

Recommendation Report for Planning Permission

REF NO: P/38/21/PL

LOCATION: Little Sefter Farm
Pagham Road
Pagham

PROPOSAL: Extension to existing agricultural barn. This site may affect the setting of a listed building & is in CIL Zone 5 (Zero Rated) as other development.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	It is proposed to extend the agricultural building on the south western side. The extension will measure 30.5m long with the same depth (17m) as existing. It will be built to the same eaves (6.2m) and ridge (8m) heights and use the same materials (Goosewing Grey roof cladding with roof lights, Moorland green wall cladding, concrete panel walls, exposed galvanised steel frame & galvanised steel roller shutter doors). It provides an internal vehicle wash area (replacing the external facility) and an additional storage area. The site plan details external 'works' comprising hedging and tree planting both to the front and side of the extension, a storm-water balancing pond with new outfall to the existing drainage ditch and an extension to the concrete yard. The application proposes ecological mitigation in the form of an increase in the field margin of the field to the north (increase from 6m to 8m for 80m of length) and, as a result of the new planting, there will be a minor reduction in the crop area of the field to the south.
SITE AREA	0.13 hectares.
TOPOGRAPHY	Predominantly flat.
TREES	There are several small to medium trees along the site frontage. The ground immediately adjacent the construction site (circa 0.09ha) was cleared of scrub & small to medium trees in December 2020.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	1.8m high wire mesh fencing to the front. Post & rail to other boundaries.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Agricultural site comprising two storage buildings with hardstanding in between and grassed & planted areas. The HGV suitable access is from Pagham Road with wide visibility splays free of vegetation. The site of the extension is virgin ground with a few small trees surrounding. Little Sefter Farm provides a hub for local field produce prior to

being delivered to the main Barfoots processing facility at Sefter Farm and for farm equipment and machinery storage & maintenance. The site is linked to the wider estate via farm tracks.

CHARACTER OF LOCALITY

Predominantly agricultural land with relatively few buildings. The Royal Oak Public House is a short walk to the north whilst immediately opposite to the east is the White House, a grade II Listed dwelling of two storeys set behind a substantial hedge with trees. Beyond this is Pennicotts Farm.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

P/13/17/AG	Prior Notification for agricultural development - proposed building to support farm operations.	No Objection 16-03-17
P/113/10/	Erection of replacement general purpose agricultural building	ApproveConditionally 20-12-10
P/126/06/AG	Prior Notification for an agricultural building	No Objection 23-10-06
P/125/06/	Reuse of existing redundant agricultural building as B1 office space and improved farm access.	ApproveConditionally 21-11-06

The building was allowed by P/113/10 which granted improvements to the access which enhanced the visibility splays. This was approved with a landscaping condition.

P/13/17/AG permitted an additional agricultural storage building to the west. This was a prior notification application under the Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the Town and Country Planning Act (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended).

There are no delivery or operating hours restrictions on the buildings in the site.

REPRESENTATIONS

Pagham Parish Council object on grounds of proximity to the Lower Bognor Road/Pagham Road junction and any increase in traffic levels at the junction. Consider the extension harms the setting of the Grade II Listed White House.

One objection from the owners of the White House on the grounds of:

- (a) Harm to views & loss of light;
- (b) Increased road traffic noise due to creation of a tunnel effect; and
- (c) Increased noise from vehicles entering/exiting site and operations on site particularly during

unsociable hours.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

The concerns of the Parish and the objector are discussed in the conclusions. It is not considered in respect of (b) that there is any evidence to suggest the extension will exacerbate noise from existing traffic using Pagham Road.

CONSULTATIONS

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

SOUTHERN WATER - no objections.

