

Recommendation Report for Planning Permission

REF NO: WA/52/25/PL

LOCATION: Cherry Tree Nursery
Eastergate Lane
Walberton
BN18 0BA

PROPOSAL: Removal of residential caravan and erection of 1 No. self-build dwelling. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan and is in CIL Zone 3 and is CIL liable.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	This application seeks the removal of a residential caravan and the construction of a three-bed detached dwelling with parking and private amenity space. The design of the new dwelling is a simple rectangular building with a dual-pitched roof running front to rear, and rooms partly in the roof space. Pitched roof gable dormers are present at both the front and rear. The dwelling will be constructed using multi-stock bricks with red brick detailing (including quoins, soldier lintels, and cills), and finished with a plain clay tile roof.
SITE AREA	0.10 hectares.
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	10 dph
TOPOGRAPHY	Predominantly flat.
TREES	None of any significance affected by the development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Close boarded fence.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Residential garden land containing one mobile home and gravel parking area.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential, agricultural including equine and commercial (horticulture) land. There are 14 agricultural workers mobile homes to the immediate north. To the immediate east and west are residential dwellinghouses.

REPRESENTATIONS

- Walberton Parish Council - Objection
- Insufficient information concerning water supply and drainage services have been given.
 - Site is not in the Neighbourhood Plan and is a departure from the Development Plan.
 - There are known Issues with foul sewer capacity in the area and further downstream which this application will only make worse.
 - Increasing frequency of sewerage release into the environment is a breach of environmental Laws.
 - The increase in housing in the area will impact the setting of the Walberton Conservation Area.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

Noted

CONSULTATIONS
CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

WSCC Highways - Advice with conditions suggested.

- WSCC mapping data indicates there have been no highways accidents or personal injury claims at the point of access to Cherry Tree Nursery from Eastergate Lane.
- The access route is an existing arrangement, and has functioned for some time. Vehicle speeds within the access are anticipated to be low and as such would allow time for vehicle manoeuvres and oncoming vehicles to anticipate any conflicts within the access and react accordingly.
- The WSCC parking demand calculator outlines that 3 spaces would be anticipated to serve a dwelling of this size. The plans show a provision of 2 parking spaces to serve the dwelling, the LPA may wish to consider the shortfall from an amenity perspective.
- Overspill parking would not be anticipated to occur within the publicly maintained highway at this location due to the nature of the road.
- The residential use of the caravan would generate similar trip movements such that the proposed development is similar in character.

South Downs National Park - No comments to make.

Environmental Health - No objection with conditions suggested.

Southern Water - Advice with conditions suggested.

ADC Drainage Engineers - Objection.

- No specific discharge location has been specified, only implied. Infiltration remains unproven as no groundwater monitoring or infiltration testing has been carried out.
- The existing discharge location has not been proven, or specific details provided.
- No surface water should drain to the foul sewer.
- Potential other discharge locations are identified, however, no details have been submitted in respects of these.
- It is not possible to assess if floor risk will be increased.
- Other details including interception details, incorporation of biodiversity, amenity and water quality benefits have not been identified, however these are not expected to impact the scale and layout of development.

ADC Ecologist - No objection with conditions suggested

- The site is in the Singleton and Cocking SAC 1200m HRA buffer, given the scale and nature of the development an appropriate assessment is not required.
- The Preliminary Ecological Assessment (PEA) has not identified impacts to protected species. No further surveys are required.
- The PEA makes recommendations for ecological enhancements in section 6.

COMMENTS ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Comments noted.

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:
 Lidsey Flood Risk Zone
 Lidsey Treatment Catchment Area
 Area of Special Control of Adverts
 Outside Built-up Area Boundary
 WSCC Mineral Consultation Area
 Singleton and Cocking Tunnels SAC Buffer Zone

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

CSP1	C SP1 Countryside
ECCSP1	ECC SP1 Adapting to Climate Change
DSP1	D SP1 Design
DDM1	D DM1 Aspects of form and design quality
DDM2	D DM2 Internal space standards
ENVDM1	ENV DM1 Designated Sites of Biodiversity or geographical imp
ENVDM5	ENV DM5 Development and biodiversity
WDM3	W DM3 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems
QESP1	QE SP1 Quality of the Environment
TDM1	T DM1 Sustainable Travel and Public Rights of Way
WSP1	W SP1 Water

<u>Walberton Neighbourhood Plan Policy 2017 HP1</u>	Spatial Plan of the Parish
Walberton Neighbourhood Plan Policy 2017 HP11	Housing Density
Walberton Neighbourhood Plan Policy 2017 HP13	Design Guidance
Walberton Neighbourhood Plan Policy 2017 VE7	Surface Water Management

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPDG	National Design Guide

SUPPLEMENTARY POLICY GUIDANCE:

SPD11	Arun Parking Standards 2020
SPD13	Arun District Design Guide (SPD) January 2021

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.

