22 The Conservation Officer's assessment is that the proposed housing development would adversely change the character of the site and the setting of adjacent heritage assets, including listed buildings and a Conservation Area, eroding the significant open field and its relationship with its surroundings. The Conservation Officer concludes that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed buildings and Conservation Area, but advises that any harm should be given considerable weight in the planning balance as such harm is permanent and irreversible.

- 6.23 In light of the strong association with the listed church and the Conservation Area, the HDC Conservation Officer advises that the Glebe Field has a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions because of its heritage interest and should therefore be considered a non-designated heritage asset. The Conservation Officer's view is that the Glebe Field, of historically open form, preserves the positive characteristics of the immediate locality, allowing the interpretation and understanding of sense of place and of the evolution of the historic context, as set out above. The Glebe land and its close association with the grade II\* listed Parish Church of Saint Mary can easily be appreciated with good inter-visibility between the application site and the church. The Conservation Officer advises that the proposed development would therefore result in the loss of a substantial part of the Glebe Field and therefore, the loss of this relationship causing harm to the setting of the listed church.
- 6.24 In respect of non-designated heritage assets, the NPPF (para 135) advises Local Planning Authorities that "*The effect of an application on a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset*". The proposal will result in the partial loss of the Glebe Field and therefore the partial loss of a non-designated heritage asset. However, a significant area of land will remain and the retained part will be that closest to the church, thereby retaining a connection between St Mary's and the Glebe. Whilst it would be ideal to preserve all that remains of the Glebe Field (the existing surgery has already encroached upon it), it is considered that, on balance, loss of part of the Glebe field could be acceptable, provided the benefits coming forward outweigh the harm arising from the partial loss.
- 6.25 Taking into account the various assessments of heritage impacts carried out by Officers, the Applicant, the Council's Conservation Officer and in letters of representation, the Officer's conclusion on the main heritage issues is as follows:
- The Glebe Field is a non-designated heritage asset, but an element of loss could be acceptable subject to sufficient benefits coming forward to outweigh that harm (reference to NPPF para 135).
  - The Glebe Field has value and importance in understanding the historic development of the village, including strong links to the Church and Rectory which result in it forming part of the setting of these heritage assets. Its partial loss therefore dilutes and obscures this understanding, but an area of the Glebe Field is retained between the Conservation Area and proposed development, providing an area of open land to act as a buffer between the development and the Conservation Area.
  - The development would harm the setting of Lady Place due to the introduction of development on an area of currently open land which reflects its original rural context and contributes positively to its setting.
  - The proposed area of buffer planting to the north of Lady Place would harm its setting due to the loss of open, rural character.
  - The heritage harm is less than substantial.
- 6.26 The heritage impacts identified above are considered in the overall planning balance later in this report. The NPPF advises that any harm to a heritage asset or its setting should require clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 134 states that "*where a development would 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*". The benefits of the scheme, and whether these outweigh the harm arising, are considered in the 'Planning Balance' section of this report. However, on the matter of heritage impacts, it is considered that proposal does not protect, conserve or enhance townscape and has a harmful impact on the significance of this non-designated

heritage asset and the setting of designated heritage assets, contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3, 25, 32, 33 and 34 of the HDPF.

### Townscape

- 6.27 As discussed above, the existing Glebe Field has landscape value and heritage value. Given its proximity to the village centre and location within the built-up area boundary, the site has close links with the townscape of Storrington. The existing undeveloped field contributes to the setting of the surrounding townscape, which is semi-rural in character as a result of the loose grain and irregular pattern of development surrounding the site, despite the proximity to the village centre and the location within a defined built-up area boundary. In addition to the advice provided by the Conservation Officer in respect of the contribution that the Glebe Field makes to the understanding of the historic context of the village, the Landscape Architect raises concern that the fundamental change to the predominantly rural character of the site arising from the development would also result in an adverse effect on the immediate townscape character.
- 6.28 The Glebe Field currently contributes positively to the rural sense of place in this location. The NPPF advises at paragraph 58 that planning decisions should aim to ensure that developments establish a strong sense of place and respond to local character and history, reflecting the identity of local surroundings, while paragraph 51 requires planning decisions to address the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment. In light of the landscape and heritage concerns arising, it is considered that the proposal also results in harm to townscape character, and the sense of place and historic context that the Glebe Field currently provides. The proposed development would not assist in establishing a strong sense of place and does not respond to local character and history, eroding the layout and setting of the historic core of the village, contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3, 32 and 33 of the HDPF.

### Design and Appearance

- 6.29 The design and appearance of the proposed residential buildings is typical of modern lower density suburban buildings. The dwellings are arranged in two cul-de-sacs to provide an irregular layout which avoids expansive parking courts. The layout incorporates landscaped areas and new planting around buildings and surfaced areas to assist in creating a verdant setting for the buildings. The dwellings incorporate a mix of roof forms and materials to add interest to the development. All of the buildings are limited to two storeys in height, with the exception of Plot 1 which has rooms in the roof space served by dormer windows. The proposed surgery building is of a larger scale than existing, but has been broken up through the use of different wings, each covered by a pitched roof and utilising a variety of materials such as brick, boarding and flint. Therefore, notwithstanding the concerns set out above relating to the extent of development across the Glebe Field and the impact of this on landscape, townscape and heritage, the external appearance of the buildings themselves would not add to this harm, subject to the use of a suitable palette of materials which reflects those predominantly used on buildings in the vicinity of the site.

### Highways and Parking

- 6.30 Each of the proposed semi-detached dwellings would be provided with a single garage and one surface parking space, and each of the detached dwellings would be provided with a double garage and two surface parking spaces. Three visitor spaces are proposed within the residential element. This is considered to be appropriate provision in this location, which is walking distance from the services and facilities within the village centre. The proposal would provide 58 parking spaces for the doctor's surgery, spread over two areas either side of the proposed building, along with covered cycle parking to the rear of the building. The Highway Authority's Parking Standards require provision of 4 spaces per

consulting room (23 consulting rooms proposed), 1 space per 20sqm of office space (around 280sqm office space proposed) and 1 space per 20sqm retail space (120sqm pharmacy proposed), totalling a maximum permissible standard of around 112 spaces for the surgery building. The Highway Authority advises that the proposed level of car parking will be sufficient to meet the expected demand in this case and raises no objection to parking provision within the development. The Highway Authority consultation response advises that the increased parking provision at the surgery should assist in reducing the off-site parking pressures along Monastery Lane.

