

# Public Document Pack

## **JOHN WARD**

Head of Finance and Governance Services

Contact: Lisa Higenbottam or Katherine Jeram  
Email: lhigenbottam@chichester.gov.uk or  
kjeram@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House  
1 East Pallant  
Chichester  
West Sussex  
PO19 1TY  
Tel: 01243 785166  
www.chichester.gov.uk



A meeting of the **Planning Committee** will be held in Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on **Wednesday 19 July 2017 at 9.30 am**

MEMBERS: Mr R Hayes (Chairman), Mrs C Purnell (Vice-Chairman), Mr G Barrett, Mrs J Duncton, Mr M Dunn, Mr J F Elliott, Mr M Hall, Mr L Hixson, Mrs J Kilby, Mr G McAra, Mr S Oakley, Mr R Plowman, Mrs J Tassell, Mrs P Tull and Mr D Wakeham

## **SUPPLEMENT TO AGENDA**

18 **Agenda Update Sheet** (Pages 1 - 15)

## Agenda Update Sheet

### Planning Committee

Wednesday 19 July 2017

#### ITEM: 6

**APPLICATION NO: EWB/17/00374/FUL**

#### **COMMENT:**

The application has been withdrawn from the agenda.

---

#### ITEM: 7

**APPLICATION NO: 17/00468/FUL**

#### **COMMENT:**

Addendum to section i) Principle of development (page 29)

The Parish Council has commented that it has maintained its objection due to the proposal comprising of two buildings. The officer's report indicates that the Parish Council had maintained its objection to there being two dwellings on the site; this is incorrect.

The final sentence of paragraph 8.3 should read:

In their subsequent comments to the amended plans it is clarified that their objection stands because the proposal remains for 2 **buildings** on the site.

Further to the above, it should be noted that the application site lies within the Strategic Development Location (SDL) for Tangmere. However the site also lies within the Settlement Boundary as allocated by the Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan, which excludes the site allocated for the SDL. The disparity between the allocation of the site within the SDL and the settlement boundary was addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan Inspector. The Inspector concluded that "the plot is capable of independent development in line with the existing pattern of development on the south side of Church Lane. Whilst it could also be incorporated into the SDL, I do not consider it essential for the comprehensive masterplanning of the housing area." (Inspector's Report - page 10).

It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not prejudice the masterplanning or the delivery of the SDL, and it remains that the proposed development would be acceptable in principle as it is located within the Settlement Boundary for Tangmere.

Additional supporting information from the agent

The agent has confirmed that the proposed gate to the vehicular access would be a 5 bar gate to match the existing. The agent has also confirmed that the developer would provide a new fence along the eastern boundary of the site, to replace the existing fence which is in a poor state of repair. The fence would be 1.2m in height to the front of the property and would increase to 1.8m in height, to the side of the property and alongside the rear garden. It is recommended that a condition is added to the recommendation to secure the proposed boundary treatments (as outlined below).

With regards to the proposed landscaping the agent has confirmed that it is intended to grow a native hedge behind the garage which would give the appearance of a natural field boundary and would not damage the garage building. Trees that would be interspersed could be Field Maple and Hornbeam. It is recommended that the landscaping condition is amended to require full details of a planting scheme, protection of any existing trees to be retained and the retention of the planting for 5 years to ensure that it is managed whilst it becomes established (as outlined below).

**Recommendation:**

The recommendation remains to permit with the addition/amended conditions and an additional informative below.

Amended conditions:

Condition 5 is to be deleted and replaced with the following condition to secure the landscaping.

**The development hereby permitted shall not be first brought into use** until a fully detailed landscape and planting scheme for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include a planting plan and schedule of plants noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities, and for large scale developments shall include a program for the provision of the landscaping. In addition all existing trees and hedgerows on the land shall be indicated including details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development. The scheme shall make particular provision for the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity on the application site. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and in accordance with the recommendations of the appropriate British Standards or other recognised codes of good practice. **The approved scheme shall be carried out in the first planting season after practical completion or first occupation of the development**, whichever is earlier, unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or plants which, within a period of 5 years after planting, are removed, die or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality and to enable proper consideration to be given to the impact of the proposed development on existing trees.

