Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DC/24/0015
Crescent Place, Storrington Road, Thakeham, West Sussex, RH20 3ED

DESCRIPTION:
Erection of a detached 4no. bedroom chalet bungalow including detached garage / car port.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/19/1093	Erection of 2.No detached dwellinghouses with associated parking and landscaping	Application refused on 18.07.2019

SITE AND SURROUNDS
The application site comprises of a single storey terrace houses (Crescent Place) and associated residential garden area to the north. Part of the application site also falls within the curtilage of a detached dwellinghouse (Little Snapes) to the north of Crescent Place. The application site is located just outside of the built-up area of the boundary of Storrington and Sullington. As such, the application is considered to be located in the countryside in policy terms.

Both dwelling sites are located on the eastern side of Storrington Road, Thakeham with separate vehicle accesses and onsite car parking, with Little Snapes also benefiting from a detached garage located near the access point. The application site slopes up from Storrington Road towards the proposed dwellinghouse location. Both sites benefit from a relatively large curtilage which is common particularly when looking within the street scene to the north of the application site moving away from the built-up area. Both dwellingshouses are made up of brick and render to the external walls, a tiled roof and UPVC fenestration.

The application site is located in Flood Zone 1 and is identified on Environment Agency mapping as being subject to medium and high risk surface water flows.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION
Full planning permission is sought for the erection of a detached two storey 4no. bedroom chalet including detached garage/car port within the existing garden areas of Crescent Place and Little Snapes.

The proposed dwelling measures approximately 13.5m in maximum length and 13.5m in width finished, and approximately 7m in total height to the roof ridge. The dwelling is proposed to be finished in face brickwork with feature dental course and painted weatherboard, and plain clay tiles. The windows are proposed to be finished in UPVc double glazed windows and the external doors in composite front door powder coated aluminium sliding and French doors. The proposed dwelling would incorporate a half-hipped roof design as well as gabled, hipped and half-hipped features, front and rear dormers and rooflights.

The proposed development also includes the erection of a detached oak framed garage and car port measuring approximately 6m in length and 6.2m in width, with a total height measuring 4.5m at the roof ridge. A roofed log store is also proposed measuring 1.3m in length, 3.4m in width and 2.5m in height. The garage/car port is proposed to be located off the proposed parking area for the proposed development, along the proposed new northern garden area boundary for Crescent Place. New fencing is proposed to separate Crescent Place and the new development, along with additional tree planting to provide screening between Crescent Place northern garden area and the proposed bungalows parking area and garage/car port. The new fencing is proposed to be 1800mm close board and/or post and rail.

The proposal seeks to utilise Crescent Place's existing vehicle access and extend the driveway to provide access and separate parking for the proposed bungalow within the northern part of Crescent Place's residential garden area. The new car parking area is proposed to be finished with porous gravel system and provide parking space for 6 cars.

Six category B and C trees are proposed to be removed to facilitate the proposed development. To mitigate the loss, eleven replacement trees are proposed to be planted onsite. The remaining trees, tree groups and hedgerows, including those along Storrington Road providing screening from public views, would be retained and protected to ensure no impact during construction.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):
Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development
Policy 2 - Strategic Policy: Strategic Development
Policy 3 - Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy
Policy 4 - Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion
Policy 15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision
Policy 16 - Strategic Policy: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Policy 17 - Exceptions Housing Schemes
Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection
Policy 27 - Settlement Coalescence
Policy 30 - Protected Landscapes
Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles
Policy 34 - Cultural and Heritage Assets
Policy 35 - Strategic Policy: Climate Change
Policy 36 - Strategic Policy: Appropriate Energy Use
Policy 37 - Sustainable Construction
Policy 38 - Strategic Policy: Flooding
Policy 39 - Strategic Policy: Infrastructure Provision
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking
Policy 42 - Strategic Policy: Inclusive Communities

Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan 2017:
Policy Thakeham6 - Design
Policy Thakeham9 - Development in the Countryside
Policy Thakeham10 - Green Infrastructure and Valued Landscapes

Paragraph 33 of the NPPF requires that all development plans complete their reviews no later than 5 years from their adoption. Horsham District Council is currently in the process of reviewing its development plan however at this stage the emerging policies carry only limited weight in decision making. As the HDPF is now over 5 years old, the most important policies for the determination of this application must be considered as to whether they are 'out of date' (NPPF paragraph 11d). This includes, for applications involving the provision of housing, whether the Council can demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites (NPPF footnote 8).