- 6.31 A number of the letters of both objection and support raise concern regarding the site access, in particular safety issues arising from the roundabout at the junction of Monastery Lane, Amberley Road and the A283. On this particular issue, the Highway Authority assessment is as follows:

*“With respects to the A283/B2139/Monastery Lane mini-roundabout, visibility from the Monastery Lane arm is restricted as a consequence of the carriageway alignment. Based on the latest three year personal injury accident [data] obtained from the Police, there are no recorded accidents. It is apparent that despite the existing restriction that traffic is using the junction without any detriment to safety. Whilst the proposed development would give rise to an intensification of use of this junction, based upon paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework, a development could only be resisted or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of the development are severe. WSCC are satisfied that based upon evidence available, that no severe safety or capacity impact would result at this junction.”*

As such, refusal on the basis of the impact of increased use of this roundabout, or the requirement for any approval of this application being subject to improvements to this roundabout, is not supported by the Highway Authority, and the LPA has no evidence to justify taking an alternative view.

- 6.32 The Highway Authority raises no objection to the proposal, subject to conditions and to a financial contribution of £7,000 to implement waiting restrictions on Monastery Lane and within the development to maintain visibility splays, if this proves necessary once the development is operational. As such, no objections are raised in respect of parking and highway issues and the proposed development is considered to accord with the requirements of the NPPF and Policies 40 and 41 of the HDPF.

#### Ecology, Biodiversity and Arboriculture

- 6.33 There are no protected trees within the site, and existing boundary vegetation is proposed to be retained and enhanced. No objections are therefore raised in respect of trees and arboriculture, subject to conditions to ensure the protection of retained vegetation during the construction process.
- 6.34 The Applicant has provided a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, which identified potential for reptiles within the site, as well as a number of ecological enhancements that could be delivered through the development. The Applicant also provides a Reptile Report, which confirms the presence of reptiles and the need for mitigation including the relocation of reptiles to the portion of the site not proposed for development. The Council's Ecology Consultant raises no objection to the proposal, subject to conditions requiring approval of a detailed reptile mitigation strategy and an ecological mitigation and enhancement plan, to ensure that full details of the recommendations put forward in the Applicant's supporting information are approved and implemented. Subject to these controls, the proposal would accord with the requirements of Policy 31 of the HDPF.



## Sustainability

- 6.35 The site is located within walking distance of the village centre, with its local services and facilities, as well as the main bus routes through the village. The site is therefore a sustainable location for development.
- 6.36 The application does not put forward details of energy use or sustainable construction as required by Policies 36 and 37 of the HDPF. However, the matters of building efficiency and energy use are controlled through the Building Regulations. This is an 'area of serious water stress' and therefore a condition requiring compliance with the higher level building regulations for water use limitation would be necessary.
- 6.37 Parts of Storrington village centre are designated as an Air Quality Management Area. The HDC Environmental Health Officer recommends that mitigation is incorporated into the development, to be detailed in an Air Quality Mitigation Plan. This is likely to include measures such as the provision of electric vehicle charging points and a sustainable travel plan to encourage sustainable transport choices. This is to be secured by condition.
- 6.38 The Environmental Health Officer highlights a lack of information accompanying the application regarding land quality. As such, conditions are recommended to require approval of a risk assessment to identify potential land contamination, with subsequent approval and implementation of any mitigation measures considered necessary as a result of the risk assessment and site investigation.
- 6.39 In light of the above, no objections are raised in respect of sustainability, subject to conditions in the event that planning permission is granted.

## Retail

- 6.40 The proposal includes a pharmacy of about 120sqm. A pharmacy is a Class A1 retail use. Some of the letters of representation have raised concern regarding the impact of the proposed pharmacy on existing pharmacies within the village centre. Policy 13 of the HDPF seeks to locate main town centre uses within existing centres, in order to maintain the vitality and viability of existing centres. The Policy allows for small scale retail development outside of defined town and village centres where it will not significantly undermine the vitality and viability of the nearest village centre. In this case, a pharmacy has strong links to the main use of the building as a doctor's surgery, and could be considered an ancillary use to the main Class D1 medical centre use. A pharmacy is likely to be used by patients to collect prescriptions and purchase medicines in connection with their visit to the surgery, and would generate limited visits to the pharmacy alone. The inclusion of a pharmacy within the surgery building therefore is likely to reduce trips to the village centre for pharmacy uses, and therefore would assist in a reduction of short trips (i.e. driving to the surgery and then on to a pharmacy) within the Air Quality Management Area .
- 6.41 It is noted that pharmacies currently exist in the village centre. However, in this case it is considered that inclusion of a small pharmacy within the surgery would not undermine the overall retail function of the centre, provided the use of the retail element is limited to pharmacy use only (and no other purpose within Class A1 of the Use Classes Order), or as part of the main surgery use. This would prevent alternative retail uses becoming established at the site (such as a convenience store), which would generate significant trips over and above those generated by the surgery alone and would have the potential to affect the retail function of the village centre and unnecessarily add to vehicle movements in the AQMA. Such conditions would also ensure that the A1 use remains ancillary to the main D1 use, even in the event that the pharmacy is run as a separate business. As such, no objections are raised to the principle of including a small pharmacy use within a new surgery building.

### Drainage and Flood Risk

- 6.42 The application includes a flood risk assessment, which includes an outline drainage strategy. The HDC Drainage Engineer and WSCC Flood Risk Management team raise no objection to the proposals, subject to conditions to secure approval of full details of the drainage scheme, along with details of its longer term management and maintenance. No objections are therefore raised in respect of drainage and flood risk.

### Amenity of Existing and Future Occupiers

- 6.43 The proposed dwellings are sited sufficiently away from existing neighbouring properties to prevent a loss of amenity and privacy. The proposed layout demonstrates that the proposed dwellings would be provided with sufficient garden space to provide future occupiers with a reasonable amount of outdoor space. The EHO notes that no details of plant serving the proposed doctor's surgery have been provided, and requests a condition requiring approval of details to ensure that any noisy plant would be suitably mitigated to prevent undue disturbance to adjacent residents. No objections are therefore raised in respect of the amenity of existing and future occupiers.