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 conflict with relevant Development Plan policies in that it cannot be ensured that the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere will not be increased by the proposed development.

Section 70(2) of the 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

There are no other material considerations to be weighed in the balance with the Development Plan.

BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN

This application not is liable for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) as it is identified as self-build and is therefore exempt.

CONCLUSIONS

PRINCIPLE
The Development Plan for the Arun District comprises the Arun Local Plan (ALP), the Walberton Neighbourhood Development Plan 2, that was made in 2021 (WNDP) and the West Sussex Waste and Minerals Plans.

The site is outside the Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB), in the designated Countryside. New development should be focussed within the BUAB, according to ALP policy SP SD2. Policy HP1 of the WNDP relates to the BUAB and states proposals for development outside the BUAB, that do not accord with the development plan policies in respect of the countryside, will be resisted unless it meets one of the strict criteria. Policy C SP1 notes countryside locations will be recognised for their intrinsic character and beauty.

The provisions of Policy HP1 and Policy C SP1 preclude residential development on the site. The principle of development on the site is, thereby, contrary to the development plan.

The NPPF is an important material consideration in determining applications. As the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year Housing Land Supply ALP Policy C SP1 is out of date and the presumption in paragraph 11(d) (the so called "tilted balance") applies.

Paragraph 14 of the NPPF (20 December 2024) relating to the status of neighbourhood plans is of relevance in this instance. Paragraph 14 says that in situations where the presumption (at paragraph 11d) applies to applications involving the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably

outweigh the benefits, provided the following apply: a) the neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan five years or less before the date on which the decision is made; and b) the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement.

The current made WNDP is less than 5 years old and sites for the allocation of housing have been provided within the WNDP. Accordingly, Paragraph 14 of the NPPF is a material consideration to which significant weight should be attached.

CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE

ALP Policy D DM1 sets out 13 design aspects of which applications should be assessed against. These include: Character, Appearance, Impact, Trees, Layout, Density and Scale. ALP Policy D SP1 requires development to make an effective use of the land.

Policy HP 13 of the WNDP requires that new development must contribute to local character by creating a sense of place appropriate to its location. HP 11 states the density of new development shall be appropriate to its location.

Para 135 of the NPPF requires development to be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout, be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting and maintain a strong sense of place.

Part Q of the Arun Design Guide (ADG) requires development to sensitively fit into its setting in order to respect the character of the District's countryside areas.

The proposal seeks to remove a mobile home and replace it with a dwelling. The mobile home currently is typical in appearance for such structures, measuring approximately 14m in length and 4m in width. It is towards the rear of the plot, resulting in a substantial frontage that functions as private amenity space, enclosed by 1.8m high close-boarded fencing. The mobile home is of no architectural merit and is largely screened from public view, with only limited visibility from the street.

The replacement dwelling would measure approximately 10m in width, 9m in depth, and 8.3m in height. While the ridge height would be marginally higher than that of the neighbouring properties, the overall scale is not considered unduly prominent due to the generous separation distances between dwellings. The new dwelling would be positioned slightly behind the front building line established by Longacres, located immediately to the east, and would sit approximately 37m closer to the highway than the existing mobile home. This repositioning would reinforce the linear pattern of development along Eastergate Lane. As a result, the dwelling would be more visible from the highway and would have a more pronounced impact on the character of the area.

The character of the surrounding area is mixed, with a variety of dwelling styles evident. On the northern side of Eastergate Lane, the prevailing form consists of larger detached properties, both single and two-storey, typically set well back from the road with verdant frontages that contribute to a sense of openness. The site is an anomaly in this context. Other parts of Eastergate Lane exhibit a more rural character, with hedgerows enclosing the highway and maintaining a green corridor. The proposal includes retention of the existing high boundary treatment, which is considered a missed opportunity to enhance the visual quality of the site and better integrate it with the surrounding context.