ADC CONSERVATION OFFICER - the existing building is seen in the context of the listed building and it is considered the proposal to substantially extend it would also be harmful. The proposal will result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the Grade II Listed White House (on the lower end of the scale) and it is necessary in accordance with para 196 of the NPPF to consider the harm against the public benefits that the development may achieve. Comments as follows:

- The extension is substantial in size and appears to of a similar size and appearance to the existing building;
- There is a hedgerow which stretches across the area of the extension, but there is very limited planting in front of the existing building which means it is visible from the road;
- The large building is in view of the listed building when looking in a southerly direction (with The White House on the left hand side), and it is considered that the same will be said of the extension;
- Both the existing building and extension do not make a positive contribution to how the listed building is experienced when looking in a southerly direction;
- There is a line of trees to partially screen the listed building and the plans indicate the intention is to increase the buffer planting next to the agricultural building and the proposed extension;
- This would help to soften the impact of the building and ensure that it is screened from the road; and
- The new planting should be introduced in a more mature condition so as to ensure that it has the desired effect of screening/softening the building on completion.

ADC DRAINAGE ENGINEERS - no objection. State that the proposed surface water drainage strategy is acceptable but there are details which require amendment and as such a standard pre-commencement condition is required.

ADC ECONOMIC REGENERATION - keen to support local businesses and support this application.

ADC LANDSCAPE OFFICER - no objection subject to a landscaping condition to clearly show planting species, actual quantities, planting densities and size at time of planting. The mitigation planting will need to act as a buffer to both the existing & proposed extension and help to screen them from the road. The proposed planting would need to be at a size that provides instant impact and has immediate mitigating effect.

COUNCIL'S ARCHAEOLOGIST - it is unlikely works associated with the proposal would impinge on archaeological deposits to the extent that refusal or the requirement of other mitigation measures would be justified.

COUNCILS ECOLOGIST - no objection. Comment that:

- The mitigation measures in sections 4 & 5 of the ecology report should be conditioned;
- This should include a landscaping plan detailing new woodland creation, new hedge planting, new arable field margin creation and balancing pond & ditch outfall;
- A landscape and ecology maintenance plan will be required; and
- Any vegetation clearance/works to trees will need to be undertaken outside the bird nesting season.

COMMENTS ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

The protection of birds nests is covered by separate legislation therefore it is not appropriate to impose this as a condition.

POLICY CONTEXT

Designations applicable to site:

Outside Built Up Area Boundary;
 Within the setting of Grade II Listed Building;
 Pagham Harbour Zone B;
 Archaeological Notification Area;
 Class C Road;
 Current Flood Zone 1;
 Future Flood Zone 3a by 2111;
 CIL Zone 5; and
 Area of Special Control (Adverts).

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

[Arun Local Plan 2011 - 2031:](#)

CSP1	C SP1 Countryside
DDM1	D DM1 Aspects of form and design quality
DDM4	D DM4 Extensions&alter to exist builds(res and non-res)
DSP1	D SP1 Design
ECCSP1	ECC SP1 Adapting to Climate Change
ECCSP2	ECC SP2 Energy and climate change mitigation
EMPDM1	EMP DM1 Employment Land: Development Management
ENVDM2	ENV DM2 Pagham Harbour
ENVDM3	ENV DM3 Biodiversity Opportunity Areas
ENVDM4	ENV DM4 Protection of trees
ENVDM5	ENV DM5 Development and biodiversity
HERDM1	HER DM1 Listed Buildings
HERDM6	HER DM6 Sites of Archaeological Interest
HERSP1	HER SP1 The Historic Environment
HWBSP1	HWB SP1 Health and Wellbeing
LANDM1	LAN DM1 Protection of landscape character
SODM1	SO DM1 Soils
QEDM1	QE DM1 Noise Pollution
QEDM2	QE DM2 Light pollution

QEDM3	QE DM3 Air Pollution
QESP1	QE SP1 Quality of the Environment
SDSP1	SD SP1 Sustainable Development
SDSP2	SD SP2 Built-up Area Boundary
TSP1	T SP1 Transport and Development
WDM2	W DM2 Flood Risk
WDM3	W DM3 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems
WMDM1	WM DM1 Waste Management
WSP1	W SP1 Water

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:

NPPDG	National Design Guide
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, The South Inshore & South Offshore Marine Plan 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.