### Affordable Housing

- 6.44 Policy 16 requires 20% of new dwellings on sites providing 5 to 14 units to be affordable, which equates to 2 units in this scheme of 9 units. The Applicant does not propose to provide any affordable units on-site. While recent experiences suggest that many Registered Providers are not willing to take on small numbers of units such as this, and therefore the Council may determine that a financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision of affordable units is appropriate, the Applicant has not provided evidence of any discussions with Registered Providers. Where the Council does accept that a financial contribution in lieu of on-site affordable housing provision is acceptable, this should be calculated in accordance with the latest draft Affordable Housing and Planning Obligations SPD, as the methodology contained therein is based on more up-to-date background evidence than the adopted 2007 Planning Obligations SPD. In support of their position, the Applicant initially relied on the Planning Practice Guidance which advises that LPAs should not seek affordable housing or infrastructure contributions on residential developments of 10 units or less, and which have a combined floor area of no more than 1000sqm. Not only do the dwellings in this case have a gross internal floor area of over 1000sqm (in the region of 1400sqm excluding garaging), but this Council have a strong and demonstrable need for affordable housing and therefore continue to apply the adopted Policy 16 to developments of less than 10 units. This approach has been supported by Inspectors. The Applicant was therefore asked to provide further evidence in support of their non-compliance with Policy 16. Such evidence would normally comprise a full financial viability assessment (taking into account matters such as land values, build costs, developer profit, professional fees, market value of development etc), which would be appraised and verified by an independent financial consultant appointed by the Council.
- 6.45 However, the Applicant has not taken this approach. Instead, they have provided a statement which, in summary, states:
- Based on the gross internal floor area of the dwellings, the affordable housing contribution (in accordance with the draft Planning Obligations SPD) would be in the region of £219,170. *[Note that Officers concur with this figure]*
  - Land for a doctor's surgery is to be 'gifted'.
  - If that 'gifted' land were developed to provide 6 dwellings, including 5 affordable units, the land value would be in the region of £215,000.
  - Around 3.07 acres of land will be transferred to the Parish Council as public open space.
  - Paddock land is valued at around £30,000 per acre. *[3.07 acres equates to around £92,100]*

- The value of the land being 'gifted' therefore has a value in excess of £305,000, which is in excess of the contribution which would otherwise be sought in lieu of on-site affordable housing provision.

6.46 However, the Council are not considering a proposal for dwellings on the land proposed for a surgery. That land is currently paddocks, as per the remainder of the site and therefore has limited existing use value. It is noted that third party representations raise concern regarding the non-provision of affordable housing, and the financial/contractual arrangements between the various parties involved, which suggest that the development is viable and should be able to provide a policy-compliant level of affordable housing. Officers agree that there is little clarity provided on the matter of the inter-reliance on various elements of the proposal in financial terms, and that the Applicant's statement on affordable housing adds little in support of their case.

6.47 However, setting aside the monetary valuations provided by the Applicant, the crux of their argument in support of the non-compliance with Policy 16 does not rely on a detailed analysis of the financial matters. Rather, their case in support of non-compliance with Policy 16 is that other community benefits will come forward as a result of this proposal, which are material considerations of sufficient weight to outweigh the affordable housing policy requirements in this case.

6.48 In light of the other community benefits coming forward, the conflict with Policy 16 is considered in the overall planning balance later in this report.

#### Infrastructure

6.49 The County Council has identified a need for financial contributions towards local primary, secondary and sixth form education to mitigate the impacts of new residents on these local services. The requested contributions total £88,751. The Applicant's Agent has confirmed that the applicant is willing to make this contribution. As such, the impact on local infrastructure arising from the development can be mitigated. While affordable housing is normally the priority when an Applicant offers a reduced contribution in comparison to that sought, it is noted that schools in the locality are currently operating at or above the recommended capacity of 95% across an area, and that there is significant pressure on education provision in the area. As such, in this instance it is considered that it is appropriate to allocate the contribution of £88,751 that the Applicant is able to provide to education as set out in the WSCC consultation response.

#### Other Material Considerations

6.50 The Applicant's Planning Statement compares the current proposal to the development at Priory Close, between Lady Place and the Our Lady of England site, stating their view that as Priory Close was considered to be sustainably located and developable in principle, the development of this site should also be. However, as set out above the application site and Priory Close are materially different. The large Church of Our Lady of England building (the unlisted Catholic church), lies to the south of Priory Close, screening views of the Priory Close development in the wider landscape. Although the new dwellings on Priory Close are visible from the rights of way crossing the site, they are set well back from the footpaths. That development therefore has a significantly different, and less harmful, impact on landscape character. It also appears from historic maps that the parcel of land on which Priory Close is sited did not form part of the original Glebe Field and therefore did not involve developing a parcel of land with the same strong links to the medieval church and the historic core of the village as the Glebe Field does. The Priory Close development therefore did not amount to development of a non-designated heritage asset. In addition, although the Priory Close development does affect the setting of Lady Place, it did not result in the same level of harm to the setting of Lady Place as the current proposal, given

that the Glebe Field provides a rural setting and open backdrop to the listed building. The current proposal would result in loss of a non-designated heritage asset and the listed curtilage of Lady Place being impacted by development, significantly changing the listed setting from the rural backdrop provided by the Glebe Field which has formed part of the setting of Lady Place since it was first constructed, to that of a suburban housing estate. As such, the impacts of the development at Priory Close are materially different to those arising from the current proposal, and it does not set a precedent for permitting the current proposal.

- 6.51 The Applicant also makes reference to the inclusion of the site in the SHELAA (Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Appraisal) in support of the development of the site. A SHELAA is the technical exercise of gathering together information to create a portfolio of sites which may be considered for future planning purposes (for example in a Site Allocations SPD or a Neighbourhood Plan) and forms part of the evidence base for the HDPF. It is a fairly broad-brush, desk-based, technical exercise to provide an assessment of potential housing and economic land capacity, and is not subject to any public consultation or detailed assessment of potential site constraints. An adopted development plan document such as a Local Plan, a Supplementary Planning Document or a Neighbourhood Plan may include site allocations, but these documents go through a rigorous and transparent process of public consultation and examination, which is quite different to the SHELAA. The SHELAA page of the Council's website includes the clear caveat that *"the assessment of sites for new housing in the SHELAA does not mean that a site will be granted planning permission or allocated for development in any future plans. Any planning proposals on sites identified in the SHELAA will be judged on their merits against relevant planning policies and any other material considerations"*. Therefore, the SHELAA assessment does not reflect the full assessment carried out through the planning application process, and the consideration of a planning application (i.e. reasons for permitting or refusing an application), or other appraisals (such as those in connection with planning policy documents such as a Neighbourhood Plan) will feed into any revisions to the SHELAA.
- 6.52 Even at this high level, the current SHELAA identifies the Glebe as being 'not currently developable', on account of visual intrusion, loss of recreational space, effect on the setting of the Conservation Area and identification in the draft SSWNP as a Local Green Space. The earlier SHELAA assessment for the Glebe Field identified that development in the south and east is not suitable due to visual intrusion, and included the site in the '6-10 years developable' category. Notwithstanding the current SHELAA assessment of the site, the SHELAA does not hold weight as a material consideration in the determination of a planning application.
- 6.53 A number of third party representations make reference to the Draft SSWNP and its designation of the Glebe Field as a 'Local Green Space'. The Applicant's supporting information refers to the lack of evidence to support this designation, as identified in the Examiner's report of the SSWNP. The SSWNP was not found to meet the basic conditions necessary to proceed to referendum and cannot therefore be afforded weight in decision making. There is currently no Neighbourhood Plan in place, and no current draft NP to have regard to. The Parish Council's consultation response advises that a report considering the potential for designation of Local Green Spaces within the Parish has been produced. However, at the time of drafting this Committee Report, the Parish Council's Local Green Spaces report had not been published and is not publicly available. Therefore, it is not possible to consider the findings of that report at this time. Notwithstanding the absence of that supporting information, even if the Parish Council's report does recommend the allocation of this, or other, land as a Local Green Space, the allocation would not be confirmed until it has been through the full plan-making process (public consultation, examination, referendum). Therefore, the potential allocation of the Glebe Field as Local Green Space holds very little weight at this time.