The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, with the supply currently calculated as being 2.9 years. The presumption in favour of development within Paragraph 11d) of the NPPF therefore applies in the consideration of all applications for housing development within the District (unless footnote 7 or Paragraph 14 applies to relevant applications), with Policies 2, 4, 15 and 26 now carrying only limited weight in decision making.

All other policies within the HDPF as itemised above have been assessed against the NPPF and are considered to be consistent such that they continue to attract significant weight in decision making.

Planning Advice Notes:
PPG Flood risk and coastal change
Facilitating Appropriate Development
Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS RESPONSES
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

Consultations:

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

HDC Arboriculture: No Objection.
The submitted Tree survey and AIA incorrectly assigns a circular root protection area to the principal remaining oak tree in the streetscene (T14). This tree is unlikely to be rooting significantly beneath the engineered road and thus its root protection area (RPA) extends further into the site than is indicated in the submissions. The submitted TPP indicates that two small areas of driveway within tree RPA's should be of a no-dig construction. In practice, larger areas will need to be of a no-dig construction in order for the driveway levels to marry. Therefore, by extending the area of no-dig construction to encompass all of the apron area to the front of the proposed garage frontage, the issue of conserving the principal trees RPA's can be achieved seemingly without re-design/re-routing of hardstanding/garage positioning.

As the passage for development access will require all traffic to pass through the area requiring ground protection, if minded to approve the application I recommend conditions to ensure that either the no-dig drive is constructed initially to enable works to pass over it or a robust scheme of ground protection measures are incorporated within the associated site specific AMS, prior to the driveway construction. The routing of services will need to be undertaken via an alternative route that does not pass through the RPA of the Oak tree (i.e not beneath the driveway). Other pre-commencement conditions are also recommended.

HDC Drainage: Objection.
Insufficient information provided. Request additional information.

HDC Environmental Health: No comments received.

HDC Landscape Architect: No comments received.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

WSCC Highways: No Objection
The LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 115), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

There are no apparent visibility concerns with the existing access point. The addition of a single dwelling would not be anticipated to give rise to a significant material intensification of use of the existing access point. The LHA are satisfied that this parking demand can be accommodated on-site. The proposed driveway also exhibits suitable space for turning to be achievable.

No details of cycle parking have been provided. Cycling is a viable option in the local area and the LHA would request that secure and covered cycle parking provision for at least two bicycles be provided in accordance with WSCC Parking Standards. The proposed garage does not meet the minimum internal

specifications for single-bay garages of 3m x 6m as outlined in Manual for Streets (MfS). To be considered for both car and cycle parking, the applicant is advised to enlarge the garage bay to 3m x 6m.

Ecology Consultant: No Objection.
The Ecologist is satisfied with the assessment of bats within the submitted Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA) and support retention of the mature Oak tree T01 as the only tree with potential bat roost features and agree that no further surveys for bats are needed for buildings and trees.

As Barbastelle bats may use this habitat, the Ecologist supports the recommendation that a Wildlife Friendly Lighting Strategy is implemented for this application (Ecological Impact Assessment (Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology, February 2023), to avoid impacts from light disturbance. This should be secured by a prior to occupation condition of any consent and implemented in full. Furthermore, the mitigation measures identified in the Ecological Impact Assessment (Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology, February 2023) should be secured by a condition of any consent and implemented in full. This is necessary to conserve and enhance protected and Priority species.