There is no current Pagham Neighbourhood Plan to consider as the emerging Plan was withdrawn in September 2020.

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 is considered to comply with relevant Development Plan policies in that it would not cause demonstrable harm to the character of the area, to the amenity of neighbouring residents or result in a severe impact on the local highway.

The proposal affects the setting of a nearby Grade II Listed dwellinghouse and section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that: "In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State, shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

The proposal is considered to comply with these in that it preserves the setting of the Listed Building.

Section 70(2) of Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) provides that

(2) In dealing with an application for planning permission the authority shall have regard to -

- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
- (aza) a post-examination draft neighbourhood development plan, so far as material to the application,
- (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
- (c) any other material considerations.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to be weighed in the balance with the Development Plan.

CONCLUSIONS

PRINCIPLE:

The site is outside of the built up area boundary where, as per ALP policy C SP1, development is generally unacceptable unless it falls into a certain category or is otherwise in accordance with a Local Plan policy which refers to a specific use or type of development. One of the exceptions under policy C SP1 is where the development is for the operational needs of agriculture.

The extension aids the growth of the Barfoots business by providing additional storage for food produce and secure storage of farm vehicles & equipment. The applicant stated that in 2019 the site was the subject of a break-in which caused damage to farm vehicles in the open yard and theft of equipment.

The proposal accords with ALP policy C SP1. The proposal gains support from part 6 of ALP policy EMP DM1 which supports the economic growth of businesses outside of the built up area boundary.

The site lies in the Pagham to Selsey Strategic Gap. ALP policy SD SP3 allows development in the gaps where certain criteria are met. It is considered that the proposal complies with these as being an extension to an existing building in an existing site, it will not undermine the separation of nearby settlements and it does not make commercial sense for the development to be located elsewhere. It maintains the agricultural character of the site and surroundings. There is no conflict with this policy.

AGRICULTURAL LAND:

In order to provide tree planting to the south of the extension, there will be a minor (190m²) reduction in the crop area of the field to the south. As there will be no permanent loss of the high grade soils in this area and as the soil will be used to grow trees instead, it is not considered that there is conflict with the Council's policy on protection of agricultural land.

HERITAGE ASSETS:

The extension will be approximately 58m from a Grade II Listed dwellinghouse (the White House). It is about 94m from the Grade II Listed Pennicotts Farmhouse which sits further east beyond the White House. The relevant Local Plan policy is HER DM1 which requires that proposals protect and, where possible, enhance the setting of Listed Buildings.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states: "In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State, shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

It is necessary to consider policy guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which sets out several steps when considering impact on heritage assets. Para 189 requires applicants to describe the significance of heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The applicant has not provided any heritage assessment.

Para 190 then requires Local Planning Authorities identify and assess the particular significance of the heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal. The Local Planning Authority must then consider the level of harm associated with the proposal and decide whether there is any harm and if so, whether this is 'less than substantial harm' or 'substantial harm'. It is then necessary to counterbalance harm with the level of public benefits associated with the proposal (as set out in paras 193-196).

The Conservation Officer assessed the proposal and the comments are set out in full on the Council's website and summarised above. The Conservation Officer considers the proposal results in less than substantial harm to the setting of the closest Listed Building, the White House, but this harm will be on the lower end of the spectrum.

It should be noted that there is a tall screen of trees and hedging around the White House which limits the impact of the extension on its setting. The proposal will only affect the setting of the White House when viewing it looking south from views north of the site and then only in respect of views from Pagham Road. The tree & hedge planting will soften the impact of the extension and, in time, help to screen it out from the streetscene.

