

PLANNING STATEMENT

LAND NORTH WEST OF GORING STATION, GORING BY SEA, NR WORTHING

ON BEHALF OF PERSIMMON HOMES THAMES VALLEY

PROPOSAL:

MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING UP TO 475 DWELLINGS ALONG WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, INTERNAL ROADS AND FOOTPATHS, CAR PARKING, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, LANDSCAPING, LOCAL CENTRE (USES INCLUDING A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1, D2, AS PROPOSED TO BE AMENDED TO USE CLASSES E, F AND SUI GENERIS) WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING, CAR PARKING FOR THE ADJACENT RAILWAY STATION, UNDERGROUNDING OF OVERHEAD HV CABLES AND OTHER SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES.

**TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED)
PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004**

Pegasus Group

Pegasus House | Querns Business Centre | Whitworth Road | Cirencester | Gloucestershire | GL7 1RT

T 01285 641717 | **F** 01285 642348 | **W** www.pegasuspg.co.uk

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | East Midlands | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester

PLANNING | **DESIGN** | **ENVIRONMENT** | **ECONOMICS**

CONTENTS:

Page No:

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	THE SITE DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION	3
3.	THE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS	5
4.	PLANNING HISTORY	7
5.	THE PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK	8
6.	ASSESSMENT	25
7.	THE OVERALL PLANNING BALANCE	44
8.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	54

APPENDIX 1 – ECONOMIC BENEFITS SPREADSHEET

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Planning Statement has been prepared by Pegasus Group to accompany a planning application which is submitted on behalf of Persimmon Homes Thames Valley (the Applicant). The application relates to land north west of Goring Station, Goring-by-Sea, near Worthing (the Application Site).
- 1.2 In summary, the application seeks outline planning permission for a mixed-use development that will deliver amongst other things, up to 475 dwellings and other supporting uses.
- 1.3 A more detailed description of the development proposals is set out in Section 3 of this Planning Statement and within the separate Design and Access Statement that accompanies the application.

The Purpose and Content of the Planning Statement

- 1.4 This Planning Statement provides a summary overview of the application proposals and identifies the Planning Policy Framework within which it should normally be considered.
- 1.5 **Section 2** provides a description of the site and its surroundings. A description of the development proposals is set out in **Section 3**. The relevant planning history is outlined in **Section 4**. The Planning Policy Framework that is applicable to the application is provided in **Section 5**. **Section 6** then provides an assessment of the main planning issues and provides a reasoned justification for the scale and nature of the development that is now being proposed. **Section 7** deals with the overall planning balance. The summary and conclusions are set out in **Section 8**.

Environmental Impact Assessment

- 1.6 On 7th December 2016 the Secretary of State issued a Direction confirming that an EIA would not be required to support an application for 475 dwellings and other associated works.

Other Supporting Documents

- 1.7 Whilst an EIA is not required, the planning application is supported by a suite of supporting documents including:-

- a. Arboricultural Opportunities and Constraints Assessment
- b. Design and Access Statement.
- c. Ecological Reports
 - Protected Species Surveys
 - Breeding Bird Survey
 - Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment
- d. Environmental Noise Impact Assessment
- e. Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy
- f. Heritage Desk Based Assessments (Archaeology and Built Heritage).
- g. Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.
- h. Statement of Community Engagement.
- i. Transport Assessment.
- j. Travel Plan

Pre-application consultation

- 1.8 The Statement of Community Engagement sets out the pre application consultation that was undertaken prior to finalising and submitting this planning application. This includes consultation with the Local Planning Authority (LPA), statutory consultees and the local community.

2. THE SITE DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

- 2.1 The Application Site is located at Goring-by-Sea, adjacent to the railway station, approximately 4.5km to the west of Worthing Town Centre.
- 2.2 The site itself is irregular in shape and extends to 19.96ha. It is relatively flat and comprises a single gently sloping field which is currently in agricultural use. There are no buildings or structures within the site apart from the overhead power lines which are proposed to be undergrounded.
- 2.3 The site is well related to the existing pattern of built development and is closely surrounded by built development on almost three sides.
- 2.4 The southern boundary runs parallel with the London to Brighton railway line. Beyond the western part of the southern boundary and the railway line is an established residential area at Singleton Crescent which is characterised by 1950/60's development. Beyond the eastern part of the southern boundary is a recent development of 3-4 storey apartments (Bluebell Way) and Chatsmore Catholic High School.
- 2.5 The existing housing which lines Ferring Lane backs on to the northern part of the western boundary. The southern part of the western boundary is separated from other housing at Ferring by a single field that is currently in agricultural use. That land falls outside the administrative area of Worthing and forms part of the neighbouring district of Arun.
- 2.6 The eastern boundary is defined by hedgerows, beyond which is the built-up area of Goring. The railway station is located close to the south eastern corner of the site on the other side of Goring Street.
- 2.7 The northern boundary of the site is defined by the watercourse known as the Ferring Rife. An agricultural field to the north of the Rife separates the site from the A259 Littlehampton Road and the open countryside beyond.
- 2.8 The site is currently served by a single field access off the A259 in the north eastern corner of the site. There are two public rights of way in the southern and south western parts of the site. PROW 2121 is aligned parallel to the railway line at the southern boundary.

- 2.9 The site is not directly affected by any national, regional or local landscape or ecological designations. The South Downs National Park does however lie to the north with its southern boundary running contiguous with the A259 Littlehampton Road.
- 2.10 There are no heritage designations within the site and it is not located within a Conservation Area. There are designated heritage assets nearby and these are considered in further detail in the Heritage Assessment.
- 2.11 The Environment Agency's flood zone mapping shows that the majority of the site lies within Flood Zone 1 (lowest probability of flooding), although small areas alongside the Ferring Rife are within Flood Zones 2 and 3.

3. THE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

3.1 The Applicant seeks outline planning permission for a development comprising:-

“Mixed use development comprising up to 475 dwellings along with associated access, internal roads and footpaths, car parking, public open space, landscaping, local centre (uses including A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1, D2, as proposed to be amended to use classes E, F and Sui Generis) with associated car parking, car parking for the adjacent railway station, undergrounding of overhead HV cables and other supporting infrastructure and utilities.”

3.2 The application is submitted in outline with all matters of detail reserved for subsequent consideration at the reserved matters stage.

Density

3.3 The application proposals involve a development of up to 475 dwellings on a site that extends to 19.96ha. The net density of the development would be circa 46 dwellings per hectare.

Layout, Landscaping and Open Space

3.4 Whilst layout is a reserved matter, an Illustrative Masterplan has been submitted to demonstrate how this scale and form of development can be accommodated within the site and assimilated into the existing built-up area.

3.5 The proposed development would not extend as far north as the Ferring Rife. The development parcels would be set back from the watercourse to provide a new area of publicly accessible parkland and area of biodiversity protection and enhancement which extends to almost 5ha, in addition to other green infrastructure.

3.6 The Masterplan is landscape-led and as explained in more detail in the Design and Access Statement, it is anticipated that the development parcels will be designed to maintain green corridors through the site on a north south axis.

3.7 Play areas are strategically located throughout the development to be accessible to the new resident population and those from neighbouring residential areas.

3.8 The local centre would be located at the south eastern corner of the site, close to the railway station. This reinforces the railway station as a local focal point and

provides an opportunity to deliver a new car park to serve the railway station and address the existing parking problems in the area.

Access

- 3.9 The site will be served by a new 3-arm roundabout junction off the A259 Goring Street at the eastern boundary. There would also be provision for a secondary access and a dedicated access into the local centre/extended railway parking area. Further details are provided as part of the Transport Assessment.
- 3.10 Pedestrian and cycle linkages are also designed into the Illustrative Masterplan to improve connectivity in the area and ensure there is appropriate permeability through the new development.

Housing Mix

- 3.11 The precise housing mix will be agreed at a later stage if planning permission is granted. It is anticipated that the proposals would include a range of house types, including detached, semi-detached, and terraced houses as well as apartments. House sizes are likely to range from 1 to 4 bedroom units.
- 3.12 The proposals would make provision for a range of tenures and this will include a significant proportion of affordable housing (30%), in accordance with Policy 10 of the Core Strategy.

Building Heights

- 3.13 Whilst "scale" is a reserved matter, it is assumed that building heights would be predominantly 2 and 2½ storeys with 3 and 4 storey elements at selected locations to add variety to the roofscape and to enhance legibility within the layout. Further detail on the distribution of building heights is provided in the Design and Access Statement.

Drainage

- 3.14 As explained in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, the proposals will incorporate on-site SUDs features which will attenuate the surface water as well as acting as an opportunity for biodiversity enhancements and contributing towards the visual amenity of the site.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 There are no known previous planning applications which relate to the Application Site.

5. THE PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

5.1 This section refers to relevant national policy and guidance and the Development Plan policies that provide the planning policy framework within which this planning application should normally be considered.

5.2 It deals with the following tiers of policy and guidance

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF2)
- The Development Plan
- Neighbourhood Planning

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF2)

Introduction

5.3 NPPF2 was published in July 2018 and was then the subject of a small number of revisions in February 2019.

5.4 The introduction section of NPPF2 explains how the revised Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied [paragraph 1]. It reiterates that Planning Law requires applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise [2]. The Framework is to be read as a whole including its footnotes and annexes [3] and it may be a material consideration in making decisions on planning applications [5].

Achieving Sustainable Development

5.5 NPPF2 explains that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development [7]. It is explained that achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives (economic, social and environmental) and that these are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways [8].

5.6 NPPF2 clarifies that these are not criteria against which every decision can or should be judged [9]. It goes on to state that planning decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions but in doing so

should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area.

The Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development (PFSD)

5.7 NPPF2 carries forward the concept of the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development (PFSD) and reaffirms that it sits at the heart of the framework [10].

5.8 Paragraph 11 sets out how planning applications should be determined:-

"11.....

For decision-taking this means:

c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date⁷, granting permission unless:

i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed⁶; or

ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole." (our emphasis)

5.9 Footnote 7 provides further guidance on when policies may be out of date. It confirms that when a LPA cannot demonstrate a 5YRHLS, the policies which are most important for determining an application involving the provision of housing should be considered to be out of date.

5.10 Footnote 7 is reproduced below. It is notable that it does not restrict its effect to just "policies for the supply of housing," as was the case with paragraph 49 of the previous Framework:-

"⁷ This includes, for applications involving the provision of housing, situations where the Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (with the appropriate buffer, as set out in paragraph 73); or where the Housing Delivery Test indicates that the delivery of housing was substantially below (less than 75% of) the housing requirement over the previous 3 years."

