

Recommendation Report for Planning Permission

REF NO: BN/51/20/PL

LOCATION: Land at Chantry Mead
& rear of 14-18 Downview Road
Barnham
PO22 0EG

PROPOSAL: 4 No dwellings including access, landscaping & associated works.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Plots 1 & 2 would be link-detached 2-storey 3 bed houses of brickwork and light render elevations and orange/brown clay tile roofs. Plots 3 & 4 would be detached 2-storey 4 bed houses of light render elevations and grey slate tile roofs. The proposals include a cul-de-sac access off Chantry Mead, driveways and attached garages for car/cycle and bin storage, and soft landscaping. Each property has a private garden. The proposal includes visitor parking and a bin collection area for Plots 3 & 4.
SITE AREA	0.20 hectares.
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	20 dph.
TOPOGRAPHY	Predominantly flat.
TREES	Mainly trees of low (garden trees) to moderate (larger trees) quality, but some of which provide visual amenity value and contribute to the verdant character of the area.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Trees, hedgerow, shrubs, timber fence panels.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The site consists of residential garden land to the rear of 14 and 15 Downview Road and vacant land to the rear of 8, 9, 10 and 11 Chantry Mead. The land is grassy and there are scattered trees, hedgerows and shrubs and garden structure/s (e.g. summerhouse). The site is enclosed by boundary treatments of fencing and hedgerows.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Suburban. To the west is Chantry Mead, a small cul-de-sac development of 11 modern 2-storey detached/semi-detached and terraced dwellings, permitted in 2007. To the east is Downview Road, which consists linear residential development of single and 2 storey properties, mainly detached, of varying ages and styles.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

bedroom chalet style bungalow. Resubmission of
EG/89/17/OUT

08-03-18

Appeal: Dismissed
18-01-19

EG/15/07/

Demolition of No. 12 Downview Road and erection of 11
No. dwellings, vehicular access, parking and garaging,
public open space and landscaping

Refused
21-06-07

Appeal: Allowed+Conditions
13-08-08

Planning history noted.

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish Council

No objection. Expect ADC Drainage Engineers to assess the application with utmost care with regard surface water drainage, given issues in area, including several significant and resolved issues at Chantry Mead (EG/15/07).

22 letters of objection:

- Adverse impact on street scene and character of area. Two-storey new dwellings sited behind bungalows, would be very visible from Downview Road. Would disrupt existing layout and pattern of development on Downview Road. Hedges would appear out of character too.
- Back garden development out of character with area. No other garden land developments in the area. Would set a precedence for garden development all along Downview Road. Area of Character.
- 4000 homes granted permission in area already, no need for garden grabbing infills.
- No additional community amenity open space provision.
- Lack of local infrastructure and employment to support more development.
- Area at high risk of surface water flooding. Ongoing issues with Chantry Mead (EG/15/07). Proposals would likely increase flood risk.
- Loss of view of greenery from properties opposite on Chantry Mead and from rear of Downview Rd.
- Enclosing impact of 2 storey properties on bungalows.
- Loss of trees harms character of area, and destroys local wildlife and flora.
- Proposed hedges, access point and loss of verge would remove open amenity space, reduce visibility and compromise highways and pedestrian safety.
- Increase in traffic on small private cul-de-sac, damage to road and green spaces of Chantry Mead and Murell Gardens.
- Increase to traffic on Barnham Road, given high level of development in area, will affect highways safety.
- Potential for conflict with access points and narrow road.
- Lack of visitor parking spaces and visitor parking space not large enough so vehicles using it would block access to Plots 3 & 4.
- Submission does not include EVCPs nor justification for lack of disability parking.
- Concerns over damage to privately maintained road.
- Inaccuracy in WSCC comments refers to 'Foxley Lane' when should be 'Barnham Road'.
- Construction Management Plan must protect integrity and cleanliness of immediate area.
- Covenant on the majority of the land not to be built on and to be used as gardens only.
- No access will be consented to from Downview Road which is a private road, and legal action will be taken if required.
- Developer/new homeowners would have to contribute to maintenance costs for road, green spaces and SUDs on Chantry Mead which is a private road.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

Comments noted and addressed in 'Conclusions' section of report and as below:

- Inaccuracy in WSCC comments, refers to 'Foxley Lane' when should be Barnham Road.
- No access will be consented to from Downview Road which is a private road, and legal action will be taken if required. DATA ERROR!!!