Additional conditions:

**No development shall commence** unless and until the concrete raft across the access to the site has been provided fully in accordance with construction details and working drawings that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the concrete raft shall be retained as approved in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of protecting the culverted surface water drain beneath and access to the site.

The dwellings hereby permitted **shall not be first occupied** unless and until the bathroom windows at first floor level on the west elevation of plot 1 and the east elevation of plot 2 shall be obscure glazed and fixed shut beneath 1.7m above the finished floor level of the room. Thereafter the windows shall be maintained as approved in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of protecting the amenity of neighbours.

**No development shall commence**, including any works of demolition, until a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved CEMP shall be implemented and adhered to throughout the entire construction period unless any alternative is agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall provide details of the following:

- (a) the anticipated number, frequency and types of vehicles used during construction,
- (b) the provision made for the parking of vehicles by contractors, site operatives and visitors,
- (c) the loading and unloading of plant, materials and waste,
- (d) the storage of plant and materials used in construction of the development,
- (e) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding,
- (f) the provision of road sweepers and/or wheel washing facilities to mitigate the impact of construction upon the public highway
- (g) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction, to include where relevant sheeting of loads, covering and dampening down stockpiles
- (h) measures to control the emission of noise during construction,
- (i) details of all proposed external lighting to be used during construction and measures used to limit the disturbance of any lighting required. Lighting shall be used only for security and safety,
- (j) appropriate storage of fuel and chemicals, in bunded tanks or suitably paved areas, and
- (k) waste management including prohibiting burning.

Reason: These details are necessary pre-commencement to ensure the development proceeds in the interests of highway safety and in the interests of protecting nearby residents from nuisance during all stages of development and to ensure the use of the site does not have a harmful environmental effect.

**No development shall commence** until details of the proposed overall site wide surface water drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The design should follow the hierarchy of preference for different types of surface water drainage disposal as set out in Approved Document H of the Building Regulations and the SUDS Manual produced by CIRIA.

Winter ground water monitoring to establish highest annual ground water levels and Percolation testing to BRE 365, or similar approved, will be required to support the design of any Infiltration drainage. The surface water drainage scheme shall be implemented as approved unless any variation is agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No building shall be occupied until the complete surface water drainage system serving that property has been implemented in accordance with the approved surface water drainage scheme.

Reason: The details are required pre-commencement to ensure that the proposed development is satisfactorily drained with all necessary infrastructure installed during the groundworks phase.

**Prior to first occupation of the dwelling(s) hereby permitted** the associated boundary treatments shall be provided in accordance with a scheme that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:

- (a) scaled plans showing the location of the boundary treatments and elevations,
- (b) details of the materials and finishes,

Thereafter the boundary treatments shall be maintained as approved in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of protecting the amenity of neighbours.

Notwithstanding any indication shown on the approved plans, and notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order) hereby approved, **the dwellings shall not be first occupied until** the first floor bathroom window(s) in the west elevation of plot 1 and the east elevation of plot 2 hereby permitted shall be permanently;

- (i) glazed with obscure glass with a glass panel which has been rendered obscure as part of its manufacturing process to Pilkington glass classification 5 (or equivalent of glass supplied by an alternative manufacturer), and
- (ii) non-opening below 1.7 metres from the finished floor level of the room in which the window is installed.

Reason: To protect the privacy of the occupants of the adjoining residential properties.

#### Additional informative

The applicant should be made aware that the onus is on the developer to ensure that no damage is caused to the culverted road surface water drainage beneath the access to the development and the verge adjacent to the front boundary of the site, including during the works required to provide utilities and services to the site.

---

**ITEM: 8**

**APPLICATION NO: 17/00670/FUL**

**COMMENT:**

Additional condition:

The development hereby permitted shall run in parallel with planning permission ref: WE/14/04206/FUL (APP/L3815/W/15/20006346).

Reason: For clarity and in the interest of proper planning.

---

**ITEM: 9**

**APPLICATION NO: 16/04141/FUL**

**COMMENT:** The agent has submitted the following statement as he is on holiday and unable to attend the committee.

'I write today as Agent for the above application in my absence at the Planning Committee Meeting.