The Ecologist supports the proposed reasonable biodiversity enhancements, which have been recommended to secure net gains for biodiversity, as outlined under Paragraph 180[d] of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023). The enhancement measures should be outlined within a Biodiversity Enhancement Layout and secured by a condition of any consent for discharge prior to slab level. Impacts will be minimised such that the proposal is acceptable subject to the conditions below based on BS42020:2013. In terms of biodiversity net gain, the enhancements proposed will contribute to this aim.

The Ecologist's no objection is subject to Natural England's formal comments on the conclusion of the Water Neutrality Appropriate Assessment and Bat Appropriate Assessment.

NatureSpace: No comments.
No likely impact on great crested newts or their habitats.

Natural England (bats): No objection.

Natural England (Water Neutrality): Objection.
Insufficient information has been provided.

Southern Water: No Objection.
subject to informative reminding the applicant that Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the foul sewer to be made by the applicant or developer.

Thakeham Parish Council: Objection
The location of the property sits on a busy road that is prone to flooding due to the topographical layout banking the property downwards to the entrance. It is locally known that this area is prone to flooding 10 meters to the north and south of the property. The construction of the driveway with a lack of SUDS will cause the nearby stream to flood down and bring the surface water on to the road – creating a hazard on a blind bend. Also, other neighbouring properties will be affected by the excess water flows.

The size and scope of the proposed dwelling is reminiscent of a previous application (DC/19/1093) which compromised of two smaller houses at the same site. This was turned down by the LPA and TPC sees no difference in the mass to the previous application. It would be a large imposition on the street scene – out of keeping with the surrounding houses and in breach of the housing size guidelines in the Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan.

The property is to be built up along the neighbouring boundary and from the documents, it is unclear whether it encroaches to the land in the north. To accommodate the size of the development, hedgerows will be lost, and the building would cause site line issues on the road.

As well as the hedge loss, there would need to be a felling of 11 mature oak trees. This, in conjunction with the hedgerow loss would has a devastating impact on the wildlife and result in a loss in biodiversity as many species of bird, mouse and bat will be affected.

After analysis, TPC conclude that the accompanying report fails to understand and does not give enough clarity on the ecological loss that will happen to the site and requests that this report is scrutinised by the LPA.

Therefore, TPC believes the application does not meet policies 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, 39, 45 and HA19 of the Horsham District Local Plan and Policies Thakeham6, Thakeham9 and Thakeham10 of the Thakeham Parish Neighbourhood Plan.

Representations:
Four letters of representation have been received for this application, two raising comments and two objecting.

Comments received are regarding flooding along Storrington Road as follows:

- The part of Storrington Road outside the application site has badly flooded following heavy rain for the last 4-5 years.
- Any planned use of the drainage culvert to manage surface water arising from the site would likely make this worse resulting in flooding and highway safety issues.
- Flooding outside Crescent Place is due to blocked drains in the road and culvert.

The grounds of the objections are as follows:

- Outside the built-up area boundary not allocated for development by HDC or Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan.
- Not an enhancement or benefit to the neighbourhood.
- Densification of the area.
- Too close to neighbouring properties.
- Loss of green space, trees and wildlife.
- Increase existing flooding issues along Storrington Road.
- Increase noise pollution and traffic.
- Increase existing access visibility and highway safety issues due to the access location on a bend and increased usage of the access.

Member Comments:
None received

HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUALITY:
The application has been considered having regard to Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act 1998, which sets out a person's rights to the peaceful enjoyment of property and Article 8 of the same Act, which sets out their rights in respect to private and family life and for the home. Officers consider that the proposal would not be contrary to the provisions of the above Articles.

