

Delegated Decision Sign off Sheet

Case Number:	LX/23/00815/FUL	Case Officer:	Vicki Baker
Proposal:	Erection of a detached dwelling.		
Site:	Land At Loxwood Hall West, Guildford Road, Loxwood, Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0QP		
Applicant/Agent:	Agent Details :		
	Mr Matt Smith 1A High Street, Godalming, GU7 1AZ United Kingdom, ,		
Application Type:	Full Application		
Site Visit:	31 May 2023		
Map Ref:	(E) 503798	(N) 133094	
Parish:	Loxwood	Ward: Loxwood	

Red Card?	N	Stat. Consultee Objections?	N	Parish Objection	Y
Third Party Representations?	3	Overall Publicity Expiry Date:	23 August 2023	CIL Liable	Y
Legal Agreement?	N		Extension of Time?	29 September 2023	
Recommendation:	REFUSE		Expiry Date:	7 June 2023	
Decided Plan(s):	Plan/DRG No.:AE01 REV A Plan/DRG No.:DP101B Plan/DRG No.:DP102B Plan/DRG No.:DP104B Plan/DRG No.:DP110 Plan/DRG No.:DP111 Plan/DRG No.:DP103B Plan/DRG No.:DP100B				
Recommendation Date:	27 September 2023				
Recommendation By:	Vicki Baker				
Signed Off by:	Katie Stephens				

1. Site Description, Proposal and History

The Site and Surroundings

The application site is in use as private garages to the front part and the rest of the site is in use as garden land for Loxwood Hall West. The site is located on the south side of a private road to the east side of Guildford Road, Loxwood and situated outside of any settlement boundary. Loxwood Hall West, which is to the east of the application site, forms part of the former Loxwood Hall estate and is a semi-detached two storey dwelling. To the front of the garages there is a gravelled parking area, some grass and trees. A brick wall in line with the front elevation of the garages separates the grass from the garden to the rear. The front and east boundaries are open, there are trees to the west boundary. The garden land at the rear of the application site is laid to lawn, there are trees and planting with planting and hedges to the west side boundary. There are residential dwellings to the north, east and west of the site and a lake to the south.

The Proposal

The application proposes the erection of a detached dwelling.

The dwelling would be sited to the west of Loxwood Hall West and be two storeys. As part of the proposed works a detached single storey three bay garage would be demolished.

Planning History

21/00300/FUL
Erection of a detached dwelling.
APPEAL DISMISSED

2. Representations and Consultations

Loxwood Parish Council

Object. Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan Appendix 3 includes the buildings at the Loxwood Hall complex as buildings of historic importance. Policy 12 of the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan and Policy 45 of the CDC Local Plan are not adhered to as a countryside location is not required and there is no essential need for the property in the proposed location. The NPPF Paragraph 80 is not met which states isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided unless: there is essential need for a rural worker; the development would involve enabling the optimal use of heritage asset; it would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance the setting; it involved the subdivision of an existing property; or else the design is of exceptional quality. 4 object 1 abstention. Cllr Todhunter abstained.

Highways

Summarised:

The addition of a single dwelling is not anticipated to result in a material intensification of use onto Guildford Road. The proposed block plan demonstrates that the site's curtilage can accommodate up to three vehicles and this number accords with the WSCC Car Parking Demand Calculator (PDC). The demolition of the garage may result in loss of a parking space for the existing dwelling, however it appears that some parking can be accommodated within the confines of the existing dwelling. The site is situated in a rural area, therefore the occupants of the proposed dwelling will be reliant upon the use of a car. The proposed site plan demonstrates cycle storage which promotes the use of sustainable transport methods.

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 there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Coastal and Drainage

Summarised:

The application form submitted in support of this application suggests that the proposed means of surface water drainage is through on-site infiltration via soak-away structures, such an approach would be acceptable in principle. However, I have concerns that the underlying geology in this area is likely to render such an approach unviable.

The surface water drainage scheme design should follow the hierarchy of preference as set out in Approved Document H of the Building Regulations and the SuDS Manual produced by CIRIA. Therefore, the potential for on-site infiltration should be investigated and backed up by winter groundwater monitoring and winter percolation testing. The results of such investigations will be needed to inform the design of any infiltration structures, or alternatively be presented as evidence as to why on-site infiltration has not been deemed viable for this development.