Part G of the ADG advises that rural settlements should achieve a density of approximately 5-15 dwellings per hectare for detached and semi-detached properties. This range seeks to balance efficient land use with the preservation of local character. The development would result in a density of 10 dwellings per hectare, which is consistent with the guidance. The layout would not result in the loss of open views or encroachment into the countryside, as the dwelling replaces an existing, albeit temporary,

structure and is located in an established area with built development. The scale and layout are appropriate in terms of character.

The dwelling adopts a traditional design, with accommodation partially within the roof space. The front elevation features two modestly sized pitched-roof dormer windows, with three to the rear, contributing to a well-balanced and proportionate appearance. The building's simple rectangular form and restrained detailing are consistent with Part Q of the ADG, which recommends that buildings in rural locations adopt uncomplicated forms to reflect their setting.

Overall, the replacement dwelling would not result in an intensification of use and is considered acceptable in terms of its appearance, scale, layout, and density. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with ALP Policy D DM1 and policies HP11 and HP13 of the WNDP.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

ALP policy D DM1 requires there be minimal impact to users and occupiers of nearby property and land. ALP policy QE SP1 requires development contribute positively to the quality of the environment and ensure development does not have a significantly negative impact on residential amenity. Part H of the ADG sets out guidance on garden depths and interface distances between houses.

The dwelling would be between 3.2m and 3.5m from the eastern boundary, and between 7.88m and 8m from the western boundary, including the access drive. It has been demonstrated on plan that the dwelling does not interfere with the 45-degree sight line (which would extend from Fairfield's nearest ground floor window), indicating that the dwelling would not adversely affect light levels to that property.

The dwelling on the eastern flank has front and rear elevations that extend further forward and back within its plot, such that the dwelling would not impact light levels to either the front or rear of that neighbouring property. In terms of overbearing and overshadowing effects, the dwelling is appropriately located within its plot, and there would be no significant harm to neighbouring occupiers.

With regard to the impact on the amenity of the local environment, a purpose-built dwelling represents a more visually appropriate solution for the residential land than a temporary structure, which would inevitably deteriorate in visual quality over time. Although it is acknowledged that the visual improvements to the land would be neutralised to some extent due to the limited impact the existing mobile structure has on the street scene.

Overall, the proposed development would not harm the quality of the environment, nor would it have any significantly negative impacts on existing local residents. The proposal accords with ALP Policies D DM1 and QE SP1.

QUALITY OF ACCOMMODATION

ALP Policy D DM2 requires internal spaces to be an appropriate size to meet the requirements of all occupants and their changing needs. Nationally Described Space Standards provide the current guidance. A 3 bed-6 person dwelling should provide a minimum of 102sqm over two floors. The internal spaces for the proposed dwellings would significantly exceed the current standards. at approx. 150sqm. The development accords with ALP Policy D DM2.

There is ample garden space provided for future occupants which is both private and useful. This accords with Part H of the ADG.

The proposal accords with ALP policy D DM2 and Part H of the ADG.

TRAFFIC & ROAD SAFETY

ALP Policy T SP1 seeks to ensure development provides safe access on to the highway network; contributes to highway improvements (where appropriate) and promotes sustainable transport. Schemes should create safe and secure layouts for traffic, cyclists and pedestrians and provide appropriate levels of parking.

According to the requirements of the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD, January 2020), two parking spaces are required for a three-bed dwelling in Parking Behaviour Zone 1. This differs from West Sussex County Council's own parking generation calculations. Even when considering the higher level of parking demand that this scheme could generate, the narrow character of the road would prevent overspill parking on the highway.

In line with the Government's 'Road to Zero' strategy, which aims for at least 50% of new car sales to be ultra-low emission vehicles by 2035, electric vehicle (EV) charging points should be provided for all new homes. The submitted plans indicate two parking spaces per dwelling, which satisfies the requirements of the SPD. This parking area currently serves the mobile home, and the established access point, already used for other structures including dwellings, will be retained.

The SPD requires cycle storage provision for two bicycles per dwelling. As EV charging points and cycle storage have not been indicated on the submitted plans, details of these can be secured by condition.