- 6.54 However, in light of the representations and the earlier draft SSWNP designation, it is useful to review the NPPF criteria for designation of land as 'Local Green Space' at paragraph 77, which is as follows:  
*The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:*
- *where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;*
  - *where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and*
  - *where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.*
- 6.55 The HDC Landscape Architect's comments on the Applicant's rebuttal to the initial consultation response highlights that the Glebe Field appears to meet these criteria. It is in close proximity to the community it serves, it is demonstrably special to the local community (evidenced by the level of representations raising concern regarding the development of the field) and it holds particular local significance as a result of its historic value, landscape value and contribution to the setting of the townscape and historic core of the village. The Glebe Field is also local in character and not an extensive tract of land. While the site is not allocated as such at this stage and therefore does not have the protection afforded to a designated 'Local Green Space', the relevance of these criteria to the Glebe Field adds weight to its value as an integral part of the local townscape. However, it must be noted in assessing this proposal, that a substantial area of the existing Glebe Field would be retained as public open space, and would continue to fulfil the NPPF paragraph 77 criteria.

#### Matters Contributing to the Planning Balance

- 6.56 Paragraph 15 of the NPPF sets out the requirement for Local Plans to be based on the presumption in favour of sustainable development, with clear policies that will guide how the presumption should be applied locally. An up-to-date Local Plan or Development Plan which has been prepared in accordance with the objective of achieving sustainable development and is consistent with the presumption in favour of sustainable development should therefore be afforded great weight in decision making, and where a development is inconsistent with policies of a relevant, up-to-date development plan, the starting point is that the development should not be approved. However, the NPPF also allows for consideration of other matters which could result in a proposal amounting to 'sustainable development'. This is particularly true where there are exceptional circumstances comprising substantial and objective benefits which outweigh the adverse starting point of conflict with the Development Plan.
- 6.57 As a starting point in this case therefore, the proposal is contrary to the relevant Development Plan Policies relating to landscape, townscape and heritage impacts, as well as affordable housing policies, which is a consideration of substantial weight against the proposal. In addition, the NPPF is clear that 'great weight' should be given to the conservation of heritage assets. The Council also has a duty under section 66 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to "*have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting*" in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting.
- 6.58 The NPPF states that there are three dimensions to sustainable development- economic, social and environmental- and that these three roles should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. To achieve sustainable development, the NPPF states that economic, social and environmental gains (*Officer emphasis*) should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.

- 6.59 The proposed development would result in social and environmental losses due to the absence of affordable housing provision and the landscape, townscape and heritage harm arising. For the reasons set out above relating to the primacy of the development plan and the guidance at paragraph 132 of the NPPF, these amount to great weight against the proposal.
- 6.60 However, there are also benefits of the development to be considered in the balance. The proposal would deliver 9 new dwellings on a site within the built-up area where residential development would, in principle, be consistent with the spatial strategy for growth set out in the HDPF. This is a benefit of the development and new housing in general provides social and economic gains. However, development proposals should comply with all relevant policies, not only those relating to the principle of development and housing supply. Although a five year housing land supply can be demonstrated within Horsham District, appeal decisions have established that housing targets are not to be taken as a ceiling figure. The provision of 9 dwellings would contribute to the NPPF's requirement for a significant boost in housing and to achieving the Council's target of 800 dwellings per annum. However, new housing should be delivered in accordance with the relevant Policies of the Local Plan, and in this case, the residential element is the key concern which results in objections to the proposal. In this case, if the application were permitted, these dwellings would be considered a 'windfall' development, and would contribute to the HDPF target of 750 'windfall' units in the plan period to 2031. Therefore the Council's ability to meet a 5-year housing land supply and to deliver 16,000 new dwellings in the plan period is not reliant on the construction of 9 dwellings at this site. Although the delivery of housing here represents a social and economic gain of the proposal, this is of limited weight in this case as a result of the conflicts of the proposal with the adopted Development Plan.
- 6.61 The Applicant intends for the surgery car park to be available for public use outside of surgery opening hours, and puts this forward as a benefit. Letters of representation refer to the potential use of the surgery car park for users of the village hall on West Street as a benefit of the proposal. However, it is not clear that there is high parking demand outside of the village centre and outside of normal opening hours. Furthermore, the extended opening hours and additional services to be provided by the new surgery building outlined in the supporting information suggests that the proposed surgery car park is likely to be in use by surgery users well into the evenings. As such, the potential use of the proposed surgery car park by other parties is not considered to be a public benefit of any weight in favour of, or against, the proposal.
- 6.62 The Applicant puts forward the proposed area of public open space as a benefit of the proposal. From the representations received, the Glebe Field is used by local residents for recreation, with some references to playing on the field or community gatherings having taken place there in the past. However, the majority of references are to the use of the land for walking (both as a route for trips to and from the village and for recreational purposes such as short walks and to access the wider countryside to the south from the village) and for exercising dogs. While unrestricted access is currently enjoyed over a fairly large proportion of the Glebe Field, it is private land and the public only have a formal right of access over the definitive route of the public right of way. The existing access to the Glebe Field could be withdrawn by the landowner at any time, with access limited to the public right of way only. Although there is support for the allocation of the site as Local Green Space by the Parish Council and in some letters of representation, the land is currently not allocated as such and there are no restrictive planning policy designations on the land.
- 6.63 The existing Glebe Field has an area in the region of 2 hectares. About 1.24 hectares of land is proposed to be retained as public open space, equating to just over half of the existing land. Although representations note that a turning head by Plot 8 would appear to

suggest an intention for further development of the land proposed for public open space, the land is proposed to be 'gifted' to the Parish/District Council and therefore its long term openness would be secured. The turning head would provide access to the public open space for grounds keeping equipment. In order for the benefit of the retention of the land shown for public open space to be considered a 'benefit' of the proposal, full ownership of the land, unfettered by restrictive covenants, would need to be transferred to the District or Parish Council. This would need to be secured by way of a Legal Agreement prior to any permission being granted for development. Given the existing private ownership of the land, the transfer to public ownership and retention as open space is a benefit of significant weight in support of the proposal, although this is tempered to a degree as part of the existing Glebe Field would be developed.