If following site investigations it is concluded that on-site infiltration is viable, infiltration should then be utilised to the maximum extent that is practical (where it is safe and acceptable to do so). Any soakage structures should not be constructed lower than the peak groundwater level.

If on-site infiltration is not possible (which I suspect will be the case), drainage via a restricted discharge to a suitable local watercourse may be acceptable. (Any discharge should be restricted to greenfield run-off rates, with a minimum rate of 2l/s). However, as the site does not appear to have a suitable watercourse passing through it, or adjacent to its boundaries, further clarification will need to be provided about the location of a possible discharge and the nature of the conduit required to convey the flows to the receiving watercourse, to prove the proposed development can be adequately and appropriately drained.

If the application is approved it should be conditioned that development shall not commence until full details of the proposed surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

An informative should be added stating that development shall not proceed until formal consent has been approved in writing from the Lead Local Flood Authority (WSCC) or its agent (CDC) for the discharge of any flows to watercourses, or the culverting, diversion, infilling or obstruction of any watercourse on the site.

Natural England

Summarised:

Further information regarding the application's proposed rainwater harvesting measures is required to determine the impact on designated sites. As submitted, the application could have potential significant effects on:

- o Arun Valley Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar site
- o Pulborough Brooks and Amberley Wild Brooks Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

Without this information, Natural England may need to object to the proposal. Please re-consult Natural England once this information has been obtained.

We advise that the Water Neutrality statement is revised to include supporting evidence to demonstrate the details of how proposed rainwater harvesting will be implemented. Chiefly this information should demonstrate how and where rainwater shall be collected as well as how it shall be stored, ensuring there is sufficiently robust drought contingency to supply the offset requirement in perpetuity.

Third Party Representations

3 no. letters of objection have been received concerning;

- o There is a lot of development in the area, do not see the need to try and squeeze a massive house into a small area.
- o The scale of the development is not required in this location and would not be of any benefit to the Loxwood Housing policy.
- o The development would adversely affect Loxwood Hall.
- o The previous application was rightfully rejected. Object to this current application for the same reasons as to the previous application.
- o This application is basically the same house as was previously refused.
- o The development would massively impact on the enjoyment and privacy of the neighbouring property to the west.
- o The construction of the development would cause disruption and damage to the shared driveway. The change of ownership of the shared driveway is of concern.
- o The development is not in accordance with the Loxwood Hall Estate covenant.

3. Relevant Planning Policy

The principal policies and neighbourhood plans relevant to the consideration of this application are as follows:

Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029:

Policy 1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Dev
Policy 2 Dev Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy
Policy 6 Neighbourhood Development Plans
Policy 25 Development in North of the Plan area
Policy 33 New Residential Development
Policy 39 Transport, Accessibility and Parking
Policy 40 Carbon Reduction Policy
Policy 45 Development in the Countryside
Policy 48 Natural Environment
Policy 49 Biodiversity

The relevant paragraphs of the NPPF have been considered.

Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan, in particular policies:

2 - Settlement Boundary
10 - Built Environment - Vernacular Policy
12 - Rural Area

Consideration has also been given to:

- o CDC PGN3: Design Guidelines for Alterations to Dwellings and Extensions
- o Chichester District Council Interim Position Statement for Housing Development

4. Planning Considerations

The main considerations are:

- i. Principle of development
- ii. Design and Impact upon Visual Amenity/Character of Area
- iii. Impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties
- iv. Highway Safety
- v. Drainage
- vi. Refuse/recycling
- vii. Biodiversity and ecological considerations
- viii. Impact upon European Sites
- ix. Sustainable Construction
- x. Other Matters

Principle of Development

The application site is located in the rural area outside of any Settlement Boundary, which is defined as the 'Rest of the Plan Area'. Policy 2 seeks to ensure that new residential development is located within settlement boundaries, save for development outside these locations whereby it would fall within Policy 45. Policy 25 of the Local Plan relates specifically to new development in the North-East part of the Chichester district and states that new development should conserve and enhance the rural character of the area, whilst Policy 48 of the Local Plan states the need to protect the quality of rural landscapes. Policy 45 of the Local Plan states that planning permission will be granted for sustainable development in the countryside where it can be demonstrated that all the following criteria have been met:

1. The proposal is well related to an existing farmstead or group of buildings, or located close to an established settlement;
2. The proposal is complementary to and does not prejudice any viable agricultural operations on a farm and other existing viable uses;
3. Proposals requiring a countryside setting, for example agricultural buildings, ensure that their scale, siting, design and materials would have minimal impact on the landscape and rural character of the area.