West Sussex County Council Highways confirmed the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety, nor would it lead to 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network. Subject to conditions securing vehicular and cycle parking and EV charging provision, the proposal would accord with ALP Policy T SP1, the Arun Parking Standards SPD, and the NPPF.

ECOLOGY

ALP Policy ENV SP1 encourages and promotes the preservation, restoration and enhancement of biodiversity and the natural environment through the development process and particularly through policies for the protection of both designated and non-designated sites.

Although the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) did not initially identify it, the site lies within the 12km buffer zone for the Singleton and Cocking Tunnels Special Area of Conservation (SAC). This area is protected due to its functional linkage as feeding grounds for Barbastelle and Bechstein's bats. The PEA has subsequently acknowledged and discussed the potential impacts the proposal may have on these qualifying features.

The PEA identifies that the site lies within 7km of the Duncton to Bignor Escarpment SAC, which is designated for its deciduous woodland, scrub, and grassland habitats. As the development would not directly impact this site, no harm is identified to its qualifying features, and it is not considered further in this assessment.

The PEA has considered the potential presence of protected species including badgers, hazel dormice, reptiles, hedgehogs, amphibians, invertebrates, and birds. No evidence of these species or suitable habitat was found on site.

An Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations has been scoped out, given the absence of suitable habitat, the limited scale of the development, and the existing use of the land. The proposal is considered to accord with ALP Policy ENV SP1.

BIODIVERSITY

ALP Policy ENV DM5 requires that development schemes shall seek to achieve a net gain in biodiversity and protect habitats on site. This scheme has been identified as a self-build such that the statutory

requirements of the Environment Act 2021 do not apply.

The application is accompanied by a PEA where the opportunities for biodiversity enhancement have been suggested. It is noted that bat and swift boxes are proposed along with native landscaping. The Design and Access Statement indicated that hedgehog housing will be provided. However, simple modifications to the design such as small mammal holes in the close boarded fence have not been provided, and would be required with the inclusion of hedgehog homes. Given the rural location the biodiversity enhancements proposed by the applicant along with additions (small mammal holes) can be conditioned.

Subject to a condition securing mitigation measures set out in the PEA, the development is in accordance with ALP Policy ENV DM5.

FLOODING AND DRAINAGE

ALP Policy W SP1 states that development will be encouraged to make water efficiency measures, enhance the quality of the water environment and will be encouraged to make active use of surface water as a design feature where it can provide additional flood relief. Policy W DM1 states minor developments are unlikely to raise significant flood risk, due to the cumulative impact all development within The Lidsey Treatment Catchment area, must also be accompanied by a Drainage Impact Assessment. 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.

W NDP Policy VE7 states development should aim to reduce flood risk by; requiring surface water management measures including according with the drainage hierarchy providing groundwater monitoring and infiltration testing, and consideration should be given to the use of SuDS in development.

The NPPG (056), the SuDS Manual and the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (which the NPPG guides designers towards (057)) outlines the key principle of SuDS. This includes applying the drainage hierarchy, which prioritises discharge locations for surface water falling on site. These documents are clear, each priority location should be fully optimised to discharge surface water before moving on to the next priority location. Robust evidence is required to prove a discharge location is not feasible, cost, ease of discharging to a location or existing historic non-compliant connections are not appropriate justification. Where a designer is seeking not to utilise the upper most priority location; evidence should include groundwater monitoring and infiltration testing at the location and to the depth of infiltration feature.

The site lies in the Lidsey Wastewater Treatment Catchment Area. The site is in Flood Zone 1 (no future risk of this changing). The drainage strategy has not formally confirmed a discharge location for surface water and has only implied that an infiltration based design will be implemented. In principle this is acceptable, however without evidence showing infiltration is possible, it remains unproven.

Should infiltration not be possible the only option possible for the designer would be to discharge to a drainage ditch. There are two options close to the site, however the drainage would need to pass through third party land to connect. No evidence if this is acceptable to the landowners has been provided.

Should infiltration be proven unviable and connect to the watercourses not possible, there are no other options open to the designer. This could render the proposal unviable. If it was later proven infiltration was viable, the groundwater level and infiltration rate would dictate the size and requirements of SuDS. If infiltration was found to be slow and the groundwater high, then SuDS (including any easements required) may cover a large area of site, this could have an impact to the size and scale of development. As such it is not possible to approve a fixed layout without fully considering the SuDS design. To approve a fixed layout at this stage, could lead to an increase risk of flooding from site. This is in direct conflict with

paragraph 181, 182 and 187e of the NPPF which state flood risk should not be increased elsewhere.

