

## Addendum Report

Planning Committee  
18 July 2018  
Agenda Item 5  
Ward: ALL

**1 Application Reference: AWC/M/0961/17**

**Recommendation – Approve  
subject to referral to the  
Secretary of State and the  
completion of a S109 legal  
agreement**

Site: Land East of Shadwells Road At Mash Barn Estate, Mash Barn Lane, Lancing

Proposal: Hybrid planning application seeking (1) Full planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of 249 dwellings with temporary access via Grinstead Lane, a Country Park, relocation and extension of the Withy Patch Gypsy and Traveller site, permanent access via a new roundabout on the A27, landscaping, two additional football pitches and other associated infrastructure (including pumping facility at the River Adur); (2) Outline planning permission (with only landscaping reserved) for a non-food retail store (Use Class A1); and (3) Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved other than access) for the erection of a further 351 dwellings, community hub, primary school, and landscaping. The application is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment. **(Amended Description)**

### **Additional Consultation Responses**

#### **Historic England (Final Response)**

*Historic England accepts the principle of the residential development but has consistently raised concerns about the potential impact of the commercial (IKEA) element of the proposals on the contribution made by the current landscape setting to the significance of heritage assets of the highest importance. These are set out in detail in our letter of 1<sup>st</sup> September 2017 and this advice should be read in conjunction with that provided earlier.*

*We welcome the measures taken to address some of the concerns expressed regarding the visual impact of the IKEA building by the introduction of a green roof, amended building height and the proposed colour banding to the cladding on the northern elevation. These amendments will mitigate some of the visual impact of the building in the setting of Lancing college as experienced from the South Downs National Park. However, they will not be as effective in addressing the impact upon*

*the landscape setting of the Terminal building at Shoreham Airport (listed Grade II\*) which is a key element of its significance. It will also not address the experience of Lancing College in views north from within the setting of the airfield. We therefore suggest that the banding is at least carried round to the west and south elevations to further mitigate visual impact. This would also support the desired approach of consistency as set out in the Design and Access Statement.*

*Historic England is aware of and has been copied into the concerns raised by Lancing College on potential impacts to their successful operation arising from the proposed access proposals. We have visited the site and understand and share their concerns. We would not want to see this, historically highly significant, educational establishment comprising purpose-built, architecturally outstanding buildings put at risk. We therefore note and welcome the discussions that have taken place to resolve this matter. Historic England support the view put forward by the college that agreeing an acceptable solution to the issue raised regarding access to the campus is important and that it is vital this is secured as part of the current process.*

### **Recommendation**

*Historic England has remaining concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. We welcome the amendments put forward to address concerns about visual impact on the experience of the setting of highly graded heritage assets. However, we recommend that they could be made more effective very simply. We welcome the discussions that are in progress regarding access issues for the listed college campus and recommend that any agreed solution needs to be effectively secured in order for it to be given appropriate weight in any planning judgement.*

*We consider that the issues and suggestions outlined in our advice need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of the NPPF and specifically para 129 which requires that harm should be minimised and para 134 which advises that where overall harm is less than substantial this should be weighed with the public benefits of the proposal (taking note that under para 132 great weight must be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets which includes change within their settings). In determining this application, you should also bear in mind the statutory duty of section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.*

*Your authority should take these representations into account and seek amendments, safeguards or further information as set out in our advice. If there are any material changes to the proposals, or you would like further advice, please contact us. We will provide any further comments about the Dome Trainer, its setting and the airfield as soon as we are able to.*

**West Sussex County Council** has clarified the financial contributions it requires in particular for education provision in addition to land for a new primary school. The contributions are set out in the following table:

### Summary of Contributions

S106 type	Monies Due
Education - Primary	£1,620,208
Education - Secondary	£1,743,687
Education - 6 <sup>th</sup> Form	£408,483
Libraries	£153,668
Waste	No contribution
Fire & Rescue	£14,630
No. of Hydrants	secured under Condition
TAD	HWiL
<b>Total Contribution</b>	<b>£3,940,676</b>

### Additional Representations

Since the report was written a further 20 letters of objection have been received raising a number of points already summarised in the main report. The majority raise concerns about the width of the proposed bridleway under the A27 and refer to the significant numbers of cyclists that use the route and conflict with pedestrians and horse riders (with reference to an effective width of 2 metres).

### Applicants response to the Report

The applicants have commented on the report and have asked that the following matters be corrected /clarified:

### Heritage

The applicants Heritage Consultant expresses concern that the report indicates that the Blister Hangar is of 'national importance' when this is not stated in Historic England's consultation response. It is accepted that the Dome Trainer is an important example of military training and as stated by Historic England is of national importance. However, the Blister Hangar is of lesser importance and has been assessed accordingly. However, the applicants have offered a planning condition that would allow for the re-use of the Blister Hangar, possibly being donated to a military museum. This amendment to the report is accepted by your Officers and the scope to relocate the Blister Hangar is a positive suggestion.

Secondly the Heritage Consultant is concerned that the report suggests that the inter-visibility between the airport terminal and Lancing Chapel was not assessed. It is submitted that the ES Heritage Chapter does assess the inter-visibility of heritage assets and concludes that on the north-south axis the view between the terminal building and Lancing Chapel would remain almost unchanged. Your Officers accept this point although Historic England still remained concerned about the wider setting of both heritage assets.