The site lies outside any of the settlement boundaries as defined in the Local Plan. The applicant asserts that Alford Bars should be considered as a settlement in its own right, however Alford Bars is not listed within the Local Plan and so it is appropriate to consider it as outside of a settlement boundary. This approach was confirmed by the Inspector in appeal decision APP/L3815/W/21/3277901, following the refusal of planning application 21/00300/FUL.

The dwelling would be sited in between the dwellings of Loxwood Hall West and Lake Cottage. As the dwelling is proposed to be sited within part of the garden land of Loxwood Hall West, it would not prejudice any viable agricultural operations. However, the dwelling does not though require a countryside location, for example it would not meet an essential rural need and would not support rural diversification, and no justification has been put forward for the siting of a dwelling in this location. Due to this reason the development is not in accordance with Policy 45 of the Local Plan.

Neither side of Guildford Road close to the application site is served by pedestrian pavements, only narrow overgrown grass verges. Occupants of the development would therefore likely be dependent on private motor vehicles to access day-to-day services and facilities causing the site to be in an unsustainable location.

The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. Until the Council has a 5 year housing land supply, in order to manage housing delivery, it has produced an Interim Policy Statement (IPS) setting out the proactive measures that the Council is taking to increase the supply of housing, and to encourage appropriate housing schemes. An IPS supporting statement

to demonstrate how the applicants consider the development would meet all the criteria of the IPS has not been submitted. Notwithstanding that a statement was not submitted, the IPS sets out that development proposals that are within, or share a boundary with an existing settlement are likely to be supported, subject to other material considerations. The site is not within nor is it adjacent to a settlement boundary, would not be sustainably located in accessibility terms and would not meet the requirements of Policy 45, therefore it is not within accordance with the IPS.

The titled balance of paragraph 11 of the NPPF is engaged given the council cannot demonstrate a five year land supply meaning its housing policies are out of date. This is further assessed in the conclusion below, but in summary, whilst the provision of an additional unit of accommodation would help address the shortfall in housing land supply, it would be a very modest benefit delivering just one unit. Balanced against this benefit is the significant harm that would be caused by the unsuitability of the location of the development. The location runs counter to the spatial strategy of the Council in guiding where new development should be located and would result in poor accessibility for future residents to local services and facilities. This harm would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the very modest benefit of the proposal (one home). The development would therefore conflict with Policy 1 of the Chichester Local Plan, which is similar to the advice given in paragraph 11 of the NPPF, and the general thrust of the NPPF which is towards sustainable development.

The submitted documents state that the development would be a self-build and this should weigh in favour of the development. Due to the fundamental issues raised with the principle of development, this would not outweigh the policy position and the application is therefore not acceptable in principle.

The above assessment of the principle of the development has also been informed by a recent appeal decision at the application site, APP/L3815/W/21/3277901, following the refusal of planning application 21/00300/FUL for the erection of a dwelling. The appeal was dismissed and is therefore a material consideration in the determining of this current application. The Planning Inspector stated in the decision that the site is outside of any of the listed settlements within the Local Plan and is not within any defined settlement boundary. The decision also stated that the appeal scheme was not in accordance with the spatial and sustainable aims of Policy 45 of the Local Plan and therefore conflicts with this policy. Whilst a 5 year supply of deliverable housing was identified at the time of the appeal decision (which is not the situation at present), the conclusions of the Inspector regarding the conflict with the development plan and wider aims of the NPPF remain relevant and are given significant weight.

The site is not close to any settlement boundary and it has not been demonstrated that there is a need for the dwelling in this location. There are no material considerations that would outweigh that the development is not acceptable in principle. The proposal is not in accordance with Policies 1, 2, 25, 45 and 48 of the Local Plan and neither is it in accordance with the IPS, therefore it is not in accordance with national policy and there are no other material considerations that would justify an exception to be made to these policies. The principle for the development has not been established.