- 5.11 Footnote 7 therefore specifies two routes to the 'tilted balance' for applications involving the provision of housing. The first indicates that the 'tilted balance' will be engaged where a LPA is unable to demonstrate a 5YRHLS and the second applies where there is a record of substantial under-delivery.
- 5.12 Footnote 6 of the Framework identifies a closed list of potential restrictive policies that could cause the "tilted balance" of paragraph 11d to be dis-applied, including policies relating to designated heritage assets and National Parks. Where there is no conflict with these restrictive policies, the "tilted balance" can be engaged.
- 5.13 Paragraph 12 of NPPF2 reiterates that the PFSD does not change the statutory status of the Development Plan as the starting point for decision making.
- 5.14 Paragraph 14 of NPPF2 relates to Neighbourhood Plans and the circumstances in which the "tilted balance" in paragraph 11d is engaged. This paragraph effectively replaces the guidance that was previously set out in the Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) on Neighbourhood Planning dated December 2016. It identifies that the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with a Neighbourhood Plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, providing that a number of criteria are met.
- 5.15 Paragraph 23 of NPPF2 identifies that strategic policies should provide a clear strategy for bringing forward sufficient land at a sufficient rate to address objectively assessed needs over the plan period in accordance with the PFSD.

Decision Making

- 5.16 NPPF2 explains that Local Planning Authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way and that decision makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible [38].
- 5.17 Guidance is provided at paragraph 48 on the weight to be given emerging plans. It states that:-

"48. Local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);

b) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and

c) the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)."

5.18 NPPF2 now includes guidance on prematurity [49-50].

Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

5.19 The NPPF2 at paragraph 59 reiterates the Government's objective of:-

"..... significantly boosting the supply of homes."

5.20 Paragraph 73 requires that LPAs annually identify a minimum of five years' worth of housing against the housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies, or against the local housing need where strategic policies are more than five years old. It continues to specify the circumstances in which different buffers will be applied to the 5YRHLS.

5.21 It is important to note the definition of "deliverable" has changed. The new definition as set out in Annex 2: Glossary of NPPF2 now reads as follows:-

"Deliverable: To be considered deliverable, sites for housing should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years. In particular:

a) sites which do not involve major development and have planning permission, and all sites with detailed planning permission, should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that homes will not be delivered within five years (for example because they are no longer viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans).

b) where a site has outline planning permission for major development, has been allocated in a development plan, has a grant of permission in principle, or is identified on a brownfield register, it should only be considered deliverable where there is clear evidence that housing completions will begin on site within five years.." (our emphasis)

5.22 The change is significant and has implications for how the LPA calculates its housing land supply. The new definition confirms that major sites which are

subject to outline planning permissions or allocations should not be considered deliverable, unless there is clear evidence that completions will be achieved within five-years.

Building a strong, competitive economy

- 5.23 NPPF2 continues the theme of contributing towards the national economy. Housing development will continue to have a role in this regard. Paragraph 80 states amongst other things that “significant weight” should be placed on the need to support economic growth.

Local Green Space

- 5.24 NPPF2 allows for the designation of land as Local Green Space through local and neighbourhood plans [99]. However, it goes on to state that designating land as Local Green Space should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services.
- 5.25 The emerging Worthing Local Plan proposes to allocate the application site as Local Green Space, but the Applicant considers that the land does not meet the criteria set out in the NPPF. The guidance states that:

“100. The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:

a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;

b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and

c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

“101. Policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with those for Green Belts.”

Promoting Sustainable Transport

- 5.26 Transport issues continue to have an important role to play in NPPF2. Various transport related objectives are identified at paragraph 102, these include addressing potential impacts on transport networks, opportunities from existing

or proposed transport infrastructure, opportunities for promoting walking, cycling and public transport and taking account of environmental effects and features that contribute towards making high quality places.

5.27 Paragraph 103 explains that the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives.

5.28 The issues to be taken into account when considering development proposals are set out in paragraphs 108 to 111. Paragraphs 108 and 109 state:-

“108 In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;

b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and

c) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.

109. Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.” (our emphasis)

Making Effective Use of Land

5.29 NPPF2 places emphasis on making effective use of land, not only on previously developed land but also on other land that is released for development. The desirability of maintaining an area’s prevailing character and setting should also be taken into account when considering density [122].

Achieving well-designed places

5.30 NPPF2 carries forward the government’s commitment to good design. It is not necessary to go into detail on this matter as this will be considered at the reserved matters stage. However, the Illustrative Masterplan demonstrates that the site can be laid out in a way which is sympathetic to the site and its surroundings.

Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

5.31 The guidance at paragraph 170 will be relevant. It states, inter alia that:-

“170 Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

“a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);

b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;” (my emphasis)

5.32 The application site does not form part of a “valued landscape.” It will nonetheless be necessary for applicants and decision makers to recognise intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. However, this will be something that needs to be balanced against the need to provide a sufficient number of new homes in accordance with the development plan and national policy.

5.33 Given the location of the site relative to the National Park regard should be had for the guidance at paragraph 172 which reads as follows:-

“172. Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.”

Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

5.34 Paragraph 189 requires that applicants assess the heritage impacts of any development proposal.

5.35 When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance [193]

- 5.36 Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification [194].
- 5.37 Paragraph 196 identifies that where there is less than substantial harm to a heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
- 5.38 The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset [197].

Annex 1: Implementation

- 5.39 NPPF2 paragraph 213 deals with the issue of consistency between existing planning policies and national guidance. It states:-

“213 ...existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with this Framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).” (our emphasis)

- 5.40 Paragraphs 215 and 216 explain how the definition of substantial under-delivery determined by the Housing Delivery Test will be phased in over time, starting in November 2018 (initially set at 25% of housing required over the previous three years).

The Development Plan

- 5.41 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. At the time of writing, the Statutory Development Plan policies for determining the application are contained within the following:-
- a. The Worthing Core Strategy 2011 (WCS);
 - b. Saved policies of the Worthing Local Plan 2003 (WLP03);

The Worthing Core Strategy

- 5.42 The most up to date part of the Development Plan is the Worthing Core Strategy (WCS) which was adopted in April 2011.
- 5.43 The WCS was prepared in the context of the now revoked Planning Policy Guidance notes and Statements [see paragraph 1.12] and the now revoked South East Plan [1.13].
- 5.44 The WCS provides the strategic planning policy framework for Worthing for the plan period 2006 to 2026. It contains the spatial vision and policies to guide planning decisions in Worthing.
- 5.45 From the Proposals Map that sits alongside the WCS, it can be seen that the application site is identified as Land Outside of Built-Up Area Boundary. Notwithstanding this, it is important to note that the site is not located within or immediately adjacent to any landscape, ecology, or heritage designation. It is simply countryside beyond the built-up area with the land to the north providing a buffer between the application site and the Highdown Conservation Area and the National Park beyond.
- 5.46 Given this context, it is considered that the most important policies in the WCS insofar as this application is concerned, will include the following:-

Policy 7 – Meeting Housing Need

Policy 13 – The Natural Environment and Landscape Character

- 5.47 It is also considered that the following policies are relevant for the determination of the application:-

Policy 8 – Getting the Right Mix of Homes

Policy 10 – Affordable Housing

Policy 12 – New Infrastructure

Policy 15 – Flood Risk and Sustainable Water Management

Policy 16 – Built Environment and Design

Policy 17 – Sustainable Construction

Policy 18 – Sustainable Energy

Policy 19 – Sustainable Travel

Spatial Strategy

- 5.48 The WCS at paragraph 5.2 acknowledges that Worthing is a borough that is constrained by the limited opportunities for expansion, given the South Downs to the north and the sea to the south. However, it recognises that there is a need to provide more housing, employment and retail space and the associated infrastructure services that development needs.
- 5.49 The spatial strategy of the WCS is for development to take place within the existing built up area boundary of the town, being the most suitable location by virtue of the existing access to services, facilities and transport links [5.4]. It also sought to deliver an edge of town strategic allocation at West Durrington [5.5].
- 5.50 Outside of the identified development areas the emphasis is on protecting and enhancing the built and natural environment [5.12].

The Housing Requirement and Delivery

- 5.51 The WCS states that:-

“7.2 The overarching housing policy goal is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home which they can afford, in a community where they want to live.”

- 5.52 It goes on to explain that it must demonstrate how the provision of housing contributes to the main vision and regeneration strategy. It must promote a wide choice of housing type, improve affordability and ensure a better balance between housing demand and supply.
- 5.53 **Policy 7** of the WCS identifies a housing requirement for 4,000 net additional dwellings in the period 2006-26 (200 dwellings per annum). It indicates that the overall supply of housing will be monitored and managed to ensure that there is a sustainable supply of housing land.
- 5.54 Paragraph 7.6 refers to the need to maintain supply. It states:-

“..... The Council will need to ensure that an adequate housing land supply is maintained, that the delivery risks

are mitigated and contingency arrangements are in place. Continuous monitoring will be required to ensure that housing delivery is managed appropriately.”

- 5.55 Paragraph 7.11 states that new developments outside of the town centre should be designed to bring forward a range of housing types to help diversify the housing offer and, in particular, meet the needs for family housing.
- 5.56 **Policy 8** deals with the mix of homes and requires the provision of a wide choice of high quality homes, with higher density housing located in and around the town centre.
- 5.57 **Policy 10** deals with affordable housing and seeks the provision of 30% on-site affordable housing on sites of 15 or more dwellings.
- 5.58 **Policy 12** identifies that new development should assist in creating sustainable communities, including appropriate financial contributions towards infrastructure provision.

The Natural Environment and landscape Character

- 5.59 Policy 13, amongst other things, seeks to preclude housing development outside of the built up boundary (with the exception of development at West Durrington). It reads as follows:-

Policy13

The Natural Environment and Landscape Character

Worthing’s development strategy is that new development needs can be met within the existing built up area boundary and, with the exception of the West Durrington strategic allocation, will be delivered on previously developed sites, therefore:

- **Residential development outside of the existing built up area boundary will only be considered as part of a borough-wide housing land review if there is a proven under-delivery of housing within the Core Strategy period.**
- **Other proposals that support countryside based uses, such as agriculture and informal recreation may be considered if they are deemed essential and/or can contribute to the delivery of the wider strategic objectives. If development in these areas is proposed it must take into account and mitigate against any adverse effects on visual and landscape sensitivity.**

- **All new development will respect the biodiversity and natural environment that surrounds the development and will contribute to the protection and, where applicable the enhancement of the area. New development along the seafront will be designed to incorporate measures which will limit any adverse impacts on the coastal and marine environment.**
- **Identified sites in the Worthing Biodiversity Report that have local and nationally recognised designations, such as a SNCI and a SSSI will be protected from any development that detracts from their environmental quality and sensitivity.** (our emphasis)

Other relevant policies

- 5.60 **Policy 15** indicates that development will be directed away from areas of the highest risk of flooding in accordance with the sequential test. It continues to identify that development will be required to ensure that there is no net increase in surface water runoff.
- 5.61 **Policy 16** explains that all new development will be expected to demonstrate good quality design. It continues to indicate that the settlement structure, landscape features and buildings which represent the historic character of Worthing should be maintained; preserving and enhancing existing assets.
- 5.62 Whilst the policy seeks to preserve and enhance existing heritage assets the policy is out of date because it does not reflect the balancing of harm against public benefits in NPPF paragraph 196.
- 5.63 **Policy 17** seeks to ensure that climate change mitigation and adaptation is embedded in new development.
- 5.64 **Policy 18** requires at least sufficient on-site renewable energy generation to match the requirements of the South East Plan.
- 5.65 **Policy 19** identifies that a Transport Assessment will be required for major new development.