The application has also been considered in accordance with Horsham District Council's public sector equality duty, which seeks to prevent unlawful discrimination, to promote equality of opportunity and to foster good relations between people in a diverse community, in accordance with Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. In this case, the proposal is not anticipated to have any potential impact from an equality perspective.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

The main considerations material to this application relate to:

- The Principle of Development
- Design and Appearance
- Ecology and Trees
- Impact on neighbouring amenity
- Flood Risk
- Water Neutrality

- Highway, Traffic, Parking and Access

The Principle of Development
Policy 2 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) sets out the main growth strategy, focusing development in the main settlements. Policy 3 of the HDPF directs development within existing settlements which have defined built-up area boundaries (BUAB) and Policy 4 states that development will be permitted outside BUAB via the expansion of settlements where, amongst other criteria, a site has been allocated in a local plan or neighbourhood plan. Policy 26 protects the countryside against inappropriate development unless it is considered essential and appropriate in scale; whilst also meeting one of four criteria. These criteria includes: supporting the needs of agriculture or forestry; enabling the extraction of minerals or the disposal of waste; providing for quiet informal recreational use; or enabling the sustainable development of rural areas.

The site is not allocated in either the HDPF nor the Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) and as such the proposed development does not accord with Policies 3 and 4 in this regard. The erection of a dwelling is not considered to be essential to its countryside location, nor does it meet any of the criteria set out in Policy 26, therefore this proposal does not accord with Policy 26. Therefore, the principle of the proposed development is contrary to the overarching spatial strategy and principles of the HDPF and TNP.

The new Horsham District Local Plan ('the HDLP') is currently being prepared and sets out emerging planning policies and proposals to guide development in the District (excluding the South Downs National Park) up to 2040, with the Regulation 19 Local Plan having recently undergone public consultation.

Emerging Strategic Policy 2 of the HDLP promotes a similar development hierarchy and permission of development within the defined BUAB as in Policy 3 of the HDPF. Therefore, as the proposal is located outside the defined BUAB and the BUAB is not proposed to change in the area of the application site, this proposal does not accord with Emerging Strategic Policy 2. Emerging Strategic Policy 3 of the HDLP supports the expansion of existing settlements to meet identified local housing needs where all the criteria detailed within the policy is met. This includes the site being either allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan and adjoining the existing settlement edge. The application site is also not allocated within emerging Strategic Policy HA18 (Storrington Housing Allocations) or the TNP therefore the proposed development would be at conflict with Emerging Strategic Policy 3.

The Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply (the Council's latest Authority Monitoring Report shows a 2.9 year supply). In recognition of these HDPF housing policies being out-of-date, the Council has published interim guidance on how housing proposals are to be considered in its Facilitating Appropriate Development (FAD) document. The FAD recognises that the Council is likely to receive applications outside of defined BUAB and on unallocated sites (such as this proposal) given its housing land supply position. The FAD confirms that applications which meet all the following criteria will be positively considered:

- The site adjoins the existing settlement edge as defined by the BUAB;
- The level of expansion is appropriate to the scale and function of the settlement the proposal relates to;
- The proposal demonstrates that it meets local housing needs or will assist the retention and enhancement of community facilities and services;
- The impact of the development individually or cumulatively does not prejudice comprehensive long-term development; and
- The development is contained within an existing defensible boundary and the landscape character features are maintained and enhanced.

The southern boundary of Crescent Place abuts the Storrington BUAB. The proposed detached dwelling with separate garden, parking area and garage/car port is congruent with the surrounding building density and site layout. The building design is also in keeping with neighbouring bricked, two storey dwellings. The level of expansion is therefore considered to be appropriate. The proposal makes provision for one additional residential dwelling during a time when the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. Therefore, the proposal is considered to help meet local

housing needs. The application site is not located within any emerging allocations or development consent orders, nor is it large in scale. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would not individually or cumulatively prejudice long-term development. Hedgerows and trees exist along all four boundaries of the proposed dwelling location, which would provide maintainable, natural boundaries between the proposed dwelling and the neighbouring properties to the north, east and south, and Storrington Road on the west. Additional fencing is proposed along the internal site access to the proposed parking area, furthering the boundaries between the proposed development and Crescent Place. In view of this, Officers consider that the proposed residential development meets the above FAD criteria.

In view of the above, while the proposal is at conflict with existing and emerging policy within the HDFP, TNP, and the HDL. However, the principle of the proposed development within the countryside is considered to meet the FAD guidance.