ADC Drainage Engineers have objected for these reasons.

The proposal does not accord with the drainage hierarchy which conflicts with the relevant parts of the NPPG, The SuDS Manual and National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems, or policy VE7 of the WNDP. It cannot be ensured that SuDS will be included within a design, or that the design (if fixed by an approval) would be implementable. Finally, as it has not been evidence that flood risk will not increase elsewhere the proposal is contrary to paragraph 181, 182 and 187e of the NPPF and ALP Policies W SP1 and W DM3.

CLIMATE CHANGE

ALP Policy ECC SP2 relates to energy and climate change mitigates and states that development should utilise energy efficient measures that reflect current standards, use design and layout to promote energy efficiency and incorporate decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy supply systems in development.

Plans and the Design and Access Statement indicates that reductions in CO2 emissions over that prescribed by Part L will be achieved by:

- Provision of Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHP)
- Fabric first approach to reduced energy demand.
- Inclusion of 16 Solar panels.

These features could be controlled by condition and are acceptable and accord with ALP Policy ECC SP2.

SUMMARY

The site lies outside the Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB) and is designated as countryside under the ALP. While this location typically precludes residential development, the site does not exhibit the intrinsic character or beauty associated with open countryside, nor does it function as such, being already in residential use. Although the proposal conflicts with ALP Policy SD SP2, it does not undermine the aims of Policy C SP1.

The replacement of a mobile home with a purpose-built dwelling would result in a modest enhancement to residential amenity and energy efficiency. The development would achieve appropriate density in line with guidance and maintain the prevailing character of the area. It would not intensify land use and is considered acceptable in terms of scale, layout, and appearance, aligning with ALP Policy D DM1 and WNDP HP13. The dwelling would provide high-quality accommodation exceeding national space standards, with sufficient private garden space, and would not result in harm to neighbouring amenity. The proposal satisfies ALP Policies D DM2 and QE SP1. These benefits would be afforded modest weight for the proposal.

In terms of transport, the scheme provides compliant parking provision and retains an existing access point. Although EV charging and cycle storage are not shown, these can be secured by condition and the proposal accords with ALP Policy T SP1. Ecological impacts have been assessed, and no harm is identified to designated sites or protected species. Biodiversity enhancements are proposed and can be secured by condition, ensuring compliance with ALP Policies ENV SP1 and ENV DM5. These benefits would be afforded neutral weight.

However, significant concerns arise regarding flood risk and drainage. The submitted strategy fails to demonstrate compliance with the drainage hierarchy or confirm a viable discharge location. Without evidence of infiltration testing or landowner consent for alternative discharge routes, the proposal risks

being unimplementable. This conflicts with ALP policies W SP1, W DM3, and VE7 of the WNP, and paragraphs 181, 182, and 187(e) of the NPPF.

Paragraph 11(d)(ii) applies. While the proposal would deliver a replacement dwelling, it does not contribute to housing numbers and therefore carries neutral weight in the planning balance. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF applies, and given the conflict with WNDP Policy VE7, the adverse impacts would therefore significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The application should therefore be refused.

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 (dependent on any exemptions or relief that may apply).

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

- 1 The proposal has not provided a drainage strategy, or satisfactorily demonstrated that on-site infiltration is viable as a location to sustainably discharge surface water. As a result, it is not possible to determine whether surface water runoff would be discharged in accordance with the SuDS hierarchy resulting in a proposal which could be unviable. It does not deliver multifunctional benefits, such as enhancements to biodiversity or amenity. Overall, it has not been demonstrated that the risk of surface water flooding would not increase on site or elsewhere which could lead to significant environmental and social harm. The proposal conflicts with Arun Local Plan policies W DM3, W SP1, Policy VE7 of the Walberton Neighbourhood Plan and relevant paragraphs of the NPPF and NPPG.

- 2 **INFORMATIVE:** Statement pursuant to Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern and discussing those with the Applicant. It has not been possible to resolve those matters within the timescale allocated for the determination of this application. The Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, in its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified in the reasons for refusal - which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.