CONSULTATIONS

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:**WSCC HIGHWAYS:**

The site and proposed access is on a private road. The Local Highway Authority (LHA) do not anticipate that the proposals would generate a highways safety concern at the nearest publicly maintainable highway, at the existing junction between Downview Road and Barnham Road. Provision of 10 car parking spaces to serve the dwellings meets the standards, and the lack of 1 visitor parking space, given parking restrictions in the area, would not be considered to detrimentally affect highway safety. The proposals would not result in an unacceptable impact on highways safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network. No objection, subject to conditions for car parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Point provision.

ADC DRAINAGE ENGINEER:

Given site is in the Lidsey Waste Water Treatment Catchment Area, surface water drainage design will need to be considered carefully. The drainage design could be very challenging on this site, but is all dependent on the results of further testing/monitoring during peak winter groundwater levels. Whatever the outcome, a sustainable drainage system must be designed and employed. No objection, subject to condition/informative requiring infiltration rates for drainage structures to be based on winter testing and requiring that full details of the surface water drainage scheme be submitted.

SOUTHERN WATER:

No objection. Request informative regarding formal application to be submitted to SW for connection of development to public sewer.

ADC TREES OFFICER:

The loss of these low and moderate quality trees will be detrimental to the verdant character of the area as viewed from the surrounding residential properties. However, none of the trees are obviously worthy of a Tree Preservation Order, and if retained trees (as shown on the TRPP) are afforded adequate respect and protection during development of the site, then no significant loss of public/visual amenity will be incurred. No objection, subject to conditions, requiring protective fencing and ground protection measures are installed adequately prior to commencement of development, and for development to be undertaken in strict accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) submitted.

ECOLOGY ADVISOR:

No objection, subject to conditions including external lighting scheme to protect bats, protection for badgers, wild nesting birds, and securing net biodiversity gains as set out in the Ecological Impact Assessment (Jan 2020) submitted and which should be incorporated into any future Landscaping Scheme.

COMMENTS ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Comments noted and addressed in 'Conclusions' section of report.

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:

Built-up Area Boundary

Barnham & Eastergate Neighbourhood Plan Area

Lidsey Waste Water Treatment Catchment Area

Minerals Consultation Area (Sharp Sand and Gravel)

Area of Character

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIESArun Local Plan 2011 - 2031:

SDSP1	SD SP1 Sustainable Development
SDSP2	SD SP2 Built-up Area Boundary
HSP1	HSP1 Housing allocation the housing requirement
DDM1	D DM1 Aspects of form and design quality
DDM2	D DM2 Internal space standards
DSP1	D SP1 Design
QESP1	QE SP1 Quality of the Environment
WMDM1	WM DM1 Waste Management
TDM1	T DM1 Sustainable Travel and Public Rights of Way
TSP1	T SP1 Transport and Development
WDM1	W DM1 Water supply and quality
WDM2	W DM2 Flood Risk
WDM3	W DM3 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems
WSP1	W SP1 Water
ENVDM4	ENV DM4 Protection of trees
ENVDM5	ENV DM5 Development and biodiversity
ENVSP1	ENV SP1 Natural Environment

Joint Minerals Local Plan 2018:

	Joint West Sussex M9 Safeguarding Minerals
<u>Barnham & Eastergate Neighbourhood Plan 2014</u> <u>POLICY ES1</u>	Applications for new development must meet the local drainage requirements
Barnham & Eastergate Neighbourhood Plan 2014 POLICY ES10	Trees and hedgerows
Barnham & Eastergate Neighbourhood Plan 2014 POLICY ES5	Quality of design
Barnham & Eastergate Neighbourhood Plan 2014 POLICY ES6	Contribution to local character
Barnham & Eastergate Neighbourhood Plan 2014	Parking and new development

POLICY GA4

Barnham & Eastergate Neighbourhood Plan 2014 Windfall sites

POLICY H2

Barnham & Eastergate Neighbourhood Plan 2014 Integration of new housing into surroundings

POLICY H4

Barnham & Eastergate Neighbourhood Plan 2014 Outdoor space

POLICY H5

Barnham & Eastergate Neighbourhood Plan 2014 Attention to detail

POLICY H6**PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:**

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

NPPG National Planning Practice Guidance

SUPPLEMENTARY POLICY GUIDANCE:

SPD11 Arun Parking Standards 2020

POLICY COMMENTARY

The Development Plan consists of the Arun Local Plan 2011 - 2031, West Sussex County Council's Waste and Minerals Plans and Made Neighbourhood Development Plans.

The policies are published under Regulations 19 and 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

The policies contained within the Barnham & Eastergate Neighbourhood Plan (made 2014) are relevant in the determination of this planning application.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:-

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

The proposal conflicts with relevant Development Plan policies in that it would result in harm to the visual amenity of the area and have an unneighbourly relationship with adjacent properties and result in harm to neighbouring residential amenity. This would be in conflict with Local Plan policies D SP1, D DM1 and QE SP1, and Neighbourhood Plan policies ES5, ES6 and H4.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are other material considerations to be weighed in the balance with the Development Plan. Despite the Council's lack of a 5 year housing land supply and that the proposals would trigger the NPPF's 'presumption in favour of sustainable development', the adverse impacts on the visual and residential amenity of the area would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits in this case, contrary to NPPF paragraph 11(d)(ii) and the relevant Development Plan policies.

CONCLUSIONS

PRINCIPLE:

The site is in the Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB), where the principle of development is acceptable, in accordance with policy SD SP2 of the Arun Local Plan (ALP) 2018, subject to consideration against other policies in the Local Plan.

HOUSING SUPPLY:

The addition of 4 dwellings adding to housing in the District would be supported by housing supply policy H SP1 of the ALP. It would accord with 'windfall sites' policy H2 of the Barnham & Eastergate Neighbourhood Plan (B&ENP), which supports small residential developments on infill sites, subject to the policies in the NP being met.

PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT:

Given the Council's 5 year Housing Land Supply position (currently 2.9 years), the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' is triggered under paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF. Para 11(d)(ii) of the NPPF makes clear that permission should be granted unless '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'. ALP Policy SD SP1 states the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF.

The addition of 4 dwellings, in the BUAB in this sustainable location relatively close to local shops, services and facilities, and which would result in economic and social benefits, would satisfy the NPPF's definition of 'sustainable development'. However, in the tilted balance, the visual and residential adverse impacts of the scheme (as described in the following sections of this report) would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits of the scheme, and the proposal would therefore not benefit from 'the presumption in favour of sustainable development'.

VISUAL IMPACTS:

The area is characterised by linear residential development along this side of Downview Road, and small cul-de-sac development on Chantry Mead (and Murrell Gardens beyond). The site and immediate surroundings are not located in an Area of Character, however further to the south is the Barnham Road & Downview Road Area of Character. There is some degree of irregularity in terms of the plot sizes/shapes and division of the garden areas in this immediate area of Downview Road and Chantry Mead. However, there is general uniformity to this continuous run of properties on Downview Road and a relatively uniform pattern of development (with Chantry Mead/Murrell Gardens forming small self-contained cul-de-sacs behind Downview Road). EG/108/17/OUT for the sub-division of the plot at no.10 Downview Road and a new dwelling on its rear garden land was refused and dismissed at appeal, in part due to this type of backland development not being characteristic of this part of Downview Road and that the development would harm the established pattern of development. The Inspector noted that there is a 'spacious and linear arrangement which defines this area' and that the proposal would 'poorly relate to the established pattern of development in the area' and cause 'unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area'.