Saved Policies of the Worthing Local Plan

- 5.66 The WLP03 was adopted in September 2003 and covers the plan period to 2006. The majority of policies in the WLP03 have been superseded by the WCS.

- 5.67 Notwithstanding this, Appendix 6 of the WCS confirms that some “saved policies” of the WLP03 remain in force.
- 5.68 The only saved policy which is considered relevant to the current application is Policy TR9.
- 5.69 **Policy TR9** identifies that on-site parking provision will be based on the standards in operation at the time.

Emerging Development Plan Documents

Coastal West Sussex Local Strategic Statement

- 5.70 A number of local planning authorities, including both Arun District Council and Worthing Borough Council have signed up to a Local Strategic Statement for the period 2015-31 (LSS). This sets out the long-term strategic objectives and spatial priorities across Coastal West Sussex.
- 5.71 The second strategic objective states:

“Local planning authorities will work proactively together and with their partners to narrow the gap between the planned housing provision of 4,000 new homes per annum to the assessed needs of 5,700...

... Each local planning authority will continue to look for opportunities for further development to meet their assessed needs in the short to medium term, particularly as a result in infrastructure investment.”

- 5.72 The LSS sets out a comparison of the objectively assessed need with current rates of delivery for each LPA and across Coastal West Sussex in Table 1. This identifies 406 too few homes per annum have been delivered in Worthing 2010-15. 2,644 too few dwellings per annum were being provided across the Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton sub-region.

The Emerging Worthing Local Plan

- 5.73 Worthing Borough Council has commenced work on a new Local Plan (eLP) which once adopted will replace the policies in the WCS.
- 5.74 An Issues and Options Consultation took place between May and June 2016. A Draft Local Plan was then produced and was the subject of a Regulation 18 Consultation between October and December 2018.

5.75 The eLP does not propose to allocate the application site for housing (or any other form of development). Instead it is proposed to be designated as a Local Green Gap (Policy SP5) and Local Green Space (Policy SP6).

5.76 The eLP remains at a very early stage in the plan making process and accordingly should only be afforded very limited weight. For the purposes of this application, the most relevant policies include:-

Policy SP1 Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development

Policy SP2 Spatial Strategy

Policy SP4 Countryside and Undeveloped Coast

Policy SP5 Local Green Gaps

Policy SP6 Local Green Space

5.77 Emerging **Policy SP1** reflects the Presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in NPPF2.

Spatial Strategy

5.78 Emerging **Policy SP2** sets out the spatial strategy of the eLP and this reads as follows:-

a) Up to 2033 delivery of new development in Worthing will be managed as follows:

i. Land within the Built Up Area Boundary - development will be permitted subject to compliance with other policies in the Local Plan. Development should make efficient use of previously developed land but the density of development should be appropriate for its proposed use and also relate well to the surrounding uses and the character of the area. The Local Plan will:

- seek to provide for the needs of local communities and balance the impact of growth through the protection and enhancement of local services and (where appropriate) the safeguarding of employment sites, leisure uses, community facilities and valued green/open spaces;
- help to deliver wider regeneration objectives, particularly in the town centre and seafront, through the allocation of key urban sites and the identification of Areas of Change;

- seek to increase the rate of housing delivery from small sites.

ii. **Edge Of Town Sites - three edge of town sites are allocated for development.**

iii. **Open Spaces / Countryside / Gaps - valued open space and landscapes outside of the Built Up Area Boundary are protected. This includes important gaps between settlements and the undeveloped coastline.**

5.79 As before, the strategy seeks to concentrate development within the built-up area and on three edge of town sites. Other land outside the built-up area is to be protected.

5.80 It should be noted that the policy deals with the plan period up to 2033 (only a 13 year period at the time of writing). The NPPF at paragraph 22 requires strategic policies to look ahead over “a minimum period of 15 years from adoption.” By the time the plan reaches adoption this timeframe will have reduced even further. Indeed, this is an issue that might require the LPA to start again to ensure that it is consistent with national policy. This further reduces the weight that can be afforded to the eLP.

Housing Delivery

5.81 The eLP at 2.16 paragraph explains that there is a need for 12,801 homes across the plan (753 dwellings per annum) period but **Policy SP3** only identifies a housing requirement of 4,182 homes in this timeframe. This results in an unmet need of 8,619 homes by 2033.

5.82 Paragraph 2.23 identifies that of the proposed housing requirement of 4,182 homes, only 1,543 homes will come forward from commitments. The remaining 949 homes will be delivered on unallocated windfall sites.

5.83 The eLP at paragraph 2.32 claims that a realistic housing capacity figure for the borough from 2016 to 2033 is a minimum of 4,182 dwellings and goes on to explain that this housing target is a “capacity-based” figure based on the level of housing that can be delivered within the Plan period, having regard to the identified constraints and potential development capacity.

5.84 The eLP is therefore only planning for a housing target of 246dpa compared to the OAN of 753dpa. Alarming, paragraph 2.34 states:-

“It is clear however that, despite taking a positive approach to development, the delivery rate for housing will fall significantly below the levels of housing need identified. Approximately 33% of the overall housing need will be met and that this would result in a shortfall in housing delivery over the Plan period of approximately 8,600 dwellings.” (our emphasis)

Addressing Unmet Housing Needs

- 5.85 The LPA has been working with other local authorities across the sub-region (through the duty to cooperate) to address the housing shortfalls but paragraph 2.35 states that:-

“Whilst positive progress has been made, it is evident that currently only a very small proportion of the borough’s shortfall might be met elsewhere in the subregion.” (our emphasis)

- 5.86 Therefore, not only is the eLP planning to fail to meet the local housing need, there is no mechanism in place to ensure that the unmet needs can be met elsewhere.

Development Outside the Built-Up Boundary

- 5.87 Emerging **Policy SP4** indicates that land outside of the Built-Up Area boundary, including the Application Site, will be defined as countryside and undeveloped coast. In this area, Policy SP4 proposes that development will be permitted where a countryside location is essential to the proposed use, it cannot be located within the Built-Up Area and it maintains the character of the area. Part f) also seeks to protect the setting of the South Downs National Park.

Local Green Gaps

- 5.88 The eLP proposes to designate the Application Site as a Local Green Gap, which will be protected to retain the separate identities and character of settlements through **Policy SP5**. The extent and location of the proposed LGS designation is shown on Fig 3 on page 30.

Local Green Space

- 5.89 Emerging **Policy SP6** also proposes to designate the Application Site as a Local Green Space (LGS). The reasons for this proposed designation are set out in

paragraphs 2.69 to 2.73. The extent and location of the proposed LGS designation is shown on Fig 3 on page 35.

Neighbourhood Planning

5.90 There is no “made” or emerging Neighbourhood Plan that covers the application site.

6. ASSESSMENT

6.1 This section of the Planning Statement sets out the main planning considerations for this application. These include the following:-

- Issue 1 Housing Need and Five-Year Land Supply (5YRHLS)**
- Issue 2 Whether the site is an appropriate location for housing development having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant adopted development plan policy**
- Issue 3 Emerging Development Plan Policy**
- Issue 4 Landscape and Visual Impact**
- Issue 5 Archaeology**
- Issue 6 Built Heritage**
- Issue 6 Traffic and Transportation**
- Issue 7 Other Technical Matters**

6.2 Some of these issues are examined in more detail in separate reports, but the purpose of this Planning Statement is to bring all the conclusions together in order to inform the overall Planning Balance.

Issue 1 Housing Need and Five Year Land Supply (5YRHLS)

Background

- 6.1 The WCS is now more than five-years old such that the housing need which prevails for the purposes of both plan-making and decision-making, is that which arises from the "Standard Method," as required by paragraphs 60 and 73 of NPPF2.
- 6.2 The eLP proposes that only 33% of the identified need can be accommodated within Worthing and that only a very small (unspecified) proportion of the unmet need might be accommodated elsewhere within the wider sub-region.
- 6.3 Indeed, the Interim Duty to Co-operate Statement of October 2018 identifies that Adur, Brighton and Hove, Chichester and Lewes all do not have sufficient capacity to address their housing needs. Whilst Arun and Horsham may be able to address a very small proportion of the resulting unmet needs, there will remain a very significant shortfall across Worthing and Adur and across Sussex.

- 6.4 Without additional provision to address this, the housing needs for up to 8,600 homes in Worthing will go unmet across the sub-region.
- 6.5 This will not only have significant adverse implications for individual households, including worsening affordability, increased rates of shared and concealed households, increased rates of homelessness and increased rates of affordable need, it is also likely to compromise the economy of Worthing.
- 6.6 There is therefore a pressing need for additional housing to meet the housing needs of the area and to support its economy. This situation exists now, as is evident from the current five-year land supply position which is set out below.

Five-year land supply in Worthing

- 6.7 The WCS was adopted on 12th April 2011. It is therefore more than five-years old. In these circumstances paragraph 73 of NPPF2 indicates that the five-year land supply should be assessed against the local housing need. Footnote 37 and the Glossary of NPPF2 define the local housing need to be the figure which arises from the application of the "Standard Method."
- 6.8 The latest assessment of the five-year land supply position in Worthing is contained in the Annual Monitoring Report 2018-2019 with a base date of 1st April 2019. This identifies a 1.8 year land supply against the Standard Method. However, this has been miscalculated in a number of ways as briefly summarised below.

Local Housing Need

- 6.9 The Standard Method is set out in the PPG and this produces a minimum local housing need for 880dpa from 2019 in Worthing, as compared to the figure of 881dpa identified in the Annual Monitoring Report. There is therefore a need for 4,400 homes in the period 2019-24.

The Backlog

- 6.10 The Annual Monitoring Report takes account of the backlog which has accrued since 2016. However, in accordance with the PPG (68-031) when the five-year land supply is assessed against the Standard Method, it is not necessary to take account of backlog.