Design and Appearance
Policy 32 of the HDPF states that good design is a key element in sustainable development, and seeks to ensure that development promotes a high standard of urban design, architecture and landscape. Policy 33 of the HDPF states that development proposals should make efficient use of land, integrate effectively with the character of the surrounding area, use high quality and appropriate materials, retain landscaping where feasible (and mitigate loss if necessary) and ensure no conflict with the character of the surrounding town or landscape. Policy Thakeham6 of the TNP encourages the external use of local natural materials, particularly bricks and clay tiles, and open fencing, such as post and rail.

The proposed building design includes a face brickwork finish with feature dentil course and painted weatherboard. The roof is proposed to be finished with plain clay tiles and incorporate a half-hipped Sussex style pitched roof design including gabled, hipped and half-hipped features, and front and rear dormers. Officers consider that the proposed materials form part of a high-quality design, in keeping with dwellings in the locality and therefore would not appear incongruent within the landscape.

Officers note Thakeham Parish Council's objection with regard to massing and that the proposal would be a large imposition on the street scene. However, Officers consider that the proposed dwelling location set back from Storrington Road, use of an existing site access off Storrington Road, and the existing vegetation screening would ensure the dwelling would not appear as a large imposition on the street scene. In regard to massing, Officers consider the proposed chalet bungalow with a total height of 4.5m to the roof ridge out not be incongruent with other existing one-and-a-half and two storey dwellings in the locality. Furthermore, Officers consider the 6m in length and 6.2m in width would result in a similar massing to surrounding dwellings and would not exceed Little Snapes to the north.

Chestnut cleft post and rail fencing is proposed to divide the driveway from Crescent Place and 180cm high closeboard timber fencing is proposed for the rear gardens. Officers consider that the use of natural materials are in keeping with the countryside location. Officers further consider that the proposed detached oak framed garage and car port is also of good quality design and materials, which would further help the site to integrate with the countryside location and nearby residential properties. In view of the above, Officers are satisfied that the proposed development will not result in any adverse design and appearance impacts in accordance with Policy 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy Thakeham6 of the Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan.

Ecology and Trees
Policy 31 of the HDPF states that development will be supported where it demonstrates that it maintains or enhances the existing network of green infrastructure. Development proposals will be required to contribute to the enhancement of existing biodiversity, and should create and manage new habitats where appropriate.

Circular 06/2005 identifies that the presence of protected species is a material consideration when considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat. Therefore, it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed application, is established before planning permission is granted. Information on biodiversity impacts and opportunities should inform all stages of development, and an ecological survey is usually necessary where the type and location of

development are such that the impact on biodiversity may be significant and existing information is lacking or inadequate.

The applicant has completed and submitted an Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA), which includes an assessment of bats and other priority species and proposed mitigation measures. The Ecologist has reviewed this information and considers the assessment sufficient. The Ecologist has recommended conditions to secure the recommended Wildlife Friendly Lighting Strategy and mitigation measures contained within the EIA. Officers concur with the Ecologist regarding the robustness of the EIA and are satisfied sufficient information has been provided to demonstrate how the proposed development would not result in adverse ecological impacts in accordance with Policy 33, subject to conditions and formal comments from Natural England. A Habitats Regulations Assessment Bats Appropriate Assessment (BAA) has been completed and Natural England has provided a consultee response on this confirming they agree with the conclusions of the BAA that the proposal will avoid an Adverse Effect on the Integrity of the Habitats sites listed in this assessment, either alone or in combination with other plan and projects.

The site contains few trees of significant landscape merit. The principal remaining features of public amenity value are confined to the roadside hedgerow and trees, which are proposed to be retained. However, the Arboriculturist has identified the need for further root protection during construction and operational phases. Officers concur with the Arboriculturist and recognise the importance of maintaining this green network feature and would seek to control this by condition.