Design and Impact upon Visual Amenity/Character of Area

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive and are sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment. Policy 33 of the Chichester Local Plan requires that the scale, form, massing and siting, height and design of development respects and enhances the character of the surrounding area and site. Policy 10 of the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan includes the requirement for dwellings to be restricted to two storeys in height where possible, avoid excessive bulk, avoid the use of flat roofed dormers, recognise the local character of the parish and be in accordance with the Local Plan.

The siting and plot size of the proposed dwelling is similar to the neighbouring dwellings to the west, however these dwellings are one and a half sized storey dwellings. The proposed dwelling would be two storeys. Loxwood Hall is larger in height than the proposed dwelling. However, given the other neighbouring dwellings are one and a half storeys, the proposed dwelling would be dominant. This would cause the proposed dwelling to compete with Loxwood Hall and be out of keeping with the other dwellings in the area which are subservient to Loxwood Hall. By competing with the visual amenity of Loxwood Hall, this would cause the proposed dwelling to neither respect nor enhance the character of the surrounding area. This is contrary to paragraph 130 and 174 of the NPPF, as well as policy 33 of the Local Plan.

In the appeal decision for the previous application at the site, the Inspector stated that a dwelling in the proposed location would subdivide the plot for Loxwood Hall West causing it to encroach into the space surrounding it, which would erode its outstanding and dominant character. In addition, it was stated that the erection of a dwelling in this location would create a more regular, formal and built-up frontage which is more typical of a suburban area, and which would be wholly out of character with the Loxwood Hall vicinity, therefore causing it to be out of keeping with the wider sporadic, spacious rural character of the area.

Due to the proposed siting, size and design of the dwelling it would not respect or enhance the character of the surrounding area and therefore it would not be in accordance with Policy 10 of the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan, Policies 33 and 40 of the Local Plan and section 12 of the NPPF.

Impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties

The NPPF states in paragraph 130 that planning should ensure a good quality of amenity for existing and future users (of places), and policy 33 of the Chichester Local Plan include requirements to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Windows are proposed in the first floor side elevations of the dwelling, the plans state that the windows would be obscure glazed. This would help to reduce the risk of overlooking to the neighbouring properties to the sides. To further reduce this risk, if the application had been capable of receiving Officer support, these windows would also have been conditioned to be non-opening below 1.7m of the floor level of the rooms in which they would serve.

The rear of the application site is currently garden land, therefore there is limited overlooking to the neighbouring dwelling to the west from the application site. Windows are proposed in the first floor rear elevation of the dwelling. These would cause some overlooking to the neighbouring site to the west. Due though to the proposed siting of the dwelling and the neighbouring dwelling to the west, these windows would not significantly increase the risk of overlooking to this neighbouring site.

If the application had been capable of receiving Officer support, it would have been conditioned that a Construction and Environmental Management Plan be conditioned to be submitted prior to commencement of any works at the site. This would have been in order to protect the amenities of the area during the construction of the development.

Subject to conditions, including for details of boundary treatments to be submitted, it is considered that the development would not have a significant negative impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties in particular in regards to their outlook, privacy or available light.

Highway Safety

Highways were consulted on the impact of the proposed dwelling on the highway, they did not raise any concerns. The development would result in the loss of the garage parking for Loxwood Hall West. Highways have stated that there appears to be sufficient space to the front of Loxwood Hall West to accommodate parking. A proposed parking plan for Loxwood Hall West was not

included in the application. If the application had been capable of receiving Officer support, a proposed parking plan for Loxwood Hall West would have been requested.

Drainage

The Council's Drainage team were consulted on the application. They stated that due to the underlying geology in this area, the proposed means of surface water drainage on-site infiltration via soak-away structures is likely to render such an approach unviable. In addition, they stated that if on-site infiltration is not possible, drainage via a restricted discharge to a suitable local watercourse may be acceptable, but how the surface water is conveyed to the receiving waterbody would need to be resolved. As the application is not considered acceptable in principle, further information on the proposed drainage for the development was not requested.

Refuse/Recycling

The submitted plans show that a bin store is proposed to the front of the dwelling adjacent to the east boundary. If the application had been capable of receiving Officer support, it would have been conditioned that floor and elevation plans of the bin store be submitted.