- 6.64 The key benefit put forward by this application is the new and enlarged doctor's surgery itself. The Applicant's Planning Statement sets out their assessment of the level of harm arising from the proposed development, and considers that this is entirely outweighed by the delivery of a new surgery building. Contrary to the assessment of the Council's Landscape Architect, the Applicant considers that the proposal would positively respond to the landscape and fully respect the topography of the site. Contrary to the assessment of the Council's Conservation Officer, the Applicant considers that the benefits of the scheme outweighs the negligible harm of the development proposal to the setting of Lady Place, although it also states that the proposed landscaped area adjacent to Lady Place would prevent any potential harm caused to the setting of the heritage asset. It is also the Applicant's view that the benefit of delivery of the new surgery and the provision of public open space outweighs the need to provide affordable housing in accordance with Policy 16.
- 6.65 The Applicant's Planning Statement sets out the current issues concerning GP provision in the Storrington area, including the deficiencies of the existing building. The Applicant sets out that the patient list has grown from 8,000 to 11,500 in the last two years, due in part to the closure of the Mill Stream surgery, and that this is predicted to reach 15,000 patients by 2019/20. They advise that the existing surgery is about 420sqm in area (this figure does not appear to include the two existing portacabins), and that in order to meet the needs of 15,000 patients by 2020, a 1,400sqm building is necessary, also taking account of planned expanded core hours, potential for seven day working, providing out of hospital services (e.g. counselling, physiotherapy, occupational therapy, minor surgery, community midwifery) and social and third sector services. The Applicant also intends for the new surgery building to provide an environment for health and social care professionals to work together to support patients, to provide a space for patient groups to meet and to allow the surgery to have trainees in attendance. The Applicant advises that many patients attend the surgery with minor injuries, rather than directly to a hospital emergency department due to the distance to the nearest three major hospitals, and that the larger building will provide the opportunity to expand this type of service.
- 6.66 The Planning Statement identifies shortcomings of the existing accommodation, including only 8 parking spaces, only two toilets (one suitable for disabled access), insufficient consulting and nursing rooms (all of which do not meet current design standards), lack of waiting room space, no private room for patient use, insufficient room for storage of non-electronic patient notes (majority held off-site), no room designated as educational, conference room or staff area. In the event that permission is not granted for the expanded surgery on this site, the Applicant indicates that a third portacabin will be necessary, and this would result in the loss of parking spaces within the site. In addition, an on-going lack of space could necessitate the surgery providing core services only.
- 6.67 From the information submitted, and in light of the representations received and consultation responses from the CCG in connection with this application, it is clear that the existing building at the Glebe Surgery is not sufficient in size to serve the local community

and that expanded or additional facilities in the village are necessary in order to meet demand and provide an improved GP service. The proposal would deliver a significant public benefit in terms of the proposed surgery, which would meet the current, and forecast, deficiency in GP provision in the area.

- 6.68 Considering the surgery element alone, the expanded surgery site would encroach on the Glebe Field, but to a far lesser extent than the residential element. The Landscape Architect is concerned that the surgery proposals do not respect the existing topography of the site, as the development would 'cut into' the existing landform. The Conservation Officer's concerns relating to the proposal identify issues such as intervisibility between Lady Place and the Glebe Field, as well as impact on setting of the Conservation Area and St Marys Church and the partial loss of the Glebe Field as a non-designated heritage asset. These harmful impacts arising from the surgery alone are considered to be limited due to the distance of separation and the area of land involved. It is therefore considered that the public benefit of provision of a new surgery building is sufficient to outweigh the limited landscape and heritage harm arising from the surgery element alone.
- 6.69 However, the application does not propose a surgery alone, and involves much wider development of the Glebe Field for 9 dwellings (with no affordable housing on-site or financial contribution towards off-site provision). It is this element of the proposal which results in the greatest harm due to the extent of the development over the Glebe Field and its proximity to Lady Place. The main consideration in balancing the harm and benefits of this proposal is therefore whether delivery of the proposed doctors surgery is a benefit of sufficient weight to justify setting aside the requirements of the landscape, townscape, heritage and affordable housing policies of the HDPF and permitting the residential element alongside the surgery element. It is therefore necessary to assess the need for housing in this location and for residential development of the extent and quantum proposed, as well as whether it is necessary to provide the residential element of the scheme in order to deliver expanded GP provision in the village.
- 6.70 The Applicant's Planning Statement says that "*The Glebe site is the only site within the Storrington Area which could accommodate a [GP] facility of the size required*" (Officer underlining). The Applicant's Statement and many of the letters of representation received (both in support and objection) refer to the Mill Stream Surgery. Many letters of objection refer to a preference for a new surgery at the Mill Stream site, with reasons including it being more accessible by pedestrians and by residents to the north and east of the village, the access to Mill Stream being safer than access to the Glebe, and the redevelopment of Mill Stream not requiring residential development of the Glebe Field. Many of the letters of support note the availability of the Mill Stream site, but support the Applicant's view that delivery of a surgery at that site is not viable.
- 6.71 In addition, the CCG has written in support of the application, and has advised that the Mill Stream site was considered as an alternative by the CCG as part of their consideration of whether to support the Glebe's bid for funding from the NHS. The CCG concluded that the Mill Stream site was unsuitable, for reasons including the size (Mill Stream was only 1/3 of the size of the new surgery) and additional cost factors such as sewerage, river bank enhancements and additional land costs from multiple owners to expand the site.
- 6.72 By way of background, the Mill Stream surgery was closed by the NHS in May 2014 following on-going concerns about the practice, in particular the management of its contract and protection of patients. At the time of closure, NHS England advised that "*As there are three local GP practices within 6.5 miles of the Mill Stream Medical Centre, and one local practice within 11 miles, who all have space on their lists to take on all of Mill Stream's patients between them, NHS England has concluded that it is not viable to continue running the practice*" (letter to Nick Herbert MP, 07.05.2014). The other practices referred to in the letter are The Glebe, Pulborough Primary Care Centre, Billingshurst Surgery and



Steyning Health Centre. In August 2014, the District Council purchased the Mill Stream surgery. There were three reasons outlined at the time for purchasing the property, which were (a) potential to create a larger combined doctors practice in the locality to replace the Glebe Surgery (b) to remove a ransom hold over access to land at the rear of the property owned by the District and Parish Councils and (c) for re-letting to generate a revenue stream. The Council's press release of 25.06.2014 states that the Council has "*been talking with the NHS and doctors from the nearby Glebe Surgery about the possibility of developing a medical health centre which would provide state-of-the-art healthcare facilities*". However, in the time since the Council purchased the Mill Stream site, no firm proposals for a new surgery at the site have been forthcoming from Doctors/NHS England and the Council has had no option but to secure a revenue stream from the Mill Stream property, as anticipated in the original purchase report, through letting the building for an alternative use. A lease agreement is currently being finalised and therefore the Mill Stream site is therefore no longer available for development of a new surgery or medical centre at the current time.