In accordance with the NPPF, it is necessary to weigh the less than substantial harm against the public benefits that the development may achieve. The proposal will not generate new jobs but will support the growth of the Barfoots food growing business and support existing employment on the Barfoots site as a whole. The proposal includes a new internal vehicle wash area which reduces the need to use equipment externally and reduce noise at the site to the benefit of nearby residential occupiers. If more vehicles are stored internally then starting their engines/carrying out maintenance will have further noise reduction benefits.

It is considered the public benefits are at a level that allows for the harm to be outweighed given harm is on the lower end of the spectrum. The proposal accords with ALP policy HER DM1 as it seeks to protect the setting of the building through tree & hedge planting. A landscaping condition is proposed to require that the new trees which are planted are as mature as practically possible to help to soften & screen the extension from the start.

In respect of section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, whilst the setting of the designated heritage asset will be subject to some harm, it is not considered this harm is significant and that over time, the harm will be reduced through the new planting scheme.

ARCHAEOLOGY:

The site lies in a designated archaeological notification area. ALP Policy HER DM6 states where a site on which development is proposed has potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, permission will only be granted where it can be demonstrated development will not be harmful to

archaeological interest. The policy requires a desk based archaeological assessment be submitted.

The applicant has not provided an Archaeological assessment and the proposal is in conflict with the policy. It is material that the Councils archaeologist does not object or require any form of survey take place. It is not considered there is any harm arising from the lack of an assessment taking place.

DESIGN & CHARACTER:

ALP policy D DM1 requires the Council seek to make the best possible use of land by reflecting or improving on the character of the site/surrounding area. It requires the Council consider scale, massing, aspect, siting, layout, density, building materials, landscaping and design features. The policy requires the scale of development keep in the general confines of the overall character of a locality. ALP policy D SP1 "Design" requires development to make efficient use of land and reflect local character.

ALP Policy D DM4 sets out criteria for which applications relating to extensions and alterations of existing buildings must be assessed against. These generally seek to minimise the impact of the proposal on the character of the host building, its neighbours and the locality. ALP policy LAN DM1 requires that new development repair or reinforce the character of the landscape

The Arun Design Guide states new development in rural areas should respect and enhance distinctive rural character, integrate into its landscape setting and use a simple unobtrusive design. The Pagham Village Design Statement (PVDS) was adopted by the Pagham Parish Council in 2007 and is a material consideration. This has minimal weight given it is over 10 years old and predates the ALP, the NPPF and Arun Design Guide. The proposal does not conflict with any of the criteria set out for the "Rural Areas" character area.

Although it is recognised the extension almost doubles the length of the building (being only 0.2m shorter than the host building), and cannot be considered as a subservient addition, it maintains the existing form & design of the host building and is typical of other agricultural buildings in the rural area. The existing building has a somewhat negative impact on the streetscene and the extension will exacerbate this. The landscaping scheme is ambitious and will, over time, soften and screen views of the building from the road. This will be beneficial to the appearance of the whole site in the long term.

It is considered that the proposal complies with the aforementioned policies and Design Guidance.

HIGHWAY SAFETY & PARKING:

ALP policy T SP1 seeks to ensure development provides safe access on to the highway network; contributes to highway improvements & promotes sustainable transport. Proposals will be supported where they explain how the development has been designed to: (i) accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and supplies; (ii) give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and have access to high quality public transport facilities; (iii) create safe and secure layouts for traffic, cyclists and pedestrians whilst avoiding street clutter.

Notwithstanding concerns of the Parish Council regarding traffic, the application states the extension will have no discernible impact on the public highway because there will be no significant increase in vehicular traffic to/from the Pagham Road access with most movements to/from the site being via estate farm tracks, rather than the public highway. The application states the existing highway access & visibility splays cater for all types of vehicles likely to use the site. It is not considered there is any reason to doubt these statements as the purpose of the extension is to better secure vehicles & equipment, provide crop storage and carry out internal vehicle washes with no increase in staffing.