Six category B and C trees are proposed to be removed to facilitate the proposed development. The Arboriculturist is satisfied that the proposed loss of the remaining internal site trees would be reasonably mitigated by proposed new planting of eleven trees onsite. The Ecologist supports the proposed reasonable biodiversity enhancements, which have been recommended to secure net gains for biodiversity Officers consider the provision of additional tree planting would help to maintain and enhance the existing biodiversity and green infrastructure on site in accordance with Policy 31.

With the above in mind, the proposal is not considered to result in adverse harm to Ecology and Trees, in accordance with Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Impact on neighbouring amenity
Policy 33 of the HDPF states that development should consider the scale, massing and orientation between buildings, respecting the amenities and sensitivities of neighbouring properties.

The proposed building is a detached, two-storey structure with dormer features, which is congruent with dwellings in the site surroundings. The incorporation of dormer elements for the first floor within the roof help to reduce the massing of the proposed building and further reflect the extended bungalow dwelling type of Little Snapes and the properties along Crescent Rise to the south of the application site.

The building is proposed to have three windows along the northern elevation, of which only one would be on the first floor and set forward enough that it would not provide any direct views into Little Snapes dwelling but would provide direct views into Little Snapes private amenity garden area. Officers consider that this window placement would result in overlooking and loss of privacy of Little Snapes private amenity space. Accordingly, Officers consider that the proposal does not accord with Policy 33 in this regard.

A singular residential property and parking area with garage/car port is proposed within the application site. This is in keeping with the plot sizes of surrounding properties and therefore considered to be an appropriate scale for this location. The dwelling is proposed to be set back from and orientated towards Storrington Road, slightly further forward than Little Snapes to the north. This reflects the pattern and layout of sites to the north along Storrington Road.

There would be limited public view of the proposed development from Storrington Road owing to the existing vegetation screening along Storrington Road and the separation distance between the proposed dwelling and the highway. Furthermore, the existing hedgerow and trees along the northern, eastern and southern boundaries of the proposed dwelling and car parking areas will also provide

screening to the neighbouring properties. Fencing is also proposed along new dwelling site boundaries with Crescent Place to provide separation and security of both properties.

As a residential dwelling, the use of this building and site would be in keeping with surrounding residential uses and therefore is not considered to result in any adverse amenity impacts through noise, odour or lighting. Officers acknowledge that there would be a small temporary impact during the construction phase of the development, however this can be controlled and minimised through planning conditions.

In view of the above, Officers consider that the proposed development will result in adverse impacts to neighbouring amenity by virtue of overlooking and loss of privacy of neighbouring private amenity space contrary to Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Flood Risk
Policy 38 of the HDPF states that development should follow a sequential approach to flood risk management, giving priority to development sites with the lowest risk of flooding and making required development safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Development proposals will: take a sequential approach to ensure most vulnerable uses are placed in the lowest risk areas; avoid the functional floodplain except for water-compatible uses and essential infrastructure; only be acceptable in Flood Zone 2 and 3 following completion of a sequential test and exceptions test if necessary; and require a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment for all developments over 1 hectare in Flood Zone 1 and all proposals in Flood Zone 2 and 3.

Paragraph 165 of the NPPF discourages inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding by directing development away from areas at highest risk. Paragraph 166 states that cumulative impacts in, or affecting, local areas susceptible to flooding, and take account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management authorities, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards.

The application site lies within Flood Zones 1, which is land defined by the Planning Practice Guidance for the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for Flood Risk and Coastal Change as having a low probability of flooding. However, the application site is also subject to medium and high-risk surface water flooding, as indicated on maps held by the Environmental Agency, as well as medium-high groundwater vulnerability, and as such the development may be at direct risk of flooding and may increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. Therefore, the proposal is an area at the highest risk of flooding, contrary to NPPF Paragraph 165.

Paragraph 168 of the NPPF is clear that development should not be permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding and states that the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. When determining any planning applications, Paragraph 173 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere and applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment, including sequential and exception tests in areas at risk of flooding. Contrary to Paragraph 173 of the NPPF and Policy 38 of the HDPF, the applicant has not completed a sequential test as part of the submitted Flood Risk Assessment.