- 6.73 The Applicant's Planning Statement states that "*this much needed new facility cannot be provided without the delivery of new houses on the site*", and goes on to say that "*the land required for the new surgery can only be released by the land owner if new houses are to be delivered on site*". It also advises that there "*would be no feasible funding mechanism for the Mill Stream site, as opposed to the Glebe Site, which would be facilitated by the delivery of new housing*" and that the provision of the doctor's surgery on the site "*requires the delivery of housing in order to fund the new medical facility*". These statements are not entirely clear on the matter of the link between the residential and surgery elements of the scheme.
- 6.74 The Applicant does not make the case that the residential development is necessary to provide funding for the surgery development. Instead, it is the case that the owner of the Glebe Field (including the land which is required for the surgery expansion) has indicated that they are not willing to release land for the surgery extension unless planning permission to develop dwellings on the Glebe Field is granted. No case has been made to show that the delivery of an extended surgery would only be viable should permission be granted for residential development of the scale proposed. Therefore, the proposed number of units and the extent of land proposed for residential development is not in any way linked to the funding of the surgery, but rather the provision of land to enable delivery of a larger surgery building forms the link. The residential element is to be constructed on land which will be in separate ownership from the surgery (once it has been transferred from the existing landowner) and the revenue generated by the residential element would not contribute to the funding of the surgery. Rather, the landowner would benefit from any uplift in land value of the land for residential use, and the residential developer would benefit from any revenue from sales of the dwellings in the event that permission were granted.
- 6.75 Given the need for expanded GP provision in the village, the identified harm arising from the proposal, and the lack of a demonstrable funding link between the residential and surgery elements here, it is relevant to consider whether this is the only site which could deliver the necessary medical centre provision to the community, and whether it is likely that an alternative scheme resulting in less harm could come forward. For example, a site search or call for sites by the Applicant may identify potential sites which could accommodate a surgery building, for example within the industrial or commercial areas within the village, or on sites with development potential which could be assessed through the preparation of a new draft SSWNP. Although the applicant has not submitted any detailed site assessments report, the CCG have confirmed that some options were considered, and specifically that the Mill Stream site has been assessed and discounted by the CCG. In any event, the Mill Stream site it is no longer available.

- 6.76 Although the application was not accompanied by any clear statement from the funding body for this scheme, nor the terms of that funding (site, size of building, location etc) and whether there is any flexibility for amending or relocating the surgery element to address concerns raised by consultees and by local residents, the Coastal West Sussex Clinical Commissioning Group has provided some background information to the funding arrangements. They advise that the NHS cannot fully fund new build surgeries, and that the majority of new surgery developments come forward as a result of Practices working with third party developers/landlords to provide accommodation under a lease. The CCG also advised that the NHS grant in this case will allow the rent charge to be reduced for the duration of the lease. They also advise that the grant is time restricted, and that the building must be completed and in service by the start of 2019.
- 6.77 On the basis of the information available at this time, it would appear as though, without funding in place for purchase of an alternative site and construction of a surgery upon it, the options for alternative sites for construction of a surgery are extremely limited, if not non-existent in the short to medium term. While it has not been demonstrated that, should a surgery not be delivered on this site (which is currently tied up with a residential element, resulting in conflict with adopted Planning Policies), one will not come forward elsewhere, and it is not clear that the expansion of the Glebe site is the only option that could be funded by the NHS and will deliver an improved GP service to the local community, no alternative proposals have come forward, other than the Mill Stream site which has since been discounted on suitability grounds, and in event no longer available. The ability of this scheme to deliver a new and expanded medical centre to serve the local community is therefore a very strong material consideration in support of this proposal.

#### Conclusion and Overall Planning Balance

- 6.78 The proposal attracts material objections of substantial weight, in particular the harm to the setting of designated heritage assets and loss of a non-designated heritage asset, as well as harm to landscape and townscape character and non-provision of affordable housing. These issues result in the proposal being contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan.
- 6.79 An extended surgery building would provide a much needed local service, which attracts significant weight as a benefit. In addition, the proposal would secure the long-term retention of the remaining Glebe Land as public open space, which too is a benefit. The new housing is also a benefit, although the policy conflicts arising from this part of the scheme reduce the weight than can be afforded to the benefit of housing provision.
- 6.80 The Glebe Field is an important non-designated heritage asset, which has value as contributing to the rural setting of the village, thereby contributing to the sense of place and the landscape value of the site, as well as forming part of the setting of listed buildings and the Conservation Area. However, the loss is not total, and over half of the existing Glebe Field is intended to be retained as open space, and 'gifted' to the Parish Council. The retained Glebe Field would ensure that the 'indented edge' of the settlement pattern is not entirely lost, and that there are still connections from the village centre to the rural area and countryside beyond through the retained and publically accessible Glebe. As such, subject to transfer of ownership of the Glebe Field to the Parish/District Council to secure its long term protection, the impacts of the proposal on townscape and landscape are limited, and are considered to be outweighed by the benefits arising.
- 6.81 In addition, the development is confined to the north-western part of the Glebe Field, retaining a substantial area of open space to the south, which would be well-related to and visually connected with the Conservation Area and St Mary's Church, thereby retaining the historic connection between these designated heritage assets and the remaining Glebe Field. It is considered that these elements of the 'less than substantial harm' identified by

the Conservation Officer are in this instance outweighed by the significant public benefits of the proposal, as per paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