The Buffer

- 6.11 Paragraph 73 of the NPPF identifies that a buffer should be added to this need based on the Housing Delivery Test results. In Worthing, the current 2019 Housing Delivery Test results identify that 54% of the number of homes required have been built over the previous three years.
- 6.12 The result of this is that Worthing Council now has a record of significant under-delivery such that it is necessary to apply a 20% buffer in accordance with paragraph 73 of the NPPF, rather than the 5% buffer assumed in the Annual Monitoring Report.
- 6.13 Whilst a Housing Delivery Test of 54% does not currently equate to a record of substantial under delivery owing to the transitional arrangements of paragraph 215 of the NPPF, it will be necessary to significantly boost the supply of housing in the short-term to ensure that the Housing Delivery Test result of November 2020 is at least 75%.
- 6.14 If this is not achieved, then there will be a record of substantial under-delivery such that the “tilted balance” of paragraph 11d of the NPPF will be automatically engaged regardless of the five-year land supply position.
- 6.15 Once the Standard Method is correctly calculated, the backlog is removed and the 20% buffer is applied, there is a five-year requirement for 5,280 homes in the period 2019-24 as compared to the requirement for 6,222 identified in the Annual Monitoring Report.

Housing Supply

- 6.16 The Annual Monitoring Report identifies a deliverable supply of 2,262 homes over this period, including 324 homes on SHLAA sites and 853 homes on proposed Local Plan allocations.
- 6.17 These sources of supply are not deliverable according to the definition of a deliverable site within the NPPF. SHLAA sites have recently been discounted from the deliverable supply by the Secretary of State on another appeal nationally¹. Similarly, in numerous (if not all) appeal decisions emerging Local Plan allocations

¹ As set out in the appeal decision at Windacres Farm, Surrey (3230164) and the Inspectors report to the Secretary of State in the recovered appeal at Land at Hawthorns, Surrey (3211033) both of which were accepted by the Secretary of State in the Land at Hawthorns appeal decision.

have been found to not be deliverable given that they are likely to remain subject to outstanding objections and have yet to be tested through an examination. Therefore, the Council is only able to demonstrate a deliverable supply of (at most) 1,085 homes.

6.18 Therefore, without any other interrogation of the LPA's evidence on housing supply it is only able to demonstrate (at most) a **1.03 year land supply**. Accordingly, NPPF Footnote 7 applies, meaning that the most important policies for determining residential planning applications are out-of-date and the "tilted balance" is engaged owing to the absence of a five-year land supply. As identified above, in the absence of an immediate boost to housing supply, the "tilted balance" will also be automatically engaged from November 2020 onwards, regardless of the five-year land supply position.

6.19 Accordingly, policies that would otherwise frustrate housing delivery should be regarded as being out of date and it will be necessary to afford these policies reduced weight in the overall planning balance.

Five-year supply across the sub-region

6.20 The five-year land supply shortfall in Worthing is also not being addressed in other LPAs within the sub-region, even when the five-year land supply is assessed against constrained housing requirements in other LPAs.

6.21 In Adur, the Council identify a 5.19 year land supply against their constrained housing requirement. The Council include SHLAA sites contrary to the approach recently endorsed by the Secretary of State. Once these sites are excluded, the Council is only able to demonstrate a **4.07 year land supply** even against the constrained housing requirement.

6.22 According to a recent appeal decision in Arun, the Council can only identify a **2.9 year land supply**.²

6.23 In Brighton and Hove, the Council is only able to identify a **4.02 year land supply** even against the constrained housing requirement.

² Land adjacent to Bonhams and Flints, Hoe Lane, Flansham (APP/C3810/W/19/3236911)

- 6.24 In Chichester, the Council identify a 5.35 year land supply against the adopted housing requirement. However, this has recently become more than five-years old and accordingly the five-year land supply must now be assessed against the standard method. This produces a **3.16 year land supply**.
- 6.25 In Horsham, the Council identify a **5.54 year land supply** against the adopted housing requirement. However, the adopted housing requirement will become more than five-years old in November 2020 and thereafter the Council will only be able to demonstrate a 4.59 year land supply against the standard method.
- 6.26 In Lewes, the Council identifies a 5.59 year land supply. However, this includes SHLAA sites contrary to the recent position of the Secretary of State and it also includes unallocated sites that are subject of resolution to grant planning permission. These have also been identified as being ineligible for inclusion in the deliverable supply by the Secretary of State³. Once these sites are discounted in accordance with the findings of the Secretary of State, the Council would only be able to identify a **4.89 year land supply** even against the constrained housing requirement.
- 6.27 Mid Sussex is the only LPA within the sub-region that can and will be able to claim a five-year land supply in the near future. The Council identify a **5.66 year land supply**.
- 6.28 Across the combined Coastal West Sussex local authorities⁴ (excluding the South Downs National Park), the adopted Development Plans provide for 4,645 homes per annum as compared to the objectively assessed need for 7,369 homes per annum⁵ or the local housing need for 7,957 homes per annum. This shortfall of between 2,724 and 3,312 homes per annum across the sub-region would equate to **a shortfall of between 54,474 and 66,233 homes** over a 20 year plan period

³ In paragraph 18 of the appeal decision at Winsford (2212671).

⁴ Comprising Adur, Arun, Brighton and Hove, Chichester, Crawley, Eastbourne, Horsham, Lewes, Wealden and Worthing

⁵ Based on the objectively assessed need identified in the respective Local Plans where these were adopted under the former NPPF or in other cases based on the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment prepared by the LPAs

6.29 In the absence of sufficient provision in Worthing and across the sub-region even when this is assessed against an already constrained housing requirement, the opportunity for households to address their housing needs will be even further constrained.

6.30 This is all before any further reductions are factored in as a result of the ongoing Covid 19 pandemic.

6.31 To summarise:-

1. There is a clear, urgent and pressing need for housing in Worthing now. This has serious consequences for real people in the real world that need a home now and also for the local economy.
2. The LPA cannot demonstrate a 5YRHLS and therefore the tilted balance is engaged by virtue of NPPF2 Footnote 7.
3. The current housing land supply shortfall is substantial with the LPA supply being no greater than 1.03 years.
4. The emerging Local Plan fails to provide sufficient land to meet the housing requirement (a shortfall of 8,600 dwellings) across the plan period up to 2036.
5. There is no plan in place through the Duty to Cooperate to accommodate this need elsewhere if not in Worthing.

There is a shortfall in supply even against constrained housing requirements across the sub-region.

Issue 2 The Principle of residential development

6.32 Having established the dire housing land supply position already facing the LPA it is necessary to explain how housing at the application site would accord with the overarching strategy of the Development Plan.

6.33 The purpose of this exercise is to demonstrate that the application site is a suitable and sustainable location where residential development can and should take place, subject obviously to other material considerations which will be considered separately.

The Development Plan

- 6.34 The starting point for the determination of any planning application or appeal is the Development Plan. The planning system is “plan led” and Planning Law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 6.35 As already explained in Section 5, the Development Plan that covers the application site comprises:-
- a. The Worthing Core Strategy 2011 (WCS);
 - b. Saved policies of the Worthing Local Plan 2003 (WLP03);

The adopted housing requirement

- 6.36 Policy 7 of the adopted Worthing Core Strategy (WCS) identifies a housing requirement of 4,000 net additional dwellings in the period 2006-26 (200 dwellings per annum). However, from the outset it is important to note that the housing requirements of the adopted WCS are out of date. That is because:-
- a. The WCS was prepared in the context of the now revoked South East Plan [see WCS para 1.11].
 - b. The WCS pre-dates both NPPF1 and NPPF2 and does not (and could not) reflect more recent changes in national policy.
 - c. For the purposes of NPPF paragraph 73 the WCS is now more than 5 years old and housing land supply should be calculated against the standard method.
 - d. The WCS only required 200dpa whereas the Standard Method now requires 880 dpa.

The Spatial Strategy

- 6.37 The thrust of the spatial strategy of the WCS was for development to take place within the existing built up area boundary of the town and at the strategic allocation at West Durrington [5.5].

6.38 The site is well related to the built-up areas Goring and Ferring and in that regard would be consistent with the spatial strategy which seeks to focus development at the urban areas.

6.39 However, whilst the application site immediately abuts the built-up area on three sides, the Applicant acknowledges that the site itself is not located within the built-up area. It is also not allocated for development of any kind. Outside the identified development areas, the WCS places emphasis on protecting and enhancing the built and natural environment.

6.40 Accordingly, the Applicant accepts that the application proposals would conflict with the part of WCS Policy 13 that reads as follows:-

"Policy 13

.....

Residential development outside of the existing built up area boundary will only be considered as part of a borough-wide housing land review if there is a proven under-delivery of housing within the Core Strategy period

....."

6.41 However, it is now evident that a 5YRHLS has not been maintained in Worthing, and by a substantial margin. Even in those circumstances Policy 13 offers no solutions and instead puts the problem off until there is a review of the WCS.

6.42 Work has started on the new eLP but it is unlikely to be adopted for 2 to 3 years. In the meantime, the adopted plan would suggest that housing needs will just have to wait regardless of the scale of the deficit (even with only 1.03 years of supply) and the serious social and economic consequences that are now affecting individuals and families in the real world will just have to continue.

6.43 The Government no longer considers this to be appropriate way of dealing with such serious problems. In circumstances where the plan-led system has failed, it is necessary to allow the Development Management process to intervene. That is manifestly the intended purpose of the "tilted balance" in paragraph 11d of NPPF2 (which post-dates the WCS). Where an LPA is unable to demonstrate a 5YRHLS, Footnote 7 of the NPPF is triggered and policies that continue to restrict and frustrate housing delivery will be deemed out of date.

- 6.44 Therefore, whilst the application proposals do not accord with the Development Plan, only limited weight can be afforded to any conflict with Policy 13. The policy must give way to enable the LPA to improve the supply of housing in the area, given the absence of any other mechanism that can address the problem.
- 6.45 Whilst it is not necessary to identify more than one route into the “tilted balance” it is also important to remember that the housing requirement of the WCS is out of date because it is derived from the now revoked South East Plan. The housing requirement in the WCS is significantly less than that which is required under the up to date Standard Methodology. This means that the Built-Up Area Boundary which was defined to only accommodate the much lower housing requirement of the WCS will, through Policy 13, actively restrict any meaningful housing delivery over and above the adopted requirement.
- 6.46 The defined boundary will necessarily need to flex to accommodate the current local housing need. The Built-Up Area Boundary insofar as it relates to Policy 13 is also out of date for this separate and free-standing reason (regardless of the desperate 5YRHLS position).