This application is for a stunning, new two storey dwelling located adjacent the beach at West Wittering to replace a tired and undistinguished detached two storey dwelling. The original application was for a three-storey dwelling of a similar architectural language, however through positive discussions with the local planning authority, this has been amended in certain areas to ensure a recommendation for approval from the Planning department.

These amendments are as follows:

- Removal of second floor
- Reduction in depth of balcony overlooking the beach and provision of privacy screens to ensuring the balcony would not result in an unacceptable level of overlooking to neighbouring properties
- Reducing the impact on the street scene by way of removing the car port and reduction in width and depth of the garage.

The materials palette has been carefully chosen to reflect the seaside environment in which it is located. This includes a predominant crisp white render with timber and knapped flint panels to provide visual interest. The material palette ensures the dwelling does not appear incongruous or overly bulky within the street scene.

The form of the proposed dwelling considers the Council's design guidance in respect of both neighbouring properties. It does not extend to such a degree that it would result in a loss of light or that it would appear overly bearing or oppressive. The proposal has been designed to ensure privacy of neighbouring properties is not affected.

The proposed dwelling is visually sympathetic to the mixed-context surroundings, promotes local distinctiveness and is set lower than the adjacent properties in line with the West Wittering Village Design Statement.

In summary, the scheme complies with the NPPF, relevant development plan policies and the West Wittering Village Design Statement and as such, has been recommended for approval'.

---

### **South Downs Local Plan Pre-submission - September 2017**

On 11 July 2017 a Full Authority meeting of the South Downs National Park Authority met and approved the draft SDNP Pre-Submission Local Plan for public consultation under Regulation 19 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations 2012. It is proposed that the public consultation will take place for a period of 8 weeks starting on 11 September 2017. Following the expiry of the public consultation it is anticipated that the Plan will be submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination in February 2018.

Reports within the committee agenda refer to the policies of the SDNP Local Plan – Preferred Options being given limited weight. Following approval of the draft SDNP Pre-Submission Local Plan for public consultation it is now considered that policies should be given some weight and that they will continue to gather weight through the local plan process.

---

### **ITEM: 10**

**APPLICATION NO: SDNP/16/04519/FUL**

### **COMMENT:**

#### **East Lavington Parish Council – comments received 18.07.2017**

East Lavington Parish Council, (ELPC), would like to thank you for the invitation to comment on this application in the light of the new information which has become available since our previous comments on the same application dated 31st October 2016.

In considering our response Councillors have taken into account the following information:

- The 'plans for discussion' dated 15th to 21st March 2017 and posted on 20th April 2017
- The 'substitute drawings' dated 19th to 22nd June 2017 and posted on the SDNP website on 27th June 2017
- The Case Officer's report, undated, and posted on 10th July 2017, as part of the document pack for the planning committee meeting on 19th July 2017
- The Advice to Planning Document from the Historic Buildings Advisor dated 19<sup>th</sup> October 2016 and included in the document pack posted on 10th July 2017

With regard to the last named item, ELPC considers that this consultee report contains significant information related to the application and it should have been posted immediately after its production, last year and not seven months later.

Although not 'new information', ELPC has also taken into account the substantial amount of officer correspondence and draft plans, related to the informal pre-planning phase preceding the current application. This material was provided to us by the Authority on 20th October 2016.

The Authority is well aware of ELPC's view on this application as expressed in our comments last October. Our task therefore has been to consider, based on the new information, whether there have been any alterations to the application sufficiently significant that that we might wish to change our views.