- 6.82 While the impact on the setting of Lady Place is also assessed by the Conservation Officer as being 'less than substantial', the close proximity of the development to this listed building, the loss of views of it from the Glebe and from Monastery Lane and the resulting enclosure of the curtilage of Lady Place by residential development lead Officers to conclude that the harm to the setting of Lady Place is at a higher level than that to the Conservation Area, St Mary's Church and the Glebe itself. However, the building would not be lost, its original curtilage would be retained, and the un-developed boundary with the Glebe Field directly to the rear of the building at Lady Place would be retained. On balance, and considering the public benefits coming forward in terms of the surgery and public open space, it is considered that this harm is acceptable when weighted against the public benefits in accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF.
- 6.83 The District has a significant need for new affordable dwellings, and Policy 16 is in place to assist in the provision of new affordable housing to meet that need. Policy 16 would require the provision of two affordable units, although if the Council were minded to accept a financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision this would equate to around £219,170. Clearly, the provision of affordable units provides a benefit to the local community, assisting those in housing need to find suitable accommodation. However, it is recognised that the provision of an enlarged and expanded GP surgery with many additional facilities and services would also provide very significant benefits to the local community. Therefore, in this particular instance it is considered that, on balance, the overall community benefits of this specific proposal are sufficient to outweigh the non-provision of a limited level of affordable housing.
- 6.84 Having reviewed the Applicant's submitted information, the third party representations, consultee comments and the relevant local and national planning policies, guidance and background documents, Officers conclude that there are sufficient benefits arising from the proposal to tip the balance of material considerations in favour of permission.
- 6.85 Given the harm arising from the proposal, in particular the residential element, it will be necessary for any planning permission to be subject to a Legal Agreement to ensure that the benefits are delivered in a timely manner. In this respect, it would not be appropriate for construction of the residential element to commence until the surgery element is complete and ready for use. This will remove the risk of works progressing on the residential element in the event that the surgery element does not come forward or is not completed for some reason. It will also be necessary to ensure that the retained public open space is transferred to public ownership (District or Parish Council) prior to the commencement of the residential development. The Highway Authority consultation response notes that the parking of vehicles on Monastery Lane restricts visibility, and the Applicant's highway designer has confirmed a commitment to funding the implementation of waiting restrictions. This amounts to a contribution of £7,000. There is also a need to re-visit the proposed scheme of landscaping, to ensure that the proposals adjacent to Lady Place are appropriate. This can be secured by condition.

## **7. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 To approve the application, subject to conditions and to a Legal Agreement to secure delivery of the surgery building and transfer of the retained open space to public ownership prior to the commencement of the residential element of the proposal, to secure a financial contribution towards implementation of waiting restrictions on Monastery Lane and within the development and to secure financial contributions to local education provision.

7.2 Proposed conditions include:

1 A condition listing the approved plans

2 **Standard Time Condition:** 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 **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for, but not be limited to:

- i. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- ii. loading and unloading of plant and materials
- iii. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- iv. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding, where appropriate
- v. the provision of wheel washing facilities if necessary
- vi. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
- vii. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works
- viii. hours of on-site construction working, including deliveries

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

4 **Pre-Commencement Condition:**

- i) No development shall take place until a programme of archaeological work 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.
- ii) The development hereby permitted shall not 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 under condition [i] 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).

5 **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development shall commence until precise details of the existing and proposed finished floor levels of the development in relation to nearby datum points adjoining the application site have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

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 **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development shall commence, 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:

- All trees on the site shown for retention on approved drawing number 3810\_DR\_003 received by the LPA 30.01.17, 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.

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).

7 **Pre-Commencement Condition:** Prior to the commencement of development or any preparatory works, a Reptile Mitigation Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, based up the information provided within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Reptile Report by Lloyd Bore Ltd., dated 2016. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the agreed timings and details.

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

8 **Pre-Commencement Condition:** An Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Plan should be submitted and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This will provide a brief summary for site workers of the mitigation detailed in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Lloyd Bore, 2016. Details shall be broken down into pre-, during and post works activities. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

9 **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development shall commence until a drainage strategy detailing the proposed means of foul and surface water disposal has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

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).

10 **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development shall commence until a detailed surface water drainage scheme including a Surface Water Drainage Statement, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall be fully coordinated with the landscape

scheme. The development shall subsequently be implemented prior to first occupation in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained as such.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to prevent the increased 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).

- 11 **Pre-Commencement Condition:** Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, details of the re-direction of existing public rights of way across the site and their surfacing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The diverted public rights of way shall be completed and available for use prior to the commencement of the development and on completion of the development, any damage done to the diverted and surfaced rights of way as a result of construction works shall be made good in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the existing public rights of way remain open and unobstructed during construction, in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015)

- 12 **Pre-Commencement Condition:** Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, an Air Quality Mitigation Plan covering both the construction phase and operational phase of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details and any mitigation measures relating to the operational phase shall thereafter be retained as approved.

Reason: To assist in the reduction of emissions in the nearby Air Quality Management Area, in accordance with Policy 24 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 13 **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development shall commence until the following components of a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination, (including asbestos contamination), of the site 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.

The following aspects (b) - (d) shall be dependent on the outcome of the above preliminary risk assessment (a) and may not necessarily be required.

- (b) An intrusive site investigation scheme, based on (a) to provide information for a detailed risk assessment to the degree and nature of the risk posed by any contamination to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.

- (c) The intrusive site investigation results following (b) and, based on these, a detailed method statement, 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 where required.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Any changes to these components require the consent of the local planning authority.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure that no unacceptable risks are caused to humans, controlled waters or the wider environment during and following the development works and to ensure that any pollution is dealt with in accordance with Policies 24 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 14 **Pre-Commencement (Slab Level) Condition:** No development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until a schedule of materials and finishes and colours to be used for external walls, windows and roofs of the approved building(s) has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing and all materials used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall conform to those approved.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental 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).

- 15 **Pre-Commencement (Slab Level) Condition:** No development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until confirmation has been submitted, in writing, to the Local Planning Authority that the relevant Building Control body shall be requiring the optional standard for water usage across the development. The dwellings hereby permitted shall meet the optional requirement of building regulation G2 to limit the water usage of each dwelling to 110 litres per person per day. The subsequently approved water limiting measures shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to limit water use in order to improve the sustainability of the development in accordance with Policy 37 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 16 **Pre-Commencement (Slab Level) Condition:** No development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until details of the measures to facilitate the provision of high speed broadband internet connections to the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, details shall include a timetable and method of delivery for high speed broadband of each dwelling/unit. The delivery of high speed broadband infrastructure shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure a sustainable development that meets the needs of future occupiers in accordance with Policy 37 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 17 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** Notwithstanding the submitted details of landscaping, prior to the first occupation (or use) of any part of the development hereby permitted, 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 that is sympathetic to the landscape and townscape character and built form of the surroundings, in particular to adjacent heritage

assets, and in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policies 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 18 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied (or use hereby permitted commenced) unless and until provision for the storage of refuse and recycling has been made for that dwelling or use in accordance with drawing numbers 2683-1004 received by the Local Planning Authority on 30th January 2017 and 3527.PL.100 rev B received by the Local Planning Authority on 19th October 2016. These facilities shall thereafter be retained for use at all times.

Reason: To ensure the adequate provision of recycling facilities in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 19 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied or use hereby permitted commenced until the car parking spaces (including garages) serving it have been constructed and made available for use in accordance with approved drawing numbers 2683-1001 received by the Local Planning Authority on 30th January 2017 and 3527.PL.001 rev D received by the Local Planning Authority on 19th October 2016. The car parking spaces permitted shall thereafter be retained as such for their designated use.