Other policies and designations

- 6.47 There are no other policies that are directly applicable to this site. In policy terms it is relatively unconstrained and the only reason that is preventing the site from coming forward to deliver much needed housing is that it lies on the wrong side of the line which defines the out of date Built-Up Area Boundary.
- 6.48 It is not in the National Park and there are no other landscape, ecology or heritage designations that directly relate to the site. It is also not protected public open space. The built parts of the proposed development would also avoid areas at risk of flooding. It therefore represents an excellent opportunity for residential development which could make a significant impact on housing delivery (both open market and affordable housing) in the short and medium term.

Strategic/Local Gap Policies

- 6.49 The site is not identified (and protected) as a strategic or local gap in the adopted Development Plan.

Local Green Space

- 6.50 The site is not designated as Local Green Space in the adopted Development Plan.

The Relationship between the Site and the Existing Built-Up Area

- 6.51 The application site is well related to the existing pattern of built development in the area.
- 6.52 The site is closely surrounded and enclosed by existing development on three sides. The Railway to the south, the Ferring Rife and the A259 Littlehampton to the north further reinforces the sense of containment.
- 6.53 The pattern of built development in the area is such that the site would represent a logical rounding off for this part of the settlement. It is essentially a large infill site. It would not represent a new incursion into the open countryside and would not encroach any closer to the National Park than the existing pattern of development.

Accessibility

- 6.54 The close relationship with the built-up area means that the site is accessible to key facilities within the urban area. The Design and Access Statement and the Transport Assessment provide further details and demonstrate that the site is in an accessible and sustainable location consistent with national guidance.
- 6.55 They show that new residents will have access to shops, services and facilities that are within walking and cycling distance and that there will be opportunities to use public transport. The proximity of the site to some of those key facilities is summarised below:-

Shops

- Tesco Express 600-metres
- Tesco Extra 1.8km
- Royal Mail 1.1km
- Town Centre 5km

Education

- Pre-school 1.5km
- Primary School 1.3km
- High School 450m
- College 500m -

Healthcare

- Pharmacy 550m
- Surgery 1.7km
- Hospital 1.0km
- Dentist 1.3km

6.56 The site is also accessible by public transport. The nearest bus stops are located on either side of The Strand (opp. Boxgrove Parade for north-westbound and adj. Boxgrove Parade for south-eastbound), circa 250-metres and 350-metres south-east of the site for the opposite and adjacent stops respectively.

6.57 Nearby bus stops are served by 2 bus routes which operate on a frequent basis throughout a typical week and weekend, providing access to a multitude of local and regional destinations including local town centres of Goring, Littlehampton and Worthing.

6.58 The location of the site adjacent to the railway station offers the opportunity to travel longer distances by train. See the Transport Assessment for further details of public transport services.

6.59 The Design and Access Statement demonstrates how the site would tie in with existing and proposed footpaths, cycleways and roads, improving connectivity in the area.

6.60 To summarise:-

1. The proposals would not accord with Policy 13 which seeks to concentrate new housing within the built-up area and on allocated sites. However, Policy 13 is out of date by virtue of the 5YRHLS position and should only be afforded limited weight.

2. The housing requirement of the WCS is out of date because it is based on the now revoked South East Plan. It also pre-dates both NPPF1 and NPPF2 and does not (and could not) reflect more recent changes in national policy.
3. The WCS housing requirement has been superseded by the standard methodology because the WCS is now more than 5 years old. The WCS only required 200dpa whereas the Standard Method now requires 880 dpa.
4. The spatial strategy and moreover, the boundary that defines the built-up area never anticipated this scale of development and it will now need to flex to accommodate additional housing.
5. The site is well related to the built-up areas Goring and Ferring and in that regard would be consistent with the general thrust of the spatial strategy which seeks to focus development at the urban areas. The site is otherwise relatively unconstrained in policy terms.
6. The site would represent a logical rounding off for this part of the settlement. It would not represent a new incursion into the open countryside and would not encroach any closer on the National Park than the existing pattern of development.
7. The site is not identified (and protected) as a strategic/local gap, or Local Green Space in the adopted Development Plan.
8. It can be demonstrated that the site is located in an accessible and sustainable location with opportunities to walk, cycle and use public transport.

Issue 3 Emerging Development Plan Documents

- 6.61 The LPA is in the process of preparing a new Local Plan as explained in Section 5.
- 6.62 It is evident that the eLP is still at an early stage in the plan making process and therefore can be afforded only limited weight in accordance with NPPF paragraph 48.
- 6.63 Even if the plan was at a more advanced stage, it still remains the case that the LPA cannot demonstrate a 5YRHLS and the most important policies are to be deemed out of date under NPPF Footnote 7.
- 6.64 Notwithstanding this, the Applicant has considered the proposals against the eLP for completeness.

The Application Site not being a Proposed Allocation for Housing

- 6.65 The Applicant acknowledges that the application site does not form part of a draft housing or mixed-use allocation in the eLP. The proposals would not therefore

accord with the eLP in this regard. However, the plan still needs to be examined and it will be necessary to review all of the objections that have been received.

6.66 The fact that the eLP does not propose to meet the local housing need figure in full and neither does it offer any solution for how the unmet needs will met elsewhere is a major cause for concern. The eLP also fails to plan for a minimum period of 15 years as required by the NPPF. These are fundamental shortcomings of the eLP which will need to be addressed if it is to have any chance of being found sound following examination.

6.67 Simply put, the LPA needs to release significantly more land for housing (land which is currently unallocated in adopted and emerging plans, like the application site, for example). The fact that the site is not allocated in the eLP means very little when it is viewed in this context.

The Spatial Strategy

6.68 The eLP spatial strategy continues to focus new development at the urban area similar to the adopted Local Plan, with housing to be provided within the built-up area and through a small number of edge of settlement allocations.

6.69 As explained in the context of the adopted Local Plan, the application site would be in general accordance with this overall strategy, being located immediately adjacent to the built-up area (and in the knowledge that further greenfield releases beyond the built-up area will be required if the local housing need is to be met).

Draft Local Green Gap and Local Green Space Policies

6.70 It is also recognised that the eLP proposes to designate the application site as a Local Green Gap (Policy SP5) and Local Green Space (Policy SP6).

6.71 The Applicant strongly objects to the proposed designation of the application site as Local Green Gap and Local Green Space on the basis that the site does not meet the requirements that have to be met to justify designating this land as such. These objections will need to be resolved through the plan making process. There can be no certainty at this stage that these designations will be confirmed and they should therefore be treated with great caution.

The Proposed Local Green Gap at Chatsmore Farm

- 6.72 The intended purpose of the Local Green Gap is to maintain the separate identity and character of the settlements at Worthing and Ferring. The policy states that any development within the Gap must not individually or cumulatively lead to coalescence between the settlements. It is therefore a spatial planning tool designed to maintain the separate identity of adjoining settlements.
- 6.73 In terms of spatial separation, CSA quite rightly observe that the settlements at Goring-by-Sea and Ferring have already coalesced along the route of the railway line, immediately to the south of the Site. This is nothing new. This has been the case for decades. Precluding development on the application site does not therefore serve to prevent coalescence. It has already happened.
- 6.74 Whilst the site functions as an area of open land which provides a break in the pattern of urban development, CSA consider that further development in this area could be accommodated without impacting on the existing function of the site in that regard.
- 6.75 The Illustrative Master Plan shows how this can be achieved:-
- a. Development would be located in the southern part of the Site and the land to the north would remain open;
 - b. In views from Littlehampton Road and the National Park a significant break in urban development would still remain and would provide the foreground to views of the urban area;
 - c. New public open space along the route of Ferring Rife and new publicly accessible footpaths will open this area up for recreational use so that it has a functional as well as visual role;
 - d. The proposals would result in a considered settlement edge which provides a more appropriate interface with the adjoining open space and farmland than the existing unsympathetic railway line; and
 - e. New landscaping at the perimeter of the retained farmland / open space, including new hedgerow and tree planting, would assist in integrating and maintaining the visual link / connection with the farmland to the north of Littlehampton Road, while creating a recognisable edge to the built form.

The proposed Local Green Space Designation at Chatsmore Farm

- 6.76 The Applicant has considered the proposed LGS designation in the context of national guidance set out in NPPF [paragraph 100].
- 6.77 Given the dire housing land supply position and the restrictions that LGS would impose on the land if it is confirmed (tantamount to Greenbelt protection), it is vitally important that this is properly scrutinised. The Applicant considers that the draft designation is not justified on this site for the following reasons:-
- a. It fails to meet the vast majority of the qualifying criteria set out in the NPPF;
 - b. The site is located in close proximity to adjoining residential areas but is not publicly accessible, save for the public footpaths which extend alongside the railway to the south of this area;
 - c. It is adjoined by housing, but does not relate to the local community, in the same way as a village green might;
 - d. The LPA has not shown that the site is demonstrably special to the local community. Examples of significance are beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of wildlife. None of these attributes can be reasonably applied to the application site; and
 - e. The designated area is not local in character. LGS should not be used to provide a blanket designation over an extensive tract of land. That is exactly what is being done here with the proposed designation washing over 30ha of open, arable farmland.
- 6.78 This list is not exhaustive. The Applicant reserves the right to add to and amend this list of concerns at a future time.
- 6.79 In circumstances where the LPA has been unable to identify anything close to what is required to meet local housing needs it can ill afford to be adding further (unjustified) policy constraints to sites like this when the land should be instead considered for housing in order to start addressing the substantial housing shortfalls.

6.80 To summarise on the emerging Local Plan:-

1. It would be wholly inappropriate to resist the application proposals on the basis of any perceived conflict with the emerging Local Plan for both procedural and evidential reasons.
2. The emerging Local Plan is still at an early stage in the plan making process and therefore can be afforded only limited weight in accordance with NPPF paragraph 48.
3. Even if the plan was at a more advanced stage, it still remains the case that the LPA cannot demonstrate a 5YRHLS and the tilted balance is engaged.
4. The Applicant acknowledges that the LPA does not propose to allocate the application site in the emerging Local Plan.
5. However, it is evident that the LPA needs to release significantly more land for housing if the plan is to have any chance of being found sound. The absence of an allocation means very little when it is viewed in this context.
6. The application site would be in general accordance with the overall strategy, being located immediately adjacent to the built-up area.
7. The proposed Local Green Gap (Policy SP5) and Local Green Space (Policy SP6) designations should be approached with great caution. The plan is at an early stage, but more fundamentally, the site simply does not meet the criteria for designation.
8. In circumstances where the LPA has been unable to identify anything close to what is required to meet local housing needs it can ill afford to be adding further (unjustified) policy constraints to sites like this.