Biodiversity and ecological considerations

Some trees are proposed to be felled as part of the development; the trees are not subject to a Preservation Order and the site is not within a Conservation Area therefore these could be felled without planning permission. If the application had been capable of receiving Officer support, it could have been conditioned that two trees are planted for every tree felled to reduce the impact on biodiversity. Further biodiversity enhancements could also have been conditioned.

The site is within the buffer zone for Ebernoe Common and The Mens Special Areas of Conservation. A Preliminary Roost Assessment was not submitted as part of the application. As the application is not considered acceptable in principle, a Preliminary Roost Assessment was not requested to determine the impact of the proposed works on the SACs.

Impact upon European Sites

Water neutrality has arisen as a serious issue affecting applications located within the Sussex North Water Resource Zone. New development tends to result in water consumption increasing and the application site is situated in an area of serious water stress. Much of this area's water (i.e. 'North of the Plan Area') is sourced from abstraction points within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone, which drains water from the Arun Valley Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site (all designated sites under the Habitats Regulations).

Natural England sent a Position Statement to Chichester District Council and adjoining Local Planning Authorities on the 14th September 2021 expressing a very serious concern that such abstraction may be causing significant adverse impacts on the biodiversity of such areas. The Position Statement confirms that new developments must not add to these adverse impacts.

Development in the Sussex North Water Resource Zone, including the application site, must demonstrate that it does not increase pressure on water resources. In other words, it must be 'water neutral'. This can be achieved by having significant water efficiency measures built into development and by providing offsetting measures to reduce water consumption from existing development.

The onus is on developers to demonstrate deliverable water neutrality for their proposals. Developers who can demonstrate water neutrality and who enter into legal obligations to secure it will be able to proceed. For those applications which do not, the decision maker, as a matter of law, has no choice but to refuse planning permission.

In such instances, the implications from the proposed development (that is the increased water demand), together with the application of measures to avoid or reduce the likely harmful effects from the discharge, are required to first be screened through the initial Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) and then tested by the council via an Appropriate Assessment (AA) to assess the impact on the designated sites in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). The completion of an AA is wholly reliant upon the applicant providing a water neutrality calculation, to demonstrate the current and proposed water demand produced by the proposed development and a mitigation package/proposal (if required) to offset any increase in water use.

Natural England were consulted on the proposed works and have said that further information on the proposed rainwater harvesting measures is required to determine the impact on designated sites. As the application is not considered acceptable in principle though, further information on the proposed rainwater harvesting measures for the development has not been requested.

Insufficient information has therefore been submitted to assess the impact of the development upon water consumption and thereby assess the significance of any impact from the proposed development and to consider any mitigation measures that might be necessary. In the absence of this information, it cannot be established that the proposal would not be likely to have a significant effect on the Arun Valley SPA, SAC and RAMSAR and is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, and the Conservation of Habitats and Special Regulations (2017).

Sustainable Development

Policy 40 of the Local Plan requires applications to demonstrate how sustainable design and construction has been considered for the development.

Within the submitted Planning Policy, Design and Access Statement it states that the rear of the proposed dwelling would be south facing to make use of passive sunlight and daylight. It also states that it would be ensured that good environmental practices would be followed, with the use of sustainable materials and drainage systems where appropriate. The submitted Energy Statement states that an air source heat pump and solar panels are proposed to be installed.

Information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development would be in accordance with Policy 40 of the Local Plan. Whilst the submission does address parts of the policy, policy 40 requires the historic and built environment, open space, and landscape character to be protected and enhanced. It also requires that the development is appropriate and sympathetic in terms of scale, height, appearance, form, siting and layout and is sensitively designed to maintain the tranquillity and local character and identity of the area.

As has been demonstrated earlier in this report, the proposed dwelling would not respect nor enhance the character of the surrounding area, and therefore the proposed works are not in accordance with Policy 40 of the Local Plan and paragraph 130 of the NPPF.

Other Matters

During the consultation of the application third party comments were submitted stating that the development would contravene a covenant in the area. As covenants are not a planning consideration, these comments were not considered. Comments were also raised by third parties about the impact of the construction of the proposed works and the future use of the proposal on the shared access. As these comments are not a planning consideration, they were not considered.

Human Rights

In reaching this conclusion the Human Rights of the applicant has been taken into account when reaching this recommendation and it is concluded that the recommendation to refuse is justified and proportionate.

