



Working in Partnership



Colin Kiely
Kiely Planning Ltd
208 High Street
Guildford
Surrey
GU1 3JB

Our Ref: SDNP/17/02011/PRE
Contact Officer: Derek Price
Tel. No.: 01243 534734

16 June 2017

Dear Colin Kiely

RE: Pre-Application Advice - Erection of five dwellings following cessation of the current use and removal of the existing buildings/hardsurfacing.

Site Address: Courts Yard, Jobsons Lane, Windfall Wood Common, Lurgashall, Haslemere, West Sussex

Thank you for your correspondence received 7 April 2017 seeking pre-application advice. Please accept my apologies for the delay in letting you have our formal response.

Site Description and Proposal

Given that the character and appearance of the site together with the relevant site history and policy framework in which any future application would be assessed is relatively well known from the recent planning applications and appeal decision, I do not intend to rehearse those particular aspects in any detail, except where they are considered relevant to the assessment of this particular.

The appeal decision has also provided assistance in interpreting the approach to the three dimensions of sustainability set out in the NPPF in respect of the principle for residential redevelopment of this site and the resultant loss of the employment use here.

Relevant Planning History

SDNP/13/02655/FUL - Erection of 2 no. detached dwellings with garages following the demolition of and removal of all existing buildings, hard surfacing and uses. WITHDRAWN 26.07.2013

SDNP/13/05501/FUL - Erection of 2no. detached dwellings with garages following the demolition of and removal of all existing buildings, hard surfacing and uses. WITHDRAWN 14.05.2014

SDNP/13/05503/FUL - Redevelopment of Courts Yard to provide replacement B1(c) Light Industrial, B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage and Distribution) floorspace with ancillary office, parking, servicing and turning facilities. REFUSED 25.11.2014

SDNP/15/05454/FUL – Erection of 2 detached dwellings and garages following the cessation of the current use and demolition and removal of all existing buildings and hard standings. APPEAL ALLOWED 02.09.2016

Planning Assessment

This latest proposal seeks to significantly increase the density of development within the site and notwithstanding the matters touched on above does, in my view give rise a number of initial concerns regarding the approach suggested in either layout option.

Existing residential development within the immediate locality remains dispersed in nature and is very much an incidental element within the landscape. For example, the small enclave of residential development immediately north of the site comprises no more than 5 individual dwellings in a loose knit grouping set in generous, relatively informal grounds. Both suggested options for five dwellings would represent a significant increase in the number of dwellings within the immediate area in a much more compact arrangement at odds with the dispersed character of development found locally (and, it has to be said, that proposed in the appeal scheme). I note that the total GIA of the development (excluding the garaging) has also increased from 780m² to 868m².

Overall, the number of proposed dwellings is considered too high and the resultant increased intensity of residential activity associated with the proposal would be harmful to the character of the area.

This is particularly the case with the introduction of the terraced layout of plots 3 to 5 associated with option E or the alternative closely spaced arrangement shown on option F. In my view this represents a form of development that is incompatible with and uncharacteristic of the rural form and vernacular of residential development found locally. To that end I would suggest that there is a conflict with paragraphs 60 and 61 of the NPPF and saved policy BE11.

Having stated my reservations regarding the two options that have been submitted, I would acknowledge that there may be scope to support a limited increase the number of residential units on the site over that previously permitted on appeal, but this must adopt a more sympathetic and informed approach. I would suggest that there is the opportunity to look at a more imaginative, even possibly contemporary approach to the redevelopment of the site that reflects the best in rural building design and response to this sensitive rural setting, as well as addressing the amount and density of development.

You may recall that our Design and Implementation Manager commented at application stage that a finer grained development possibly arranged to reflect a farmstead group would seem to be a better interpretation for the redevelopment of the site. Whilst not wishing to impose any particular design solution, examples where such an approach has recently been considered include a site in Funtington (SDNP/16/03715/FUL) and in terms of contemporary rural architecture, Redford Farm, Redford (SDNP/16/05302/FUL).

In addition and 'without prejudice' to the matters touched on above, I would also make the following brief observations in respect of the layout(s) as submitted:

Plot 2 is close to the margin of the surrounding woodland. Whilst I assume that the treeline and canopy spread may well be stylised or indicative on the drawing, I would be concerned that there appears to be limited amenity space that is not likely to be affected by shading because of the westerly orientation, therefore resulting in future pressure to remove trees. Therefore the siting may need to be reconsidered.

In the light of this, I suggest that any future application should be accompanied by a tree survey and assessment that identifies any that may need to be removed and any proposed replacements.

It would also be helpful if an application is accompanied by an indication of what and where supplementary landscaping is proposed to mitigate the impact of the development.

Compared to the footprint of the dwellings, the various garage/carport buildings appear quite substantial on drawings 103 and 104. Is this correct?

You will be aware that the SDNPA have introduced CIL since 1st April 2017 and further enquiries relating to its administration and application should be directed to the SDNPA itself.

As you know we have a future meeting scheduled where I would hope there is the opportunity to engage in further proactive discussion on the points covered above.

If you pursue a formal planning application please note that the requirements of the South Downs National Park Authority Local Validation List will apply with regard to the information required to be submitted. Further information is available at www.southdowns.gov.uk/planning/planning-advice.

It would be advisable to contact the Building Control department at your Local Authority to check if building regulation approval is required.

Please note that the advice contained within this letter constitutes an informal Officers opinion and does not prejudice, nor is binding upon, any future decision taken by the South Downs National Park Authority.

Yours faithfully,

Derek Price
(Signed)
Principal Planning Officer (National Park)