

Addendum Planning Statement to accompany Planning Application Y/12/15 for

4 New dwellings & Associated Landscaping

At
The Old Coal Yard
North End Road
Yapton
West Sussex
BN18 0DN



This addendum to the original planning statement has been provided to help the local authority analyse the planning application for the construction of 4 dwellings on the site. In particular this addendum addresses the shift in emphasis that arises from a recent appeal decision which found that Arun DC does not have a five year supply of housing.

Stephen Jupp, MRTPI, Chartered Town Planner, February 2015

ADDENDUM

As made clear on the cover sheet, this addendum to the original planning statement has been provided to help the local authority analyse the planning application for the construction of 4 dwellings on the site. In particular this addendum addresses the shift in emphasis that arises from a recent appeal decision which found that Arun DC does not have a five year supply of housing.

The relevant appeal decision letter is dated 23rd February 2015 and relates to Land at Nyton Road and Northfields Lane, Westergate [planning application AL/61/13 refers]. A copy of this decision letter is attached.

In paragraph 6 of the decision letter that inspector states:

“Following the closure of the inquiry the Appellant forwarded a copy of the Housing Land Supply Statement of Common Ground submitted at a recent inquiry in respect of land West of Westergate Street, East of Hook Lane, Westergate (Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/A/14/2220943). The Council’s position in relation to housing land supply at the Hook Lane inquiry differed considerably by comparison with this appeal. The most significant differences relate to the extent of the housing requirement, whether there had been a persistent record of under-delivery (and therefore whether a 5% or 20% buffer should apply for the purposes of paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework), and whether the Council is able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply.”

Housing Land Supply is dealt with in paragraphs 51 to 97 of the decision letter with the Inspectors conclusions being in paragraphs 96 and 97 which I quote in full below:

“96. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that the relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

97. I conclude the Council’s assessment of the supply of deliverable housing sites to be reasonably robust. On the basis of the evidence before me I have found that the Council has a supply of deliverable sites, sufficient to provide 3326 dwellings over the next five years. This is inadequate to meet the five year housing requirement for 3566 dwellings. Taking account of the 20% buffer required by the NPPF, there would be a shortfall of 881 dwellings. The appeal proposal would go some way to meeting this shortfall and this consideration weighs in favour of the proposal.”

[Addendum to Planning Statement]

[The Old Coal Yard, Yapton]

Assessment of Scheme Against Framework, in Light of Absence of 5 Year Housing Supply

From the above findings it is clear that all planning policies pertaining to the supply of housing must be considered out-of-date [Framework, para 49].

The NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It advises that sustainable development should be seen as the golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.

I set out in some detail in the Planning Statement why it is considered that the proposed development constitutes sustainable development, and those findings remain pertinent.

It is clear that in this case the proposal satisfies the three dimensions of sustainable development and therefore the provisions of paragraph 14 apply, namely that there is a presumption of granting planning permission.

Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that where the development plan is absent, silent, or the relevant policies are out of date, permission should be granted for development, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies within the Framework as a whole, or specific policies within it that indicate that development should be restricted.

For the purposes of this application, those are the tests that the decision maker must apply.

I am aware that the case officer has raised some concern with the layout and siting of the proposed dwellings. I consider that the submitted artist's impression makes clear that the development will be of a high quality and will enhance the character and appearance of the locality. A stepped frontage is in keeping with the characteristics of this part of the streetscene.

Frontage and roadside parking is a characteristic of the locality. If there is actual concern with the visual impact of the parking areas then the proposed roadside hedgerow, sited behind the visibility splays, would largely screen the parking area after a couple of years.

Regardless of these factors I do not consider that any possible concerns could be of such magnitude that they could significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of providing additional housing in the District.

Planning permission should therefore be granted.

[Addendum to Planning Statement]

[The Old Coal Yard, Yapton]