As advised by the HDC Drainage Team, the initially submitted Flood Risk Assessment does not provide adequate information to fully assess the application and is therefore considered inadequate. The applicant has submitted an amended Flood Risk Assessment, and while comments have not been received from the HDC Drainage Team on this revision, a sequential test is still absent. As detailed above, a sequential test is required as part of a Flood Risk Assessment to demonstrate that the proposal will not result in an increased risk of flooding and is steered towards areas within the lowest risk of flooding from any source, including surface water flooding. Officers consider that the amended Flood Risk Assessment includes insufficient information to address the requirements of NPPF paragraph 173.

Insufficient information has been submitted to determine that the proposed development would not result in an increase in flood risk on or around the site, as required by paragraph 173 of the NPPF.

Therefore, an adequate assessment of flood risk cannot be undertaken, and the proposal does not accord with Policy 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Water Neutrality
The application site falls within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone as defined by Natural England and which includes supplies from groundwater abstraction which cannot, with certainty, demonstrate no adverse impacts upon the defined Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites.

An advice note from Natural England (September 2021) advises that plans and projects affecting sites where an existing adverse effect is known will be required to demonstrate, with sufficient certainty, that they will not contribute further to an existing adverse effect. The received advice note advises that the matter of water neutrality should be addressed in assessments to agree and ensure that water use is offset for all new developments within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone.

The applicant has not provided a Water Neutrality scheme to support this planning application. An Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken based on the submitted information, and consulted upon with Natural England, who are in agreement with officers that there is insufficient information submitted in order to determine the likely impacts of the proposal, by way of a lack of evidence over the baseline water use. Therefore, officers conclude that insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the development is water neutral. It cannot therefore be concluded that the proposed development would not result in a likely adverse impact on the Arun Valley protected sites.

In the absence of a strategy to demonstrate water neutrality through the incorporation of on-site measures and/or appropriate offsetting actions capable of achieving water neutrality, there is no certainty that the proposal will not contribute further to the existing adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites. There are no considerations of overriding public interest that would alternatively warrant the grant of permission under s.64 of the Regulations. In such circumstances the grant of permission would be contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) Policy HB2(D), Paragraphs 185 and 186 National Planning Policy Framework (2023), and the Council's duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority Habitats & Species).

Highway, Traffic, Parking and Access
Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework states that transport access and ease of movement is a key factor in the performance of the local economy. The need for sustainable transport and safe access is vital to improve development across the district. Policy 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework states that development that involved the loss of existing parking spaces will only be allowed if suitable alternative provision has been secured elsewhere. Adequate parking facilities must be provided within the developments to meet the needs of the anticipated users.

The Crescent Place existing vehicular access would be utilised for the development to create a shared access. The proposal does not incorporate any alterations to the site's access off Storrington Road. Following consultation with WSCC Highways, there are no apparent visibility issues with the existing point of access on to Storrington Road. It is not anticipated that the new dwelling would intensify movement to and from the site.

The proposal would provide 6 vehicular spaces on top of the existing 6 informal vehicular spaces for Crescent Place. Car Parking Demand Calculator indicates that the proposed size of the dwelling and location would require at least three car parking spaces. The Local Highway Authority is satisfied that sufficient space would be available to accommodate the parking demand on-site, with space for turning.

There are no details provided for the secure cycle parking provision, however it is acknowledged that the site is located where cycling may not be a viable option. A pedestrian footpath is proposed to access the dwelling from the car parking area. The driveway is proposed to be finished in porous gravel grid system.

With the above in mind, the proposal is not considered to result in harm to the function or safety of the highway network, in accordance with Policies 40 and 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework

(2015).