The subdivision of the vacant land to the rear of 8-11 Chantry Mead, the addition of 2 new dwellings (Plots 3 & 4) in this part of the site and their north-south orientation, would fail to reflect the established general pattern and layout of development in the area, and the building lines and orientation of

neighbouring properties. It would be read as an uncomfortable and cramped infill. These properties (Plots 3 & 4) in particular would appear cramped within the plot, would fail to relate to the more spacious, lower density housing on Downview Road and would represent 'overdevelopment' of the site. The new buildings would thus fail to successfully integrate into the context in which they are located and its surroundings, and would fail to reflect the local character of the area. In addition, the new two storey properties would be sited behind 3 bungalows on Downview Road (nos. 15, 16, 17) and this would make the new buildings very visible within the street scene and they would appear prominent and incongruous within the context.

The proposals result in harm to the immediate street scene and visual amenity of the area, in conflict with the NPPF, ALP policies D SP1 and D DM1 and policies ES5, ES6, and H4 of the B&ENP.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY:

The siting and scale of the 2 properties at the rear (Plots 3 & 4) result in an unneighbourly relationship and harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants. The new buildings would be in very close proximity to the nearest neighbouring properties and gardens, with only around 3.5-7.5m from the garden boundaries and 11m-14m from the rear elevations of nos 17 and 18 Downview Rd, and only 4-7m to the garden boundaries and 13-14m from the rear elevations of 9 and 10 Chantry Mead. This separation distance to no.17 Downview Rd in particular would fail to comply with the emerging ADC Design SPD standard for side to rear separation distances of a minimum 14m. The lack of separation distance and the close proximity between plots, and the two storey scale of the proposed dwellings, would result in a sense of being 'hemmed in' and a degree of enclosure, overbearing and overshadowing on these neighbouring properties and gardens. This would be exacerbated by the fact that nos.16 and 17 are only single storey bungalows (whereas the new dwellings would be two storey) and by the small size of the rear gardens to these neighbouring properties.

Although it is acknowledged that, while the side facing first floor windows would be obscure glazed to avoid overlooking, given the lack of separation distance and close proximity of the plots, there would be some degree of overlooking and/or perception of overlooking from the first floor rear windows towards the gardens and properties at nos 17 and 18 Downview Road and no. 10 Chantry Mead. In the case of 17 Downview Rd, this impact would be exacerbated by the fact it is a single storey bungalow and so would suffer perceived and/or real overlooking from the new 2 storey properties in close proximity.

The proposals would fail to protect the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants, in conflict with para 27 of the NPPF and ALP policies D DM1 and QE SP1.

INTERNAL & EXTERNAL STANDARDS:

Plots 1 & 2 would provide 2-storey 3 bedroom homes, with a Gross Internal Area (GIA) of approximately 145sqm. This would exceed the minimal internal space standards set out in the Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standards (2015) which is 84-102 sqm for a 2-storey 3 bedroom home. Plots 3 & 4 would provide 2-storey 4 bedroom homes, with a GIA of approximately 167sqm. Again, this would exceed the national internal space standards of 97-124sqm. The proposals would therefore accord with ALP policy D DM2, which requires internal spaces to be of an appropriate size and that the national standards provide guidance.

There are no specific policies in the ALP or adopted guidance with regard external spaces. Policy H5 of the B&ENP states that proposals for new housing development should include good quality outdoor amenity space and that this should be commensurate to the size and type of dwelling and the character of the area. Paragraph H.04 of the emerging Arun Design Guide SPD advises that outdoor amenity spaces should be of an appropriate size and shape and be usable and enjoyable. It states rear gardens

should have a minimum depth of 10.5m and buildings should be set back by 2m from the plot boundary to mark defensible space.