In summary, the principal concerns we expressed in our letter last October were:

- The scale of the proposed replacement dwelling was out of keeping with the rural, isolated and elevated location. The front elevation in particular was much too high and too massive and its neo-Georgian style was completely alien, and would introduce an assertive and urbanising effect
- By contrast, the existing old cottage had a modest vernacular appearance and enhanced the quiet rural scene
- We considered that the new development was completely out of step with Saved Policy H12 of the Local Plan, and with the first objective of the South Downs National Park to 'conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area
- We stated clearly that we were absolutely opposed to the idea that digging down one metre to try and disguise the height of the south front would be acceptable. We learned from the Popple Meadows experience that such an approach would most probably create more problems than it would solve
- Finally, we made clear that we were not opposed to a limited redevelopment of the site in which the old cottage was retained, and combined with a sympathetic one and a half storey extension in keeping with the rural setting in terms of its size, height and overall design and in particular that the ridge line should not exceed the current one

#### The 'Plans for Discussion'

These drawings are dated between 15th and 21st March 2017 and were posted a month later on 20th April. The drawings reference meeting with the Authority on 19th January 2017 and 13 March. There are references on the drawings to 'possible resolutions' and 'revised plans'. One or even two revisions were made in some cases.

These plans and their annotations following the meetings indicate clearly that at this time the Authority was not able to support the application, and was still trying to agree a way forward with the applicant. Minor changes are made to the back and sides of the house, but the only revision to the front is a slightly modified canopy over the front door.



### The Substitute Drawings

The substitute drawings are dated between 19th and 22nd June and were posted on 27<sup>th</sup> June. The invitation to comment followed on the same day.

The substitute drawings appear very similar to the plans for discussion, but they do incorporate revisions made between 19th and 22nd June. Presumably these revisions result from further discussions regarding the plans for discussion. Each of the new drawings is marked as “Agreed Amendments” but it is not clear who was agreeing what with whom. Presumably the Authority had not ‘agreed’ since there is no sign of the usual caveat about comments being ‘without prejudice’.

Again, the changes are all to the back and sides of house and involve minor changes to heights and to swapping hipped roof ends on the garage for gabled ends. There is no change to the front of the house which remains as it appeared in September 2016, at the time of the original formal submission.

Clearly the Authority decided that the minor changes were sufficient to allow a decision to recommend approval of the plans in June, which they had been unable to do in March, despite the evident fact that no significant changes had been made. This change of mind seems to have occurred either just before or immediately after the submission of the new plans on 22nd or 23rd June since invitations to comment went out on the 27th.

ELPC remains puzzled and concerned by the decision to recommend approval so suddenly, and after nine months when virtually no changes were made to the original plans.

### Case Officer's Report

The Case Officer's report seems very tentative about the recommendation. There is no ringing endorsement of the proposal. Instead it abounds with expressions like ‘could’ and ‘on balance’ suggesting a clear difficulty in justifying the recommendation.

The only exception is the praise for the quality of design and materials, with constant references to the Sussex Farmhouse vernacular. ELPC does not agree with this description of the design, especially not in relation to the front of the house. We think it looks like a pseudo-Georgian mansion, a town house that might look appropriate in the middle of Midhurst or Chiddingfold, but not in this isolated and prominent rural location.

There is even a version of the critical south elevation...but the only change is a slightly modified canopy over the front door.

### The Historic Buildings Advisor's (HBA) Report

The Case Officer's report makes only very brief references to this report, and none at all to the strong objections she makes. Her report states clearly that the proposal should be refused. She considers that the old cottage should not be demolished and that the new house being neo-Georgian in design is completely unsuitable in this location.

ELPC is at a loss to understand why the Case Officer does not even acknowledge this advice let alone accept and follow it. The HBA is a qualified professional, and employee of the District Council. ELPC's comments are almost identical to the HBA's.

### Conclusion

ELPC can see nothing in the substitute plans that would encourage councillors to make any change to our comments made on the original application in October 2016. On the contrary, we consider that the force of our conclusions has been significantly strengthened by the firm advice of the HBA.

Therefore we continue to believe very strongly that the application should be refused in its present form.

### **Applicant's response to the points raised in Cllr Elliott's Red Card**

1 – 18<sup>th</sup> century cottage with later additions in prominent position highly visible from public rights of way and noted by officers as sensitive location in rural area of South Downs National Park.

Mr Elliott's dating of the cottage is misleading.

A full understanding of the fabric, history and merits of the existing building is clearly set out in Mr Fred Aldsworth's building and archaeological assessment dated January 2015 and which is attached with the application.