Issue 4 Landscape and Visual Impact

6.81 The application is supported by a Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVIA) prepared by CSA. The main findings can be summarised as follows:-

1. The Site does not carry any statutory or non-statutory designations for landscape character or quality.
2. The Site is relatively open and there are opportunities for near distance views from the adjoining highways and dwellings, however these are limited in scope owing to the density of urban development to the west, east and south of the Site.
3. The Site is assessed as being at the lower end of **medium** landscape quality and **medium** landscape value.
4. In terms of landscape sensitivity, the Site is well related to surrounding urban development, is of relatively low landscape and environmental quality. Landscape sensitivity was therefore assessed as **medium**.

5. The LVIA has informed the preparation of a Concept Masterplan and Landscape Strategy Plan. These plans show development set back behind an area of semi-natural open space which follows the route of Ferring Rife.
6. The Landscape Strategy indicates that there are significant opportunities for environmental enhancements within the open spaces across the Site.
7. The visual assessment found that in views from Littlehampton Road and public highways which border the Site, development will be seen within the context of existing built development, typically set back behind farmland and open space.
8. From vantage points on Highdown Hill, the Site lies within the middle distance and forms part of a rectangular area of open land which lies within the low lying, settled coastal plain. Development will be visible from Highdown Hill. However, it will clearly relate to existing settlement on the coastal plain.
9. In terms of landscape effects, the proposals would result in the loss of an area of undistinguished farmland which would be replaced by new homes and substantial areas of open space. Development in the location proposed would relate to the surrounding urban uses and would be consistent with the surrounding settlement pattern.
10. The proposed development would be located to the south of Ferring Rife, set back behind an area of semi-natural open space and the farmland which follows the edge of the A259. Despite some inter-visibility, landscape effects on the character of the rolling downland of the National Park will be very limited.
11. The LVIA concludes that development at the Site in the manner shown on the Concept Masterplan / Landscape Strategy, can be delivered in a manner which respects the character of the local landscape / townscape and sensitive views from the National Park. It can also deliver significant areas of new open space, which will serve both new and existing residents.

Issue 5 Archaeology

6.82 A below ground archaeological desk-based assessment (DBA) has been prepared by CgMs Heritage (part of the RPS Group). The main findings of DBA can be summarised as follows:-

1. The study site is located within the Archaeological Notification Area: Multi-period Settlement Activity Northbrook College, Worthing (DWS8644) as defined by Worthing Borough Council. The red designation signifies the ANA has a high archaeological potential.
2. The DBA has considered the potential for other yet to be discovered archaeological assets within the site, and concludes that there is a high potential for prehistoric archaeology and a moderate potential for all other periods.
3. The site is perceived to have high archaeological potential for the late prehistoric periods, a moderate potential for the Roman period, a moderate

potential for the Medieval period, and a low potential for all other periods. A late Post-Medieval farm was present within the site.

4. As a result of this further mitigation measure will be needed in advance of development.

Issue 6 Built Heritage

6.83 Pegasus Group have provided a desk-based assessment that considers built heritage. The main findings of the assessment can be summarised as follows:-

1. No designated heritage assets lie within the proposed development site.
2. It is considered that the proposed development will result in a negligible level of harm at the very lowermost end of the less than substantial harm spectrum, to the heritage significance of:-
 - a. the Grade II Listed Building of Jasmine and Clematis Cottages,
 - b. the Grade II Listed Buildings of North Barn, and
 - c. the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden and Conservation Area of Highdown Garden.
3. No harm to the significance of any other assets through changes to setting, including the Scheduled Highdown Hill Camp, is anticipated.

Issue 7 Traffic and Transportation

6.84 The application is supported by a Transport Assessment prepared by Milestone Transport Planning. This addresses issues such as traffic generation, the opportunities to take up more sustainable methods of transport and the suitability of the proposed site access. The main findings can be summarised as follows:-

1. The development proposals comply with the core principles of various current national and local planning policies.
2. Residents would have opportunities to adopt sustainable travel patterns and behaviour for various journey purposes, thereby negating the need for them to own a vehicle and travel by private car.
3. A wide range of amenities, which are likely to cater for the day-to-day needs of future households and occupiers are accessible on foot and by cycle within the maximum recommended distances, prescribed by the CIHT.

4. The site is well located relative to public transport services available at Goring rail station and bus stops along The Strand and the A259, which provide a good level of connectivity to a whole host of journey destinations.
5. There are no significant safety issues with the existing local highway network within the vicinity of the application site and the proposals would not exacerbate any safety issues.
6. The development proposals would not have a material impact on the operational and safety characteristics of the local highway network, particularly to the conditions of amenity, capacity and safety.
7. Notwithstanding the above, the Applicant is mindful of predicted cumulative impacts when considered alongside other commitments and mitigation is proposed that would fully mitigate the development and substantially reduce queues and delays on nearby junctions including Goring Crossways.
8. Future households and end-users of the commercial aspects would be actively encouraged to adopt sustainable travel patterns through the implementation of a residential Travel Plan.
9. In the context of NPPF paragraph 109 there is no reason to withhold planning permission on traffic or transportation grounds.

Issue 8 Other Technical Matters

6.85 The application is also supported by other supporting documents including an Ecological Assessment and a Flood Risk Assessment. These do not identify any insurmountable constraints that would preclude development on this site, or which cannot be overcome at the detailed design stage.

7. THE OVERALL PLANNING BALANCE

7.1 This section of the Planning Statement explains how the Applicant believes the decision maker should approach the determination of this application, before going on to identify the issues that need to be weighed in the overall planning balance.

The Decision Making Framework

7.2 This application should be determined in the context of the “tilted balance” as set out in paragraph 11d of NPPF2 (the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development).

7.3 It is an indisputable fact that the LPA is unable to demonstrate a 5 Year Housing Land Supply as required by the NPPF. As a consequence, the “tilted balance” is engaged by virtue of NPPF Footnote 7. That means that the most important policies for determining the application are out-of-date (including WCS Policy 13).

7.4 The Applicant accepts that there are restrictive policies that need to be taken into account in this case, for the purposes of Footnote 6 of NPPF2. These relate to designated heritage assets and the nearby National Park.

7.5 It is therefore necessary to demonstrate that the public benefits outweigh any harm to the significance of the heritage assets in accordance with NPPF2 paragraph 196 before the tilted balance in paragraph 11d could be engaged. Case law on heritage matters confirms that this is not an even or unweighted balance, reflecting the statutory duties in s.66 and s.72 of the Planning (listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

7.6 With regards to the National Park, the decision maker must also give great weight to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks [NPPF 172] and consider whether harm to the National Park would justify refusal.

7.7 Assuming that the tilted balance is not dis-applied by the Footnote 6 policies, the decision maker must consider whether any adverse impacts arising from granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The Suffolk Coastal judgement indicates that the decision maker must then consider in the context of Section 38(6) of the 2004 Act whether these considerations amount to “other material considerations” that justify the grant of planning permission.

7.8 The Applicant recognises that NPPF paragraph 11d does not change the statutory presumption in favour of the Development Plan as set out in s.38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase 2004 Act. However, it does mean that some policies may need to be afforded reduced weight in accordance with the Suffolk Coastal Supreme Court Judgement⁶. Otherwise those policies would block and frustrate the Government's objective to significantly boost the supply of housing (NPPF2 paragraph 59).

7.9 Having set out the framework for decision making, the Applicant will now go on to identify the positive benefits and adverse effects that have been taken into account in reaching the overall conclusions.

The benefits associated with the application proposals

7.10 If the application proposals were to be granted, they would secure important benefits that would respond to all three of the Government's overarching objectives for sustainable development (social, economic and environmental). The benefits of the application proposals are outlined below.

The Social Benefits

7.11 The Applicant considers that very significant weight should be afforded to the provision of **additional open market homes**. Appeal inspectors have consistently applied similar weight to this in other appeals, recognising the inadequate levels of house building in recent years, which is affecting the availability and affordability of housing across the country.

7.12 It is an undisputed fact that this country is in the middle of a housing crisis. The Government accepts that the housing market is broken and the NPPF includes the national policy imperative that requires LPA's to significantly boost the supply of housing [paragraph 59].

7.13 The evidence relating to the housing land supply position reveals that the situation in Worthing is beyond desperate. The LPA is unable to demonstrate a 5YRHLS now. It can only demonstrate 1 year supply. It will also be unable to demonstrate a 5YRHLS for the rest of the plan period to 2033. The local housing need will not be met unless urgent action is taken, and the LPA is currently

⁶ Suffolk Coastal District Council (Appellant) v Hopkins Homes Ltd and anor (Respondents) Richborough Estates Partnership LLP and anor (Respondents) v Cheshire East Borough Council (Appellant) [2017] UKSC 37

planning for a substantial housing shortfall at the end of the plan period of 8,600 homes. [eLP para 2.34]. It is planning to fail.

- 7.14 As well as increasing the availability of open market housing, the proposals would also make provision for a meaningful number of new **affordable homes (30%)**.
- 7.15 The provision of additional affordable housing should be afforded very significant weight. It is generally true that the planning system has a technocratic character which requires abstract policy to be applied to objective evidence usually expressed in statistical terms. Occasionally, however, a human face emerges, and this is particularly true when considering the real problems facing real people in need of affordable housing. With a planned shortfall of 8,600 homes, affordable housing needs will also go unmet resulting in more people being forced to live in unsatisfactory housing.
- 7.16 It should be noted that the site is owned by the Applicant, a national housebuilder and there are no impediments to its delivery. It is immediately available for development and capable of implementation following the necessary approvals. In other words, it is capable of assisting with the LPA's housing needs and obligations now.
- 7.17 The scheme would also deliver a mix of housing including much need open market family housing at a time where the LPA's current sites are heavily weighted towards flats.

Economic Benefits

- 7.18 The Applicant considers that Significant weight should be afforded to **expenditure on construction and investment** in the area.
- 7.19 NPPF2 states that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development [NPPF para 80]. Housing development has a significant role to play in supporting economic growth.
- 7.20 Following the recent recession, the Government placed a major emphasis on the construction industry to kick-start the economy. There has been a clear push on planning for growth through national planning policy initiatives including the NPPF and NPPF 2 which were intended to stimulate growth in the economy.