Each property would benefit from a front and rear garden, the buildings would be set back by over 2m from the plot boundaries and would have rear gardens with a depth over 10.5m. The size of the gardens would be appropriate to serve 3 and 4 bed dwellings and would be of a size and shape which would be usable and enjoyable. As such, the proposals would accord with B&ENP policy H5 and the emerging guidance in the ADC Design SPD.

WASTE PROVISION:

The Site Plan confirms that bins would be stored in the integral garages to each property, and shows a bin collection area for Plots 3 & 4 nearer to Chantry Mead to allow for easier kerbside collection. This would accord with ALP policy WM DM1 and policy H6 of the B&ENP. If the Council were minded to grant planning permission, a planning condition would be applied requiring a minimum of 2 bins (1 for refuse and 1 for recycling) of 240l each to be provided within the garages to serve each property.

HIGHWAYS:

A new access point and cul-de-sac off Chantry Mead is proposed to serve the development. Chantry Mead is a private road and, as such, formal consent would likely be required from the land owner for the proposed site access works. The Local Highway Authority (LHA), WSCC Highways, have been consulted on the proposals and raise no objection on highways safety grounds, parking nor the impact on the operation/capacity of the highway network.

The requirement for a development of this size would be a total of 10 parking spaces (2 per 3 bed and 3 per 4 bed), and 2 visitor spaces in accordance with the ADC Parking SPD. The proposals would provide 10 parking spaces to serve the dwellings, but there would be a shortfall of 1 visitor parking space. However, this in itself is not considered to be sufficiently significant and harmful to on-street parking pressures to form a reason for refusal, and the LHA have confirmed they consider there would not be a detrimental impact on highways safety from this visitor parking shortfall. Cycle parking will be provided within the garages, which would conform with the MfS which requires cycle storage to be undercover and secure. If the Council were minded to grant planning permission, planning conditions could be applied requiring plans and details of Electric Vehicle Charging Point provision, and car and cycle parking to be constructed as per the approved plans.

As such, the proposals would accord with paragraphs 106, 108 and 109 of the NPPF, policies T SP1 and T DM1 of the ALP and policy GA4 of the B&ENP and the ADC Parking SPD.

DRAINAGE:

The site is in Flood Zone 1 (low risk of flooding) but is in the Lidsey Waste Water Treatment Catchment Area, where surface water drainage is an issue and SUDs must be carefully considered and designed. A Foul and Surface Water Drainage Statement has been supplied. The Council's Drainage Engineers have been consulted. They acknowledge that, given the ground conditions in the area (including at Chantry Mead) during peak winter levels, the drainage design for this site could be very challenging, however they raise no objection, subject to a condition and informative requiring infiltration rates for drainage structures to be based on winter testing and requiring that full details of the surface water drainage scheme be submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to commencement of development.

In the event of the Council being minded to grant permission, this condition and informative would be applied, to ensure the development would be adequately drained and would not increase flood risk on

site or elsewhere, in accordance with the NPPF, ALP policies W DM2 and W DM3 and B&ENP policy ES1.

TREES:

The site contains trees of low (garden trees) to moderate (larger trees) quality, some of which provide visual amenity value and contribute to the verdant character of the area. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement plus Tree Retention and Protection Plan (TRPP) have been supplied. The Council's Trees Officer has been consulted on the application and raised no objection. The majority of the existing tree stock on site will be removed to accommodate the development, to provide the only logical access onto the plot and construction of this number of units. The loss of these low and moderate quality trees will be detrimental to the verdant character of the area as viewed from the surrounding residential properties. With so few trees remaining across the site, there are few opportunities for conflict between trees and any construction. Those trees to be retained appear to have been afforded sufficient room to allow future growth without constraint. None are obviously worthy of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). If retained trees (as shown on the TRPP) are afforded adequate respect and protection during development of the site, then no significant loss of public/visual amenity will be incurred. Two conditions are recommended, requiring a meeting to ensure the protective fencing and ground protection measures are installed adequately prior to commencement of development, and for development to be undertaken in strict accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement submitted.