This assessment suggests inter alia that (a) it is very unlikely a case could be made for the existing building to be included on the Statutory List (b) the existing building does not satisfy the criteria for establishing heritage significance or value to the community and (c) any designation would be contrary to the South Downs National Park Authority objective of encouraging quality designed housing.

There are numerous other neighbouring buildings that are very much more visible than the existing building from public rights of way and we expect the replacement house to be less visible than those other neighbouring buildings as a result of design, careful positioning, landscaping & proposed materials.

2 – Planning Application SDNP/16/04519/FUL seeks to demolish the cottage and replace it with a two storey Georgian style mansion.

This is a misrepresentation & a negatively driven & unfounded observation.

The proposed building is not a mansion but a four bedroom family house with garages. The design has been developed to reflect the South Downs objectives and policies and uses appropriate & carefully chosen materials.

3 – Replacement house totally out of keeping with the location due to scale, massing, design and especially height.

This is a misrepresentation and a negatively driven & unfounded observation. The design of the replacement building addresses that which might be expected of the location. Considerable thought as well as detailed & full discussions with the SDNP (& Chichester Council) has gone into the scale, massing, design & height of the replacement house.

4 – Significant resident opposition to destruction of this local landmark, whose historical interest has been noted by Historic Building Advisors.

There is not significant resident opposition. Objections from the Parish Council appear to be very similar to the objections set out in this Red Card & which we are answering in this note.

There have been objections from 3 local residents. One resident requests further information on the existing building which we have supplied (see 1 above) and gives their views on our design. The second resident gives their view on the existing building & memories of time spent with former owners and gives their personal view on our design and the third resident gives their view on the existing building, memories of time spent with former owners and their comments on hedging which we have already considered as shown by the mindful positioning of the house and the proposed landscaping.

5 – Conflicts with SDNP key objective to “conserve and enhance natural beauty and cultural heritage”. Also conflicts with CDC and SDNP planning policies H12 and Draft SD45 on replacement dwellings.

We do not understand the reasoning behind these concerns or objectives. For the last few years we have been trying extremely hard to enhance the beauty of the South Downs by building an attractive house fit for the 21<sup>st</sup> century that can be enjoyed the next generation and beyond. At no time were CDC / SDNP planning policies H12 & Draft SD45 put forward as considerations / objections.

6 – An earlier application by same applicant was submitted in 2014 (SDNP/14/03791/FUL) to demolish the cottage and replace with much larger house. Not supported by officers and subsequently withdrawn.

This is an unfortunate & unfair interpretation of events.

From the very beginning we have always stated that we wanted to progress matters with officer support through discussion and amendment where required. Until we submitted our first application there was nothing to discuss with the officers of the South Downs. Having submitted our first application we received a reaction from officers & we were able to meet & to discuss with them their comments & requirements. We then withdrew our original application only after we thought the revised application had addressed the points raised by them.

7 – New Application even larger, higher and more assertive despite constructive guidance from officers during an “informal” pre – application process lasting more than a year.

Again this is a misrepresentation.

The new application is not larger. In addition the word “despite” implies that advice from the officers was ignored which could not be further from the truth. We have found the SDNP / CDC guidance most useful.

8 – No objection in principle to sympathetically designed extension to original cottage if no higher than present building.

The site is some 10 – 12 acres and long term the location & land lend themselves more to a family house rather than to a retirement house / bungalow.

The proposed design for the new building, its carefully designed positioning, its deliberate use of sympathetic materials & landscaping is specifically designed to make it less visible than & more in keeping with its surrounds than the existing building.

It is worth noting that other than the limited resident opposition mentioned in 4 above as far as we are aware there has been a very positive response to our proposals.

## **Agents Supporting Information**

### Site Levels

I am happy to stand by the levels above datum mentioned in the D&A statement.

To be clear we are proposing to reduce the ground level adjacent to the entrance from 53.50 to 52.50 above datum - 1m in height. The 53.50 level is the survey level adjacent to the entrance door to the existing house.

We are proposing to set the new ground floor finished level height at 52.65m above datum. The existing ground floor finished floor level varies around the ground floor so in some parts the difference may well be 1.15m but if you are proposing to condition the levels it would be best to condition the levels above datum rather than by reference to the existing finished floor levels.