It is not considered the proposal exacerbates any existing highway safety concerns. There is space in the site for car parking and no conflict with ALP policy T SP1 or the Council's Parking Standards SPD.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY & NOISE:

ALP policy D DM1 requires there be minimal impact to users and occupiers of nearby property and land. ALP policy QE SP1 requires all development contribute positively to the quality of the environment and ensure development does not have a significantly negative impact on residential amenity.

It is not considered there will be overlooking or loss of privacy as no eye level windows or openings will be created on the elevation facing the White House. There will also be no harm to light for the occupiers of the White House as the extension is 58m away with a two lane road and a tall screen of trees in between.

ALP policy QE DM1 (Noise Pollution) is only relevant where new noise generating development is proposed. The proposal provides new internal storage for vehicles and crops. The effect of relocating the vehicle wash inside will be to provide additional noise mitigation to the existing use of pressure washers & compressors thus providing a reduction in noise.

It is recognised the site does not have planning restrictions on hours of operation and its use may be creating some amenity problems for neighbouring residential occupiers. It would not be reasonable to impose an hours restriction on the site because of this extension. If a restriction was imposed on the extension alone this would create operational conflicts with the rest of the site. Whilst the nearby residential dwelling has existed for a longer time than the agricultural storage site, the use is still a longstanding one and is appropriate for a countryside location alongside a busy road.

It is not considered that there are any conflicts with ALP policies D DM1, QE SP1 or QE DM1.

FLOODING & SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE:

The site of the extension is in Flood Zone 1 however, according to the Council's climate change maps it will be in part designated as Flood Zone 3 by the year 2111.

ALP policy W DM2 refers to the sequential test, need for a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and mitigation measures. Policy ECC SP1 states development must be located & appropriately designed to adapt to impacts arising from climate change such as the increased probability of tidal and fluvial flooding. Government guidance states this type of development is 'less vulnerable' and is appropriate in Flood Zone 3a without the need to consider the sequential or exception tests or provide an FRA. As such, it is not considered that there is any conflict with ALP policies W DM2 or ECC SP1.

ALP Policy W DM3 states all development must identify opportunities to incorporate a range of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) as appropriate to the size of development. The application proposes a surface water attenuation/balancing pond with a flow control system to ensure surface water run-off rates are no greater than existing. The pond will retain a general depth of 200-500mm and connect to the existing drainage ditch by an open channel. This will provide water vole habitat as well as surface water drainage attenuation.

The applicant provided drainage drawings and the information required by the "Surface Water Drainage Proposal Checklist" on the Council's website. Drainage engineers consider that the scheme is acceptable in principle but that additional information is required and the discharge rate needs to be altered therefore a standard condition is required to secure the changes. It is therefore considered that the application is in accordance with the requirement of policy W DM3.

BIODIVERSITY:

The site is approximately 2.5km from the Pagham Harbour SPA/Ramsar Site and is in a Biodiversity Opportunity Area designated by the ALP. It is not considered there is any conflict however with ALP policy ENV DM2 as the site lies in the Pagham Harbour Zone B where mitigation is only required for residential developments.

ALP Policy ENV DM3 states new development must retain & incorporate locally valued and important habitats; and be designed to minimise disturbance to habitats. Policy ENV DM5 seeks to achieve a net gain in biodiversity and protect existing habitats on site.

The site of the extension has been cleared however, the application is accompanied by an ecological appraisal. The report does not identify any impacts to protected species but partly in recognition of the biodiversity improvement area and partly to compensate for the lost habitat, proposes wildlife habitat comprising of woodland, hedge planting, arable field margins and balancing pond.

The Council's ecologist assessed the submission and advises no objection subject to mitigation measures being secured by condition. On this basis the proposal complies with ALP policies ENV DM3 and ENV DM5.

SUMMARY:

It is considered that the extension complies with relevant development plan policies and there are no adverse impacts to granting this permission. The application is recommended for approval subject to the following conditions.

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) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). It is not considered that the recommendation for approval of the grant of permission in this case interferes unreasonably with any local residents' right to respect for their private and family life and home, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest and the recommendation for approval 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 not liable for CIL.