Conclusion and planning balance

The development would not comply with national or local planning policies that seek to ensure that dwellings are delivered in sustainable locations and there is no justification to demonstrate that the proposal would meet an identified local need. The development would also result in harm to the character of the area due to the proposed size and design of the dwelling. Furthermore, insufficient information has been submitted to assess the impact of the development upon water consumption. It is therefore recommended that the application be refused. The applicant was advised that the proposal was not acceptable and advised to withdraw the application, however this advice was not undertaken.

The Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Consequently, the development plan policies relating to new residential development are out-of-date and NPPF paragraph 11(d) is therefore engaged. The modest benefit of a new home to the housing supply is recognised and weight attributed accordingly. However, the proposal runs contrary to the council's spatial strategy; the unsustainable and unjustified countryside location, and the harm to the character of the area, significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme when assessed against the policies of the development plan and NPPF taken as a whole which promotes sustainable development.

Officer Recommendation

REFUSE

Human Rights:

The Human Rights of all affected parties have been taken into account and the recommendation is considered justified and proportionate.

5. Recommendation

Officers Recommendation is to REFUSE the following: Erection of a detached dwelling. for the following reasons:-

1) The site lies outside the designated Settlement Boundary and the proposal is consequently located in designated countryside, where the policies of the development plan state that development will only be permitted where it requires a countryside location and where it meets an essential, small scale and local need, which cannot be met within or immediately adjacent to the existing settlement. It has not been demonstrated that the proposed dwelling requires a countryside location, nor that it is required to meet an essential, small and local need. Therefore, the proposed development constitutes an unjustified form of development, located outside the settlement boundary that is in conflict with Policies 1, 2, 25, 45 and 48 of the Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029, paragraphs 11 and 80 and sections 12 and 15 of the NPPF 2023 and Policy 2 of the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan.

2) The proposed development, by virtue of its size, siting and design would be out of keeping with the other residential dwellings in the area and conflict with the visual amenity of Loxwood Hall causing it to neither respect nor enhance the character of the surrounding area. The proposed dwelling would therefore not be in accordance with Policy 10 of the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan, Policies 33, 40, 45 and 48 of the Chichester Local Plan

2014-2029 and sections 12 and 15 of the NPPF 2023 and there are no material considerations that would outweigh the harm identified.

3) The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposal would likely lead to an increase in water consumption which is likely to have a significant effect upon European Designated Sites. Insufficient information has been submitted to assess the impacts of the development upon water consumption and thereby assess the significance of any impacts from the proposed development and to consider any mitigation measures that might be necessary. In the absence of this information, it cannot be established that the proposal would not be likely to have a significant effect on the Arun Valley SPA, SAC and RAMSAR and is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, and the Conservation of Habitats and Special Regulations (2017).

4) Insufficient information has been provided to identify the presence of protected species within the site, the likely significant impacts upon the Mens SAC and the Ebernoe Common SAC and any necessary mitigation that would be required to reduce the impacts of the development. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021), The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) (as amended) and Policy 49 of the Chichester Local Plan.

5) This decision relates to the following plans: AE01 REV A, DP100 B, DP101 B, DP102 B, DP103 B, DP104 B, DP110 and DP111.

INFORMATIVES

- 1) The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, it has not been possible to resolve them. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

Approved Plans

Details	Reference	Version	Date Received	Status
PLAN - EXISTING GARAGE FLOOR PLAN AND ELEVATIONS	AE01 REV A		03.04.2023	Not Approved
PLAN - PROPOSED GROUND AND FIRST FLOOR AND STREET SCENE	DP101	B	27.06.2023	Not Approved
PLAN - PROPOSED TYPICAL SECTION, LOFT AND ROOF PLAN	DP102	B	27.06.2023	Not Approved
PLAN - PROPOSED SOUTH AND EAST ELEVATIONS	DP104	B	27.06.2023	Not Approved
PLAN - SITE LOCATION PLAN	DP110		03.04.2023	Not Approved
PLAN - SITE BLOCK	DP111		03.04.2023	Not Approved

PLAN				
PLAN - PROPOSED NORTH AND WEST ELEVATIONS AND SITE PLAN	DP103	B	27.06.2023	Not Approved
PLAN - Proposed Site Plan	DP100	B	27.06.2023	Not Approved