### Design

The design of the proposed replacement dwelling at Copse Cottage in Graffham has consciously been developed in the informal tradition of the English Picturesque which has been adopted for residential buildings in the English countryside in one form or another over the last 200 years.

The design has been carefully developed to adopt the materials and forms of typical Sussex farmhouses found in the local vicinity. Thus the materials employed are red clay roof tiles on a 45° pitch, random coursed Fittleworth stone with red clay brick quoins, dressings and chimneys, and painted timber external doors and windows.

A feature common to many farmhouses and other dwellings in detached locations in this part of the West Sussex countryside is that they tend to show evidence of extension and adaptation over a period of time; typically from a fairly simple base building typically dating from mid to late C18 with extensions and alterations carried out in similar locally sourced materials but set out and proportioned in the style of the period in which they were built. This brings a pleasing harmony of material palette but with a variety of different interpretations of scale, rhythm, window proportion, door panelling and so on.

This manner of extending and adapting houses continued into the 1950s, from which time several extensions broke away from the tradition of adopting vernacular construction design and adopted different design directions, often making use of industrialised building systems and materials such as uPVC for windows, leading to a breakdown in legibility of the vernacular tradition, as can be seen with the existing house on the site at Copse Cottage.

In fact it is rare to find a building in the area, any one part of which dates back to the early nineteenth century or before, which has not been adapted or extended in this way. Therefore it could be argued that a combination of a variety of historical styles – as opposed to one consistent design from a specific period – is the defining characteristic of buildings in the area in and around Graffham.

A good example of this kind of incremental development of a building form can be seen in the case of Glattings Farm near Bignor, some 3 miles east this site. In this case the early group of farm buildings, including a modest farmhouse, dairy and stable courtyard was extended in the early Victorian period with a new block to reface the South elevation; the new block contrasting strongly with the earlier base building in proportion, ceiling height, window style (vertically proportioned sash contrasting with horizontally proportioned casement on the earlier parts) and details such as cornices and panelled doors (in place of ledged and braced doors).

In this way the design for the new replacement building seeks to amalgamate a number of different styles of domestic design, unified by a common palette of materials.

The East facing wing represents an early phase of the notional history of the construction of the building, being characterised by informally positioned casement windows tucked up under an unassuming eaves, with sash windows to the ground floor level.

Moving to the North block, the building presents a range of hip roof forms at varying levels which aggregate into a picturesque composition brought together over time. The South block hints at a later addition, perhaps dating from the 1820s, as the notional owner might have become more prosperous. This block presents a slightly more formal elevation with three sash windows on each of ground and first floor levels, with a three course brick string course tying the masonry together mid-way up the elevation – a characteristic use of brick and random coursed stone which can be seen in many houses of this size and type locally.

On the West elevation a 'later' addition extends from a quarter landing off the staircase and so negotiates the varying levels of the site with a small sunroom which adopts the style of the 1860s.

In this way the building as a whole reads as an informal accretion of parts brought together in a pleasing and varied though harmonious composition with no one element strongly dominating another.

## **Representations**

4 Third Party letters of objection in response to re-advertisement (3 responses from previous objectors)

- Applicants have a right to demolish but its replacement should be an improvement to the built environment
- Any new building on the site should be discrete
- Design of the new dwelling does not represent the 'Sussex Farming Vernacular – it verges on the aggressive
- The proposed dwelling does not reflect the house name i.e. Copse Cottage. If the north and south elevations were swapped around that would indicate a constructive way forward.
- Very little change since earlier comments were made. Impact of garage block on neighbouring property
- New design has made some changes but none to the frontage or overall size – concerns raised by Parishioners have not been addressed.
- Demolition of existing dwelling
- New dwelling is out of scale and sympathy with its surroundings
- Conflicts with the objectives of the NP
- Sympathetically extending the existing cottage could be achieved

## **Additional Conditions/Informatives**

### **Site Levels**

At no time shall the replacement dwelling and associated garaging be constructed other than in accordance with the levels and heights above the datum point (50.00) shown in Drawing No. 547-07 Rev. A dated 21.06.2017. For the avoidance of doubt the various elements of the building shall be constructed to the following levels above datum.