RECOMMENDATION**APPROVE CONDITIONALLY**

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 Development shall not commence, other than works of site survey and investigation, until full details of the proposed surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The design should follow the hierarchy of preference for different types of surface water drainage disposal systems as set out in Approved Document H of the Building Regulations, and the recommendations of the SuDS Manual produced by CIRIA. No part of the extended building shall be occupied until the complete surface water drainage system serving the property has been implemented in accordance with the agreed details and the details so agreed shall be maintained in good working order in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development is satisfactorily drained in accordance with policies W SP1, W DM1, W DM2 and W DM3 of the Arun Local Plan. This is required to be a pre-commencement condition because it is necessary to implement the surface water drainage system prior to commencing any building works.

- 3 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location Plan 001 Rev 04;
Existing and Proposed Site Block Plan, Floor Plan & Elevations 002 Rev 04; and
Estate Plan 004 Rev 04.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of amenity and the environment in accordance with policies D DM1, D DM4, T SP1, ENV DM3, ENV DM5, EMP DM1, HER DM1 & QE SP1 of the Arun Local Plan.

- 4 No development above ground floor level shall take place until a detailed Landscape and Ecology Maintenance Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The Plan should include the detailed design of the proposed mitigation measures set out at sections 4 & 5 of the Ecological Appraisal by GPM Ecology (08/03/21). The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and timetable.

Reason: To ensure adequate protection and enhancement of biodiversity interests in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF and policies ENV DM3 & ENV DM5 of the Arun Local Plan.

- 5 No development above ground floor level shall take place until there has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, a landscaping scheme including details of all new hard & soft landscaping and details of trees and hedgerows to be retained,

together with measures for their protection during the course of the development. The tree planting should be introduced in a form that is as mature as practically possible so as to ensure it has the desired effect of screening & softening the building on completion.

The Landscaping details should include mitigation measures proposed in the Ecological Appraisal by GPM Ecology (08/03/21) including the woodland creation, hedge planting, area of grass field margin in the field to the north and balancing pond & ditch outfall.

The approved landscaping details shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season, following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner, and any trees or plants which, within a period of five years from the completion of development, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of amenity, biodiversity, heritage and the environment of the development in accordance with policies D DM1, LAN DM1, HER DM1, ENV DM3 & ENV DM5 of the Arun Local Plan.

- 6 The materials and finishes of the external walls/roof of the extension shall match in colour and texture with those of the existing building.

Reason: In the interests of amenity in accordance with policies D DM1 & D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan.

- 7 INFORMATIVE: Statement pursuant to Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order 2015. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 8 INFORMATIVE: Infiltration rates for soakage structures are to be based on percolation tests undertaken in the winter period and at the location and depth of the proposed structures. The percolation tests must be carried out in accordance with BRE365, CIRIA R156 or a similar approved method and cater for the 1 in 10 year storm between the invert of the entry pipe to the soakaway, and the base of the structure. It must also have provision to ensure that there is capacity in the system to contain below ground level the 1 in 100 year event plus 40% on stored volumes, as an allowance for climate change. Adequate freeboard must be provided between the base of the soakaway structure and the highest recorded annual groundwater level identified in that location. Any SuDS or soakaway design must include adequate groundwater monitoring data to determine the highest winter groundwater table in support of the design. The applicant is advised to discuss the extent of groundwater monitoring with the Council's Engineers. Supplementary guidance notes regarding surface water drainage are located here <https://www.arun.gov.uk/surfacewater>. A surface water drainage checklist is available here <https://www.arun.gov.uk/drainagechecklist> and this should be submitted with a Discharge of Conditions Application.

- 9 INFORMATIVE: The applicant should note that under Part 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, with only a few exceptions, it is an offence for any person to intentionally take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild birds while the nest is in use or being built. Birds nest between March and September and therefore removal of dense bushes, ivy or trees or parts of trees etc. during this period could lead to an offence under the act.