### Residential

Cala Homes has indicated that the overall density of development is now 33.1 dwellings per hectare (dph) following various amendments to the scheme and not 35 as indicated on page 11 of the report. Following various amendments to the scheme the final mix of the development is now as set out below (this replaces the table on page 12).

Dwelling Type	Market	Affordable	Total
1 bed	18	55	73
2 bed	161	74	235
3 bed	154	51	205
4 + bed	87	0	87
Total	420	180	600

Various amendments to the scheme have also changed the overall parking numbers indicated on page 21 to 518 for residents and 50 visitor spaces.

The report occasionally misspells Cala as Carla.

## Planning Conditions

IKEA has expressed concern that condition No 35 specifying the extent of green roof is unnecessary as condition 34 requires details to be reserved.

IKEA has expressed concern about any requirement to return the louvres on the east elevation as the evidence suggests that there are only distant views of this elevation from Mill Hill (condition 38).

Condition 49 – Retail Travel Plan to be amended to Staff Travel Plan.

A revised Breeam Condition is suggested (condition No 40).

IKEA would agree to a condition which prevents any lighting being installed until a lighting scheme has been approved and that luminance of the public car park shall accord with the parameters set out in the Lighting Design Statement. This is being discussed further with the SDNP.

A revised condition relating to the area of Saltmarsh is suggested. (this is being reviewed by Natural England).

## Planning Assessment

The WSCC response clarifies the level of contributions required towards the cost of a new primary school (circa £6 million) and a significant contribution towards secondary education. The applicant had assumed that the offer of 2 hectares of land for a 2 Form Entry (FE) primary school would provide for the necessary education contribution, as the development itself only generates a requirement for a 1 FE school (1 hectare of land).

The Adur Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) does make it clear that contributions would be required to help pay for the build costs of the new school as well as contributions towards secondary and sixth form education. However, one of the key differences of opinion relates to the land value attributed to the additional land being offered. WSCC maintains that its value would be based on educational value (£100k per acre), whereas the applicants argue that this should be based on residential value (circa £1 million per acre). This situation is complicated by the fact

that the contributions towards build cost were to be shared with the strategic allocation at West Sompting (480 dwellings).

At this stage, there is no agreement about the precise level of contribution for the primary school, however, there is a requirement for contributions for secondary education and sixth form education (£1.15 million). Given the viability of the development set out in the main report, this contribution could not be met and Members are left in a difficult position in terms of the weighing up the priorities of different infrastructure providers.

To meet the education requirements for the development it would mean that contributions secured for health services and the police are diverted to education and inevitably a request for a reduction in the percentage of affordable housing delivered. One option might be to allow for an off-site education contribution and allow the 2 hectares to be used to deliver additional housing, however, the County Council feel that the provision of land for a school on the site is essential.

Members will be aware that the provision of land could still ensure the delivery of a school with direct funding from central government under the 'Free School' programme and there would be scope to use education contributions from West Sompting development to help deliver a school on the New Monks Farm site. Members may consider, however, that the scope to take an off-site contribution for education may be an option worth pursuing.

This is a difficult situation and the County Council has expressed considerable concern that the education requirements of the development are not being met. There is clearly a risk that a site is provided without any scope to actually deliver the school to serve the new expanded residential area. However, on balance, your Officers feel that the provision of affordable housing is a priority on this site given the level of need within the Borough and contributions towards other service providers should be maintained. There is the opportunity to clawback any additional profit from the development towards education requirements as indicated in the main report.

Your Officers accept some of the comments regarding the suggested planning conditions. Whilst, it is important that the green roof is provided as indicated on the indicative plans, it is a reserved matter and therefore can be secured at the detailed application stage. Amendments to the wording of the Breeam condition and Travel Plan condition are also accepted. Natural England has put forward an alternative wording for the protection of saltmarsh and the potential need to secure additional compensatory mudflats and the precise wording could be agreed between all parties during any delegation period. An additional condition is required to secure 10% of residential dwellings to have solar (PV) panels installed and to ensure delivery of the other sustainable design measures.

IKEA is concerned about extending the louvres onto the east elevation in view of the distant views of this elevation from Mill Hill. Your Officers disagree on this point and feel that this would help provide some further mitigation and there is some design logic in extending the louvres to wrap around the north-eastern corner of the building. This view is supported by the SDNP. Further supporting images of the louvres have been submitted to demonstrate how they would mitigate views from the

SDNP. IKEA has indicated that it would not agree to free or discounted delivery for local residents but it has agreed, as indicated in the report, to use low emission delivery vehicles.

There is no agreement on reducing the extent of yellow on the east elevation at high level but preventing lighting at this higher level would help address some of the concerns of Historic England. Whilst, the Sussex Wildlife Trust has mentioned the scope for a green wall on this northern elevation there are significant maintenance issues with such walls and your Officers have been advised by an external landscape consultant that for a north facing wall of this height there would be a need to replace 25% every year.

There would need to be some flexibility around the proposed conditions as some negotiations are ongoing and some matters would be covered by the S106 and would not need to be included in the list of planning conditions and vice versa. This is reflected in the revised recommendation below.

### **Amended Recommendation**

On balance, it is recommended that the Committee approves the proposed development but the issuing of the decision be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development subject to the completion of a S106 agreement and the Secretary of State confirming that he does not wish to call in the application for his determination and the imposition of conditions set out in the agenda as amended in this addendum (or as amended in light of ongoing negotiations on the S106 agreement).