In the event of the Council being minded to grant permission, these conditions would be applied, to ensure the development adequately protected trees and local visual amenity, in accordance with policy ENV DM4 of the ALP and ES10 of the B&ENP.

ECOLOGY:

An Ecological Impact Assessment (Jan 2020) was submitted. The Council's Ecologist raised no objection, subject to conditions including external lighting scheme to protect bats, protection for badgers, wild nesting birds, and securing net biodiversity gains as set out in the EIA submitted.

In the event of the Council being minded to grant permission, these conditions would be applied, to ensure the development would adequately protect local wildlife and protected species and enhance biodiversity, in accordance with the Environment Bill, NPPF and policy ENV DM5 of the ALP.

OPEN SPACE:

Given the size of the development (4 dwellings), there would be no requirement or trigger for the provision of Public Open Space or Play on site. CIL monies would need to be sought for recreation and leisure facilities as detailed in the ADC SPD Open Space, Playing Pitches, Indoor and Built Facilities (January 2020).

If the Council were minded to grant approval of the application, then a Landscape Scheme detailing soft landscaping and planting would be required, and a planning condition added accordingly.

MINERALS:

The site is in a Mineral Consultation Area for Sharp Sand & Gravel. The County's Minerals and Waste Team raise no objection, based on the fact that they would not expect to be consulted on non-mineral (in this case residential) development with a site area less than 0.5ha or for a development of less than 10 dwellings. Significant levels of mineral sterilisation would not occur for a site or development of this size,

and an assessment regarding prior extraction, as set out in Minerals Local Plan policy M9, is not required in this case.

SUMMARY:

The proposals relate to the provision of housing and, as such, due to the Council's current lack of a 5 year HLS, the NPPF's 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' would be engaged. The proposal represents sustainable development within the Built-Up Area Boundary. However, any benefits of the proposals would not be outweighed by the significant and demonstrable harm to visual and residential amenity as a result of this 'backland' garden development. As such, the proposals would not benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development, and the conflict with policies within the Development Plan and the NPPF, warrants refusal of the application.

The application is refused for the following reasons:

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

The Council in making a decision, should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority such as Arun District Council to act in a manner, which is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights.

Consideration has been specifically given to Article 8 (Right to respect private and family life), Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). It is not considered that the recommendation for refusal of permission in this case interferes with applicant's right to respect for their private and family life and their home, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of neighbours). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest and the recommendation for refusal is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.

DUTY UNDER THE EQUALITIES ACT 2010

Duty under the Equalities Act 2010:

In assessing this proposal the following impacts have been identified upon those people with the following protected characteristics (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation).

The proposal would have a neutral impact on the protected characteristics.

CIL DETAILS

This application is CIL Liable therefore developer contributions towards infrastructure will be required (dependant on any exemptions or relief that may apply)

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

- 1 By reason of the siting, size and orientation of the dwellings on Plots 3 & 4, the proposals appears cramped within the plot, represent overdevelopment of the site, and would fail to reflect the established general pattern and layout of development in the area. The proposals

results in harm to the immediate street scene and visual amenity of the area, in conflict with the NPPF, Arun Local Plan policies D SP1 and D DM1 and policies ES5, ES6 and H4 of the Barnham & Eastergate Neighbourhood Plan. The adverse visual impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits of the proposal.

- 2 By reason of the siting, scale and close proximity to neighbouring plots, the dwellings on Plots 3 & 4 result in an unneighbourly relationship and a harmful enclosing, overshadowing and overlooking impact to neighbouring occupants. The proposals would fail to protect the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants, in conflict with the NPPF and Arun Local Plan policies D DM1 and QE SP1. The adverse amenity impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits of the proposal.