Ground Level immediately adjacent to the south elevation – 52.50

Finished floor level of the ground floor of the new dwelling – 52.65

Ridge height of the south elevation of the new dwelling – 60.84

Ridge height of the east elevation – 59.6

Ground Level immediately adjacent to the west elevation of the garage/store building – 52.15

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory relationship results between the new development and the adjacent land.

### **INFORMATIVE - Wildlife affected by development**

The developer's attention is drawn to the provisions of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994, and to other wildlife legislation (for example Protection of Badgers Act 1992, Wild Mammals Protection Act 1996). These make it an offence to kill or injure any wild bird intentionally, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird intentionally (when the nest is being built or is in use), disturb, damage or destroy and place which certain wild animals use for shelter (including badgers and all bats and certain moths, otters, water voles and dormice), kill or injure

certain reptiles and amphibians (including adders, grass snakes, common lizards, slow-worms, Great Crested newts, Natterjack toads, smooth snakes and sand lizards), and kill, injure or disturb a bat or damage their shelter or breeding site. Leaflets on these and other protected species are available free of charge from Natural England.

The onus is therefore on you to ascertain whether any such species are present on site, before works commence. If such species are found or you suspected, you must contact Natural England (at: Natural England, Sussex and Surrey Team, Phoenix House, 32-33 North Street, Lewes, East Sussex, BN7 2PH, 01273 476595, [sussex.surrey@english-nature.org.uk](mailto:sussex.surrey@english-nature.org.uk)) for advice. For nesting birds, you should delay works until after the nesting season (1 March to 31 August).

---

**ITEM: 11**

**APPLICATION NO: SDNP/16/05874/FUL Bury Gate Farm**

**COMMENT:**

Condition 2 amended

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the plans noted below.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date on Plan	Status
Plans - Site Sections	241/PL/230		30.06.2017	Approved
Plans - Sections AA BB CC	241/PL/231		30.06.2017	Approved
Plans - Proposed Planting landscape plan	BG_001	A	30.06.2017	Approved
Plans - Proposed Site Block Plan	241/PL/150	A	30.06.2017	Approved
Plans - Location plan	241/PL/001		24.11.2016	Superseded
Plans - Proposed landscape plan - planting	BG_001		05.12.2016	Superseded
Plans - Proposed landscape plan - Hard surfaces	BG_002	A	05.12.2016	Approved
Plans - Proposed block plan	241/PL/150		24.11.2016	Superseded
Plans - Proposed ground floor plan	241/PL/200		24.11.2016	Superseded
Plans - Proposed first floor and roof plan	241/PL/201		24.11.2016	Superseded
Plans - Proposed sections	241/PL/210		24.11.2016	Superseded
Plans - Proposed south and west elevations	241/PL/220		24.11.2016	Superseded
Plans - Proposed north and east elevations	241/PL/221		24.11.2016	Superseded

Plans - Proposed garden store plans	241/PL/222		24.11.2016	Superseded
Plans - Elevations	600E		24.11.2016	Submitted
Plans - Garage plans and elevations	601C		24.11.2016	Submitted
Plans - Floor and roof plans	700E		24.11.2016	Submitted
Plans - Proposed Ground Floor Plan	241/PL/200	B	23.06.2017	Approved
Plans - Proposed South and West Elevations	241/PL/220	B	23.06.2017	Approved
Plans - Proposed First Floor Plan and Roof Plans	241/PL/201	B	23.06.2017	Approved
Plans - Proposed North and East Elevations	241/PL/221	B	23.06.2017	Approved
Plans - Proposed Sections AA and BB	241/PL/210	B	23.06.2017	Approved
Plans - Proposed Garage and Store Elevations	241/PL/222	A	23.06.2017	Approved
Plans - Proposed North and East Elevations Levels Analysis	241/PL/SK005	A	30.05.2017	Approved
Plans - Proposed South and West Elevations Levels Analysis	241/PL/SK004	A	30.05.2017	Approved
Plans - Site Block Plan and Extent of Existing Hardcore	241/PL/SK003		24.05.2017	Approved