

Question 6

Is the site at Angells Sandpit, an appropriate location for housing and is 15m rather than 20m as required by Natural England, an appropriate buffer to the adjacent SSSI, can an acceptable access be achieved, will it have an adverse impact on the adjacent listed building and are there any land contamination issues relating to its development? Should the Built-Up Area Boundary be extended to link with Water Lane?

- 6.1 During the preparation of the Storrington, Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan, the Qualifying Body has undertaken extensive consultation with statutory bodies and has scrutinised the information which has been provided by the agent promoting the site.
- 6.2 Following the receipt of the representation from Natural England under the Regulation 16 consultation, Horsham District Council considers that the buffer of 20m would be a more appropriate buffer to safeguard the adjacent SSSI.
- 6.3 The Qualifying Body has also consulted with Historic England (9 October 2017 – please refer to Appendix A). Historic England considered the proposal against the impact on the Grade II listed building (School Cottages 1-2 Water Lane) and concluded no substantial harm would arise from the proposal at Angell Sandpit providing certain conditions are applied.
- 6.4 During the plan making process ECE Planning, who are the agent acting on behalf of the owner have indicated to the Qualifying Body that access to the site via the private road Heather Way has been secured and the site is therefore deliverable. It is for the agent and landowner to give suitable reassurance that this has been achieved.
- 6.5 With regards to the issue of contamination, it was the understanding of Horsham District Council that a desktop assessment site of contamination issues has been prepared to address this issue. This was made available to Horsham District Council on 12 September 2018. This has been sent to the Environmental Health Officers to provide a technical view on this matter.
- 6.6 Planning Authorities must ensure that land cannot be determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The study concludes that further assessment and monitoring is required to fully identify the extent and nature of contamination on this site. The initial view of the Horsham District Council Environmental Health Officers is that the desk top study is insufficient at this stage to demonstrate that this regulatory requirement can be met.

Appendix A
Correspondence from Historic England (9 October 2017)



Mrs Tracey Euesden
Clerk, Storrington and Sullington Parish Council
The Parish Hall,
Thakeham Road
Storrington
West Sussex, RH20 3PP.

Our ref: HD/P5404/
Your ref:
Telephone 01483 252040
Fax

9th October 2017

Dear Mrs Euesden,

Former Sandpit off Water Lane, Sullington, West Sussex (Also known as Angel Sandpit)

Your e-mail to my colleague Rob Lloyd-Sweet has been passed to me as Mr Lloyd-Sweet has been temporarily seconded to another team. I apologise for the delay in getting back to you on this matter.

I also apologise for our not having commented on the Regulation 14 version of the Plan, which is regrettable. I note that it was recently out for consultation and have checked our records but cannot find any record of our having been notified of that consultation. It would be helpful to know how and when the Parish Council consulted us so that I can check again.

As regards Angel Sandpit I see that planning permission has previously been granted for four houses on part of the former sandpit, albeit on appeal. I assume that these are the four houses in the SE corner of the site. These are to the south of the listed cottages so clearly the effect on their setting was considered acceptable at that time

It appears to me that the appeals for Chestnut Cottage were refused for two main reasons – the “urbanisation” of Water Lane that would result from the proposed developments and the loss of the openness of the Cottage’s grounds which the Inspector considered to be of significance to the Cottage’s setting.

The effect on the character of Water Lane is not really within our remit, but I see that the proposed access to the site would be from Heather Way thus avoiding any immediate effects on Water Lane.

As regards the effect on the significance of the listed building and of its setting, although the development would be in the wider setting (at least, in the normal interpretation of the word rather than in its interpretation regarding heritage assets) of the Cottage, the Inspector that conducted the appeal was concerned about the loss of the openness of the Cottage's own grounds. The development of the former sandpit would not encroach upon the openness of those grounds so would not give rise to the same concerns.

Indeed, I do not consider that the development of six, presumably two-storey, houses would be likely to have any real impact on the significance of the Cottage, and therefore we do not object to the allocation of this site on that (or any other) basis.

If the policy allocating this site is retained in the Plan, it could include criteria restricting the number of storeys of the houses and requiring a buffer zone and/or retention and strengthening of the boundary vegetation to provide greater seclusion for the cottages.

I hope this is helpful and answers your queries but do please come back to me if anything is unclear.

Yours sincerely,



Martin Small

Principal Adviser, Historic Environment Planning

(Bucks, Oxon, Berks, Hampshire, IoW, South Downs National Park and Chichester)

E-mail: martin.small@historicengland.org.uk

cc Norman Kwan, Horsham District Council