Reason: To provide car-parking space for the use in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 20 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development shall be first occupied until the road(s), footways, and casual parking areas serving the development have been constructed, surfaced, and drained in accordance with plans and details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To secure satisfactory standards of access for the proposed development.

- 21 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied or use hereby permitted commenced until the cycle parking facilities serving it have been constructed and made available for use in accordance with approved drawing number 3527.PL.001 rev D received by the Local Planning Authority on 19th October 2016. The cycle parking facilities shall thereafter be retained as such for their designated use.

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate provision for the parking of cycles in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 22 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** Prior to the first occupation (or use) of any part of the development hereby permitted, a verification report demonstrating that the SuDS drainage system has been constructed in accordance with the approved design drawings shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be maintained in accordance with the approved report.

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).

- 23 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** Prior to the installation of any plant to serve the doctors surgery or pharmacy hereby permitted, an assessment of the acoustic impact arising from the operation of all internally and externally located plant shall be undertaken in accordance with BS 4142:2014. The assessment shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority together with a scheme of attenuation measures to mitigate any adverse impacts identified in the acoustic assessment. The scheme shall be submitted to and approved in



writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme as approved by the Local Planning Authority shall be fully installed before the use of any plant commences and shall be operated for as long as the use is continued.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental in the interests of residential amenities by ensuring an acceptable noise level for the occupants of adjacent residential properties and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 24 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** Prior to the first occupation (or use) of any part of the development hereby permitted, details of all boundary walls and/or fences shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied (or use hereby permitted commenced) until the boundary treatments associated with that dwelling (or use) have been implemented as approved. The boundary treatments shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved details.

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

- 25 **Regulatory Condition:** The garage(s) hereby permitted shall be used only as private domestic garages for the parking of vehicles incidental to the use of the properties as dwellings and for no other purposes.

Reason: To ensure adequate off-street provision of parking in the interests of amenity and highway safety, and in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 26 **Regulatory Condition:** Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order amending or revoking and/or re-enacting that Order), the area shown for a pharmacy on drawing number 3527.PL.100 received by the Local Planning Authority on 19th October 2016 shall be used only as a Class A1 pharmacy, or as part of the Class D1 medical centre, and for no other purposes whatsoever, (including those falling within Class A1 as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) without express planning consent from the Local Planning Authority first being obtained.

Reason: Establishment of an alternative retail use in this location through a change of use as permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order or Use Classes Order 1987 would not be appropriate in accordance with Policies 13 and 24 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 27 **Regulatory Condition:** Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order amending or revoking and/or re-enacting that Order), with the exception of the area indicated for use as a Class A1 pharmacy, the Doctors Surgery Building hereby permitted shall be used only for the provision of medical or health services and for no other purposes whatsoever, (including those falling within Class D1 as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) without express planning consent from the Local Planning Authority first being obtained.

Reason: In light of the local need for medical centre provision, which has justified permitting development as an exception to adopted Policies of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 28 **Regulatory Condition:** Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (and/or any Order revoking and/or re-enacting that Order no development falling within Classes A B C D E F G and H of Part 1 of Schedule 2 (amend classes and schedule as necessary) of the order shall be erected, constructed or placed within the curtilage(s) of the dwellings on Plots 4, 5, and 9 (as annotated on drawing number 2683-1000 received by the Local Planning Authority on 30th January 2017) hereby permitted without express planning consent from the Local Planning Authority first being obtained.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to maintain, as far as possible, the setting of the adjacent listed building, in accordance with Policies 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 29 **Regulatory Condition:** Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 or Orders amending or revoking and re-enacting the same, no windows or other openings (other than those shown on the plans hereby approved) shall be formed in the south-eastern side elevation of Plot 4 and the western side elevation of Plot 5 without express planning consent from the Local Planning Authority first being obtained.

Reason: To ensure that future occupiers are provided with an appropriate level of privacy and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 30 **Regulatory Condition:** Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 or Orders amending or revoking and re-enacting the same, no gate, fence, wall or other means of enclosure shall be erected or constructed and no hardsurfacing constructed or laid in front of the forward most part of any proposed building which fronts onto a highway or access way without express planning consent from the Local Planning Authority first being obtained.

Reason: In order to ensure that the development remains of a high quality of design and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 31 **Regulatory Condition:** No external lighting or floodlighting shall be erected or placed on the site other than in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the erection of any such lighting.

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

- 32 **Regulatory Condition:** There should be no importation of soil and other fill materials onto the development site unless confirmation that the soil/fill has been certified as fit for purpose by a competent person and has been subject to analysis by an accredited laboratory to ensure that it is free from contamination has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure that no unacceptable risks are caused to humans, controlled waters or the wider environment during and following the development works and to ensure that any pollution is dealt with in accordance with Policies 24 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

## Notes to Applicant

1. Please be advised that there are conditions on this notice that will require the submission of details to be submitted for approval to the Local Planning Authority. To approve these details, you will need to submit an "Application for approval of details reserved by condition" with an application form and pay the appropriate fee. Guidance and the forms can be found at [www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/paperforms](http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/paperforms)
2. A Surface Water Drainage Statement is a site-specific drainage strategy that demonstrates that the drainage scheme proposed is in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems. An Advice Note and a proforma for the statement can be found using the following link <https://www.horsham.gov.uk/planning/development-management>.
3. In connection with the above condition relating to the diversion and surfacing of public rights of way, the Applicant should have regard to the WSCC Rights of Way officer comments, i.e. that the development will obstruct the definitive route and therefore a footpath diversion is necessary, and that the routes are presently unmade and should be surfaced to the Rights of Way team's specifications to encourage greater use of these paths.
4. The Air Quality Management Plan required by the above conditions should be informed by HDC's Planning Advice Document: Air Quality and Emissions Reduction Guidance (2014) and the IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction (February 2014), and should include both type 1 and type 2 mitigation measures.
5. Please note that Southern Water require a formal application for connection to the water supply and connection to the public sewerage system in order to service this development. To initiate a sewer capacity check to identify the appropriate connection point for the development, please contact Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire (tel: 0330 303 0119) or [www.southernwater.co.uk](http://www.southernwater.co.uk)
6. The applicant is advised to enter into a legal agreement with West Sussex County Council, as Highway Authority, to cover the proposed adoptable on-site highway works. The applicant is requested to contact The Implementation Team Leader (01243 642105) to commence this process. The applicant is advised that any works commenced prior to the S38 agreement being in place are undertaken at their own risk.
7. The Construction Environment Management Plan required by the above conditions should include details of proposed hours of demolition and construction activities (including deliveries & despatch), which are recommended to be limited to 08.00 – 18.00 Monday until Friday, 08.00 – 13.00 Saturdays and no working on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, unless alternative hours are demonstrated to be acceptable.

Background Papers: DC/16/2108