- 7.1 More recently we have been faced with the severe economic impact of the Covid 19 pandemic. It is unnecessary and undesirable to expand upon the chilling statistical data which describes the current impact or to consider the various models which anticipate the future implications for the UK economy. It is, however, relevant to say something about the contribution made to the UK economy by the construction industry with particular regard to employment generation and retention.
- 7.2 The construction sector currently contributes £117 billion to the UK economy annually (6%), providing 2.4 million jobs (6.6%) in 343,000 businesses (13.3%), a significant proportion of which are self-employed. The OBR have forecast that the economic output of the construction sector will decrease by 3% or £3.5 billion as a result of the lockdown and the University of Essex suggest that the number of people employed in the construction sector could reduce by 16.5% or circa 400,000. These reductions will have significant repercussions on the national and local economies and the ability of people to remain in work.
- 7.3 Promoting construction not only provides the opportunity to limit the adverse effects of the lockdown, it also acts as an economic stimulus for the rest of the economy. The Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors identify that for every £1 spent on construction and additional £2.84 is generated across the rest of the economy.
- 7.4 It is therefore necessary to seek to limit the adverse economic effects of the lockdown by affording the economic considerations, including employment support and generation, economic output and the economic stimulus that arises from development, significant weight during the determination of planning applications and appeals.
- 7.5 It is widely recognised that house building has knock on effects upon other sectors which leads to increased demand for building materials and equipment at the building phase as well as domestic furniture and carpets etc following completion. This generates/sustains employment in other sectors. The construction industry also stimulates lending and financial markets, another important sector in the UK economy.
- 7.6 The construction industry is reliant upon a constant stream of new sites to keep people employed and to maintain delivery rates. The local housing need for

Worthing requires a step change in construction activity and for this to be maintained over the planned period. This indicates that new construction jobs could be created locally unless delivery is frustrated by the planning system. The Applicant would attach moderate weight to the newly created **construction jobs**.

7.7 Moderate weight should be attributed to the provision of **homes for economically active people** that can support the economic role of Worthing. New residents can also help to sustain local facilities and services including public transport, by bringing additional expenditure to the area on a day to day basis.

7.8 The likely economic benefits of residential element of the scheme alone can be summarised as follows:-

- a. Development costs - £53.3m
- b. Direct job creation – 62 to 140 jobs
- c. Indirect and induced job creation – 123 to 279 jobs
- d. GVA – £33.6m to £58.1m pa during the construction phase
- e. Annual Household expenditure £16m pa

APPENDIX 1 – ECONOMIC BENEFITS SPREADSHEET

7.9 The proposals would deliver a new **local centre** which will serve the day to day needs of the development and existing residents nearby. It would also provide an element of permanent employment. This should be afforded limited/moderate weight.

7.10 The application proposals will also provide **financial contributions towards off-site community infrastructure**. The Applicant recognises that these payments are essentially required to mitigate the impact of the development, however they do still represent new investment in infrastructure which will also be used by existing residents living in the surrounding area. In this case the Applicant will amongst other things, bring forward highways mitigation that will also address predicted cumulative problems arising from development elsewhere. This should be afforded limited/moderate weight as a benefit.

Environmental Benefits

- 7.11 The application proposals would provide **additional car parking next to the railway station**. It addresses existing problems of on-street car parking in the area and makes travel by rail a more attractive proposition, with all the related benefits that this would have in terms of reducing car use. This should be afforded moderate weight.
- 7.12 The scheme would also deliver significant amounts of public open space, green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancements particularly on the northern edge of the development. **Public open space** on residential schemes is often only that which is required to serve the new resident population, but in this case the proposals go beyond this and provide a new publicly accessible resource on the edge of the built-up area. This, in conjunction with the **additional native planting and demonstrable biodiversity enhancements**, should be afforded moderate weight in the planning balance.
- 7.13 The proposals also provide for the **undergrounding of the high voltage cables and removal of pylons** which currently impact on the character and appearance of the site. This should be afforded limited/moderate weight.
- 7.14 Overall it can be seen that the proposals will deliver a range of benefits which taken together, weigh heavily in its favour.

The adverse effects to be weighed in the balance

- 7.15 Arguably, **conflict with the Development Plan** should not be regarded as an adverse effect. That is because the purpose of the tilted balance is to establish whether it would be a material consideration that justifies a decision that is not in accordance with the Development Plan. If the conflict with the Development Plan is factored in to the tilted balance itself, then the Development Plan would be double counted in the overall planning balance.
- 7.16 This issue is a matter that is currently being considered by the courts and it is therefore only included through an abundance of caution.
- 7.17 The Applicant accepts that there would be a partial conflict with the Development Plan, in that the proposals would not accord with WCS Policy 13. However, Policy 13 is out of date and it should be afforded reduced weight for the reasons summarised below:-

- a. The LPA cannot demonstrate a 5YRHLS.
 - b. The current housing land supply shortfall is substantial.
 - c. The housing requirement cannot be met without releasing more greenfield land beyond the defined Built Up Area Boundary.
 - d. The emerging Local Plan fails to provide sufficient land to meet the local housing need across the plan period (it plans for a shortfall of 8,600 dwellings).
 - e. Policy 13 if rigidly applied, will continue to frustrate housing delivery, contrary to the national policy imperative to boost housing supply [NPPF paragraph 59].
- 7.18 This combination of factors leads the Applicant to conclude that the weight to be afforded to the conflict with WCS Policy 13 should be limited at most.
- 7.19 The proposals would give rise to a **loss of countryside**. However, such losses are inevitable if the housing needs of Worthing are to be met. The Applicant would therefore afford only limited weight to the loss of countryside.
- 7.20 CSA consider the likely **effects of the development on the character and appearance of the area**. CSA note that the site itself does not carry any statutory or non-statutory designations for landscape character or quality. It is well related to surrounding urban development, is of relatively low landscape and environmental quality and reads as an area of open farmland which indents into the existing built up area. The development would relate to the surrounding urban uses and would be consistent with the surrounding settlement pattern.
- 7.21 In terms of landscape effects, the proposals would result in the loss of an area of undistinguished farmland which has already been taken into account above, in the context of the loss of countryside. Despite some inter-visibility, landscape effects on the character of the rolling downland of the National Park will be very limited. This would not justify refusal of the development, but in circumstances where there would be some harm to the scenic beauty of the National Park (albeit the site itself is not within the National Park and the harm is very limited), this also weighs against the proposals.

- 7.22 Taking the guidance at NPPF paragraph 172 into account, the Applicant would afford Moderate Weight to the overall effects of the development on the character and appearance of the area (including the National Park).
- 7.23 The Pegasus Desk Based Heritage Assessment considers the **effects of the development on the heritage significance of nearby designated heritage assets**. It concludes that the proposals would give rise to “less than substantial harm” to the heritage significance of the following assets:-
- a. Clematis and Jasmine Cottages (Grade II Listed building) – negligible less than substantial harm at the very lowermost end of the spectrum.
 - b. Highdown Gardens RPG/Conservation Area – negligible less than substantial harm at the very lowermost end of the spectrum.
 - c. North Barn two Grade II Listed buildings – negligible less than substantial harm at the very lowermost end of the spectrum.
- 7.24 This requires a balanced judgement of the harm to the designated heritage assets against the public benefits as required by paragraph 196 of NPPF2. In this case the Applicant considers that the public benefits would clearly outweigh the very limited harm.
- 7.25 The Applicant accepts that considerable importance should be given to the presumption in favour of preservation and that it is not an unweighted balance. However, it is still necessary to consider the extent of the harm and significance of the asset that would be affected as per the judgement of *Palmer v Herefordshire Council & Anor [2016] EWCA Civ 1061*.
- 7.26 Having regard to the number assets, their significance and the level of impact in each case, the Applicant would afford these harms moderate weight in the planning balance.

Other considerations

- 7.27 There are no other grounds to resist development on this site which cannot be avoided, mitigated, or controlled through planning conditions and/or planning obligations. Matters of detailed design can be addressed at the Reserved Matters stage.

Compliance with the Development Plan

7.28 The Applicant accepts that there would be a partial conflict with the Development Plan (**WCS Policy 13**), but for the reasons already outlined, Policy 13 is out of date and any such conflict can only be afforded limited weight. The proposals would otherwise comply with the strategy and objectives of the Development Plan when read as a whole.

Overall Conclusion

7.29 Neither of the NPPF Footnote 6 policies indicate that planning permission should be refused. Accordingly, the tilted balance would not be dis-applied in this case.

7.30 Following the preceding analysis, the Applicant concludes that any adverse effects would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the Proposed Development, such that planning permission should be granted in accordance with NPPF2 paragraph 11d.

7.31 To summarise on the overall planning balance;-

1. The proposals will deliver a range of social, economic and environmental benefits which can be afforded varying levels of weight as identified below. These include:-

- Provision of Open Market Housing – Very Significant
- Provision of Affordable Housing– Very significant
- Expenditure on construction and investment in the area – Significant
- Creation of construction jobs - Moderate
- Providing homes for economically active people – Moderate
- Provision of a new Local Centre (incl. jobs) – Limited/Moderate
- Provision of car parking for the railway station - Moderate
- Financial contributions towards off site infrastructure – Limited/Moderate
- Undergrounding of HV cables – Limited/Moderate
- Public open space, Planting and Biodiversity enhancements – Moderate

2. The potential residual adverse impacts have been identified and these should also be afforded varying degrees of weight as follows:

- Partial conflict with the Development Plan [Policy 13] – Limited
 - Loss of countryside – Limited
 - Landscape and visual impact (incl. very limited harm to National Park)
- Moderate
 - Impact on designated heritage assets – Moderate
3. The Public Benefits would outweigh the less than substantial harm to heritage assets in the context of NPPF paragraph 196 and the very limited impact on the National Park would not justify the refusal of planning permission in NPPF Footnote 6 terms.
 4. All other identified impacts can be mitigated through Planning conditions, obligations or through reserved matter applications.
 5. The proposals would be in general accordance with the spatial strategy of the Development Plan.
 6. Overall the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. As such the proposals represent sustainable development in the context of NPPF 2 paragraph 11d.

8. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 8.1 The Applicant seeks outline planning permission (with all matters of detail reserved) for a residential led mixed-use development for up to 475 dwellings, along with other associated works.
- 8.2 This Planning Statement explains why the application proposals represent sustainable development and it has been demonstrated that there are compelling reasons that justify the grant of planning permission.
- 8.3 The main issues in this case have been identified by the Applicant as follows:-

Issue 1 Housing Need and Five-Year Land Supply (5YRHLS)

Issue 2 Whether the site is an appropriate location for housing development having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant adopted development plan policy

Issue 3 Emerging Development Plan Policy

Issue 4 Landscape and Visual Impact

Issue 5 Archaeology

Issue 6 Built Heritage

Issue 7 Traffic and Transportation

Issue 8 Other Technical Matters

- 8.4 The Applicant's findings can be summarised as follows:-

Issue 1 Housing Need and Five-Year Land Supply (5YRHLS)

1. There is a clear, urgent and pressing need for housing in Worthing now. This has serious consequences for real people in the real world that need a home now and also for the local economy.
2. The LPA cannot demonstrate a 5YRHLS and therefore the tilted balance is engaged by virtue of NPPF2 Footnote 7.
3. The current housing land supply shortfall is substantial with the LPA supply being no greater than 1.03 years.
4. The emerging Local Plan fails to provide sufficient land to meet the housing requirement (a shortfall of 8,600 dwellings) across the plan period up to 2036.
5. There is no plan in place through the Duty to Cooperate to accommodate this need elsewhere if not in Worthing.