Climate change:
Policies 35, 36 and 37 require that development mitigates to the impacts of climate change through measures including improved energy efficiency, reducing flood risk, reducing water consumption, improving biodiversity and promoting sustainable transport modes. These policies reflect the requirements of Chapter 14 of the NPPF that local plans and decisions seek to reduce the impact of development on climate change. The proposed development includes the Surface Water Drainage Scheme and enhanced biodiversity measures to build resilience to climate change and reduce carbon emissions. In view of the above, Officers are satisfied that the proposed development makes provisions to reduce the impact of the development on climate change in accordance with Policies 35, 36 and 37of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Conclusions:
As the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, the presumption in favour of development within Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF would apply in the consideration of this application, reducing the weight to be applied to Policies 4 and 26 of the HDPF. However, in this case the Paragraph 11(d) 'tilted balance' is disengaged as the absence of water neutrality and the location of the development in an area at risk of flooding both provide Footnote 7 clear reasons for refusal.

It is therefore considered that the issues identified in respect of flood risk and water neutrality are matters that are contrary to the overarching spatial strategy and principles of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Development Plan. The site does not benefit from fall-back, with the proposal seeking a private market house in the countryside. There are not considered to be any material considerations or public benefit that would outweigh the harm identified.

The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies 31, 33 and 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

Horsham District Council has adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule which took effect on 1st October 2017.

It is considered that this development constitutes CIL liable development.

Use Description	Proposed	Existing	Net Gain
District Wide Zone 1	226	0	226
		Total Gain	**226**
		Total Demolition	**0**

Please note that the above figures will be reviewed by the CIL Team prior to issuing a CIL Liability Notice and may therefore change.

Exemptions and/or reliefs may be applied for up until the commencement of a chargeable development.

In the event that planning permission is granted, a CIL Liability Notice will be issued thereafter. CIL payments are payable on commencement of development.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate with a sufficient degree of certainty that the proposed development would not contribute to an existing adverse effect upon the integrity of the internationally designated Arun Valley Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar sites by way of increased water abstraction, contrary to Policy 31

of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Paragraphs 185 and 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), thus the Local Planning Authority is unable to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority Habitats & Species).

2. The proposed development is subject to medium and high risk surface water flooding, as indicated on maps held by the Environmental Agency, as well as medium-high groundwater vulnerability and as such the development may be at direct risk of flooding, and may increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. In the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment and sequential test the proposed development is considered contrary to Policy 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and paragraphs 165, 168 and 173 of the NPPF (December 2023).

3. The proposed development by virtue of window position and proximate situation in relation to Sailtops private amenity space would result in adverse overlooking and loss of privacy contrary to policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

NOTE TO APPLICANT

POSITIVE AND PROACTIVE STATEMENT
Statement pursuant to Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received, in order to be able to, where possible, grant permission.

Plans list for: DC/24/0015
(The approved plans will form Condition 1 on the Decision Notice of all Permitted applications)

Schedule of plans/documents **not approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location Plan		2022.351.01	04.01.2024
Block Plan		2022.351.01 REV A	04.01.2024
Elevation & Floor plan		2022.351.03	04.01.2024
Plans		2022.351.03 REV A	04.01.2024
Materials		2022.351.05 REV A	04.01.2024
Layout plan		2022.351.06 REV A	04.01.2024
Tree plan		LLD2853-ARB-DWG-001 REV 00	04.01.2024
Tree plan		LLD2853-ARB-DWG-002 REV 00	04.01.2024
Plans		LLD2853-ECO-DWG-001 REV 00	04.01.2024
Supporting Statement		NONE	04.01.2024
Supporting Statement		NONE	04.01.2024
Supporting Statement		NONE	04.01.2024

Supporting Docs		ARB-SCH-001 REV 0	04.01.2024
Supporting Statement		NONE	04.01.2024
Supporting Statement		P-014 REV 2	04.01.2024
Supporting Statement	Flood Risk Assessment		24.04.2024

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Stephanie Bryant Date: 16/05/2024

Authorising Officer sign/initial Adrian Smith Date: 16/05/2024