There is a shortfall in supply even against constrained housing requirements across the sub-region.

Issue 2 Whether the site is an appropriate location for housing development having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant adopted development plan policy

6. The proposals would not accord with Policy 13 which seeks to concentrate new housing within the built-up area and on allocated sites. However, Policy 13 is out of date by virtue of the 5YRHLS position and should only be afforded limited weight.
7. The housing requirement of the WCS is out of date because it is based on the now revoked South East Plan. It also pre-dates both NPPF1 and NPPF2 and does not (and could not) reflect more recent changes in national policy.
8. The WCS housing requirement has been superseded by the standard methodology because the WCS is now more than 5 years old. The WCS only required 200dpa whereas the Standard Method now requires 880 dpa.
9. The spatial strategy and moreover, the boundary that defines the built-up area never anticipated this scale of development and it will now need to flex to accommodate additional housing.
10. The site is well related to the built-up areas Goring and Ferring and in that regard would be consistent with the general thrust of the spatial strategy which seeks to focus development at the urban areas. The site is otherwise relatively unconstrained in policy terms.
11. The site would represent a logical rounding off for this part of the settlement. It would not represent a new incursion into the open countryside and would not encroach any closer on the National Park than the existing pattern of development.
12. The site is not identified (and protected) as a strategic/local gap, or Local Green Space in the adopted Development Plan.
13. It can be demonstrated that the site is located in an accessible and sustainable location with opportunities to walk, cycle and use public transport.

Issue 3 Emerging Development Plan Policy

14. It would be wholly inappropriate to resist the application proposals on the basis of any perceived conflict with the emerging Local Plan for both procedural and evidential reasons.
15. The emerging Local Plan is still at an early stage in the plan making process and therefore can be afforded only limited weight in accordance with NPPF paragraph 48.
16. Even if the plan was at a more advanced stage, it still remains the case that the LPA cannot demonstrate a 5YRHLS and the tilted balance is engaged.

17. The Applicant acknowledges that the LPA does not propose to allocate the application site in the emerging Local Plan.
18. However, it is evident that the LPA needs to release significantly more land for housing if the plan is to have any chance of being found sound. The absence of an allocation means very little when it is viewed in this context.
19. The application site would be in general accordance with the overall strategy, being located immediately adjacent to the built-up area.
20. The proposed Local Green Gap (Policy SP5) and Local Green Space (Policy SP6) designations should be approached with great caution. The plan is at an early stage, but more fundamentally, the site simply does not meet the criteria for designation.
21. In circumstances where the LPA has been unable to identify anything close to what is required to meet local housing needs it can ill afford to be adding further (unjustified) policy constraints to sites like this.

Issue 4 Landscape and Visual Impact

22. The Site does not carry any statutory or non-statutory designations for landscape character or quality.
23. The Site is relatively open and there are opportunities for near distance views from the adjoining highways and dwellings, however these are limited in scope owing to the density of urban development to the west, east and south of the Site.
24. The Site is assessed as being at the lower end of medium landscape quality and medium landscape value.
25. In terms of landscape sensitivity, the Site is well related to surrounding urban development, is of relatively low landscape and environmental quality. Landscape sensitivity was therefore assessed as medium.
26. The LVIA has informed the preparation of a Concept Masterplan and Landscape Strategy Plan. These plans show development set back behind an area of semi-natural open space which follows the route of Ferring Rife.
27. The Landscape Strategy indicates that there are significant opportunities for environmental enhancements within the open spaces across the Site.
28. The visual assessment found that in views from Littlehampton Road and public highways which border the Site, development will be seen within the context of existing built development, typically set back behind farmland and open space.
29. From vantage points on Highdown Hill, the Site lies within the middle distance and forms part of a rectangular area of open land which lies within the low lying, settled coastal plain. Development will be visible from Highdown Hill. However, it will clearly relate to existing settlement on the coastal plain.

30. In terms of landscape effects, the proposals would result in the loss of an area of undistinguished farmland which would be replaced by new homes and substantial areas of open space. Development in the location proposed would relate to the surrounding urban uses and would be consistent with the surrounding settlement pattern.
31. The proposed development would be located to the south of Ferring Rife, set back behind an area of semi-natural open space and the farmland which follows the edge of the A259. Despite some inter-visibility, landscape effects on the character of the rolling downland of the National Park will be very limited.
32. The LVIA concludes that development at the Site in the manner shown on the Concept Masterplan / Landscape Strategy, can be delivered in a manner which respects the character of the local landscape / townscape and sensitive views from the National Park. It can also deliver significant areas of new open space, which will serve both new and existing residents.

Issue 5 Archaeology

33. The study site is located within the Archaeological Notification Area: Multi-period Settlement Activity Northbrook College, Worthing (DWS8644) as defined by Worthing Borough Council. The red designation signifies the ANA has a high archaeological potential.
34. The DBA has considered the potential for other yet to be discovered archaeological assets within the site, and concludes that there is a high potential for prehistoric archaeology and a moderate potential for all other periods.
35. The site is perceived to have high archaeological potential for the late prehistoric periods, a moderate potential for the Roman period, a moderate potential for the Medieval period, and a low potential for all other periods. A late Post-Medieval farm was present within the site.
36. As a result of this further mitigation measure will be needed in advance of development.

Issue 6 Built Heritage

37. No designated heritage assets lie within the proposed development site.
38. It is considered that the proposed development will result in a negligible level of harm at the very lowermost end of the less than substantial harm spectrum, to the heritage significance of:-
 - a. the Grade II Listed Building of Jasmine and Clematis Cottages,
 - b. the Grade II Listed Buildings of North Barn, and
 - c. the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden and Conservation Area of Highdown Garden.

39. No harm to the significance of any other assets through changes to setting, including the Scheduled Highdown Hill Camp, is anticipated.

Issue 7 Traffic and Transportation

40. The development proposals comply with the core principles of various current national and local planning policies.
41. Residents would have opportunities to adopt sustainable travel patterns and behaviour for various journey purposes, thereby negating the need for them to own a vehicle and travel by private car.
42. A wide range of amenities, which are likely to cater for the day-to-day needs of future households and occupiers are accessible on foot and by cycle within the maximum recommended distances, prescribed by the CIHT.
43. The site is well located relative to public transport services available at Goring rail station and bus stops along The Strand and the A259, which provide a good level of connectivity to a whole host of journey destinations.
44. There are no significant safety issues with the existing local highway network within the vicinity of the application site and the proposals would not exacerbate any safety issues.
45. The development proposals would not have a material impact on the operational and safety characteristics of the local highway network, particularly to the conditions of amenity, capacity and safety.
46. Notwithstanding the above, the Applicant is mindful of predicted cumulative impacts when considered alongside other commitments and mitigation is proposed that would fully mitigate the development and substantially reduce queues and delays on nearby junctions including Goring Crossways.
47. Future households and end-users of the commercial aspects would be actively encouraged to adopt sustainable travel patterns through the implementation of a residential Travel Plan.
48. In the context of NPPF paragraph 109 there is no reason to withhold planning permission on traffic or transportation grounds.

Issue 8 Other Technical Matters

49. The application is also supported by other supporting documents including an Ecological Assessment and a Flood Risk Assessment.
50. These do not identify any insurmountable constraints that would preclude development on this site or which cannot be overcome at the detailed design stage.

The Overall Planning Balance

51. The proposals will deliver a range of social, economic and environmental benefits which can be afforded varying levels of weight as identified below. These include:-

- Provision of Open Market Housing – Very Significant
- Provision of Affordable Housing– Very significant
- Expenditure on construction and investment in the area – Significant
- Creation of construction jobs - Moderate
- Providing homes for economically active people – Moderate
- Provision of a new Local Centre (incl. jobs) – Limited/Moderate
- Provision of car parking for the railway station - Moderate
- Financial contributions towards off site infrastructure – Limited/Moderate
- Undergrounding of HV cables – Limited/Moderate
- Public open space, Planting and Biodiversity enhancements – Moderate

52. The potential residual adverse impacts have been identified and these should also be afforded varying degrees of weight as follows:

- Partial conflict with the Development Plan [Policy 13] – Limited
- Loss of countryside – Limited
- Landscape and visual impact (incl. very limited harm to National Park) – Moderate
- Impact on designated heritage assets – Moderate

53. The Public Benefits would outweigh the less than substantial harm to heritage assets in the context of NPPF paragraph 196 and the very limited impact on the National Park would not justify the refusal of planning permission in NPPF Footnote 6 terms.

54. All other identified impacts can be mitigated through Planning conditions, obligations or through reserved matter applications.

55. The proposals would be in general accordance with the spatial strategy of the Development Plan.

56. Overall the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. As such the proposals represent sustainable development in the context of NPPF 2 paragraph 11d.

Concluding Comments

8.5 Having undertaken the planning balance in the way that has been outlined, the Applicant concludes that the proposals represent a suitable and sustainable form

of development in this location and that there are compelling reasons that justify the grant of planning permission. The site is available, suitable and capable of delivering much needed development as soon as the necessary approvals are in place.

- 8.6 In view of the forgoing, the LPA is respectfully requested to grant Outline Planning Permission, subject to any necessary conditions and planning obligations.

APPENDIX 1:
ECONOMIC BENEFITS SPREADSHEET

ECONOMICS BENEFITS SPREADSHEET FOR CHATSMORE FARM

Homes		465
Development costs - estimated		£53,259,984

Development cost per dwelling		£114,538
Average turnover per construction worker in the South East		£171,553
Construction job years		310
Construction period in years		5
Direct jobs (based on turnover)		62
Direct jobs (based on HBF)		112 to 140

Indirect and induced jobs (based on HBF)		223 to 279
Indirect and induced jobs (based on Scottish Government)		123 to 153
Indirect and induced jobs (based on CBI)		205 to 257

Total jobs		234 to 419
-------------------	--	-------------------

GVA per construction employee in the South East		£79,857
GVA per total employee in the South East		£64,156
Total GVA		£33.6M to £58.1M

Average weekly household expenditure in the South East		£658
Vacancy rate in South Oxfordshire		1.01
Households arising		469
Annual household expenditure		£16,025,536.80