



Agenda Update Sheet

Planning Committee

Date: 28th November 2019

ITEM 6

Application DM/19/3123

P18 Drainage Engineer Consultation Comments

SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE

A Drainage Statement and Maintenance and Management Plan Report completed in August 2019 have been submitted in support of the application. This statement has been produced to support a previous application's reserve matters stage. The current application is for a greater number of properties than the drainage statement allows for and as such does not directly correlate with the application. However, the principle of the surface water drainage scheme on site can be understood from this report.

It is proposed that surface water would be attenuated within buried attenuation tanks across the development beneath areas of public realm such as car parking. Surface water would then discharge into the watercourse south of the site from a single outfall. The combined discharge rate is shown to be 4.3l/s up to the 1 in 100 year storm event with an additional 40% allowance for climate change.

The landowner south of the site has provided evidence that they would allow the site to lay drainage across the land to reach the watercourse.

The principle of the proposed surface water drainage method is acceptable, although further details and confirmations will be required as part of a drainage condition.

FOUL WATER DRAINAGE

A Drainage Statement and Maintenance and Management Plan Report completed in August 2019 have been submitted in support of the application. This statement has been produced to support a previous application's reserve matters stage. The current application is for a greater number of properties than the drainage statement allows for and as such does not directly correlate with the application. However, the principle of the foul water drainage scheme on site can be understood from this report.

It is proposed that foul water drainage shall flow via gravity to a pumping station to the south of the site. A new rising main is then proposed to convey flows south east before connecting to an existing Southern Water pumping station. The proposed new rising main will cross the watercourse, which at this location is considered to be Main River.

It is unknown whether third parties would allow a new foul water rising main to cross the Main River. However the principle of the proposed foul water drainage is acceptable, although further details and confirmations will be required as part of the drainage conditions.

FLOOD RISK

The proposed development is located within flood zone 1 and would be considered to be at low fluvial flood risk. However, the site is located in close proximity to the watercourse and areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3, at medium and high risk respectively.

The proposed development is located within an area of very low surface water flood risk. However, an area of increased surface water flood risk is located adjacent to the watercourse and is located in proximity to the site.

There are not any historic records of flooding occurring on this site and in this area. This does not mean that flooding has never occurred here, instead, that flooding has just never been reported.

SUGGESTED CONDITIONS

For the principle of foul water drainage:

“The development hereby permitted shall not commence unless and until the proposed means of foul water drainage has been submitted too and approved in principle by the Environment Agency and West Sussex Highways. Details should include the means of crossing the Main River to allow connection to the existing public foul water sewer system.”

For surface water we could modify the C18F multiple dwellings wording:

“The development hereby permitted shall not commence unless and until details of the proposed surface water drainage and means of disposal have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No building shall be occupied until all the approved surface water drainage works have been carried out in accordance with the approved details. The details shall include a timetable for its implementation and a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime. Maintenance and management during the lifetime of the development should be in accordance with the approved details.”

For the foul water we could also modify the C18F multiple dwelling wording:

“The development hereby permitted shall not commence unless and until details of the proposed foul water drainage and means of disposal have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and local sewerage provider. No building shall be occupied until all the approved foul water drainage works have been carried out in accordance with the approved details. The details shall include a timetable for its implementation and a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime. Maintenance and management during the lifetime of the development should be in accordance with the approved details.”

P18 Urban Designer Consultation Comments

Summary and Overall Assessment

The layout works well with the proposed buildings fronting the attractive tree-lined boundaries on the east and west side as well as the green corridor/escarpment to the south. It is nevertheless unfortunate the open space to the south, which featured in the outline consent, has been omitted as a large proportion of the dwellings are flats although most of them at least benefit from balconies or patio spaces. The further revised drawings have sufficiently addressed my concerns over the design of the blocks of flats. In particular, the three storey part of block A now feature a set-back zinc clad top/second floor; this generates a greater level of articulation providing the necessary visual interest in this prominent façade at the site entrance. Overall the street elevations in particular can now be commended for their contemporary approach that benefits from architectural integrity and order. For this reason I withdraw my objection to the planning application. I would nevertheless recommend conditions requiring the approval drawings / material in respect of the following:

- Hard and soft landscaping including boundary treatment and pergola design.
- Facing materials
- A 1:20 scale section and elevation (vignette) of block A's three storey façade.

Layout

The layout is loosely based on the illustrated outline arrangement (DM/17/3034) with the access road running adjacent to the south, east and west boundaries of the site. This provides for a perimeter block arrangement that gives the building frontages a positive relationship with the boundaries that face Cuckfield Road as well as the attractive tree-belts on the east and west side and the escarpment/open space/green corridor to the south. Unfortunately most of the latter is now excluded from the red line boundary and consequently there is little public open space provision which is a deficiency especially given the high proportion of flats without a private garden. However most of the flats benefit from balconies or patios with a small communal garden associated with block A.

The scheme requires the removal of a significant number of trees, and more than envisaged at the outline stage. I defer to Irene Fletcher / Sarah Nelson's response to this. However, I understand that the additional loss is because most of the trees along the escarpment now need to be removed to underpin the access road and facilitate drainage. Furthermore, the layout can be commended for the positive changes that have been made since the previous withdrawn application that have resulted from: (i) pulling the buildings away from the southern boundary; (ii) permitting a consistent green-edged boundary while retaining the well-established and attractive Blue Cedar (by setting back plot 27) and more satisfactorily safeguarding the existing trees on the Cuckfield Road frontage.

The provision of a 2 metre wide link to the Northern Arc development is welcomed and when the latter is completed, it should provide access to the open space and neighbourhood centre facilities that compensate to some extent for the lack of provision within the site.

The revised drawings include the following additional layout improvements to the original application submission:

- The parking area in front of plot 39/40 are now articulated with pergola-type structure in place of garages, that has a less imposing relationship with the adjacent building frontages.
- The rear alleys serving the houses have been designed-out by giving them all a semi-detached configuration that permits narrower gaps between them facilitating more direct access to the rear gardens.
- The threshold areas / defensible spaces, serving block B, have been marginally extended and softened through landscaping that has been facilitated by the removal of an unnecessary pathway to the south and re-positioning the parking to the north.
- The ground floor flats on block C now benefit from dedicated rear gardens that also secure their privacy (previously shown as communal).

Section drawings have been provided that show the relationship of the building frontages, retained trees and new access road in relation to the escarpment. The sections show a natural slope that (I assume) disguises the retaining measures within it.

As the access road is nearly all shared space, it should signal this in terms of the surface treatment by extending the block paving in place of tarmac.

Elevations

As well as the latest changes to block A, the revised drawings also incorporate the following improvements:

- The frontages of the houses now have more order and rhythm generated from their consistent gaps and articulation.
- Blocks B and C are better ordered and the fenestration has been organised so that it reinforces the natural symmetry of block C's south and west elevations and creates a more open façade on block B's east elevation.
- The brick detailing on blocks A-C benefits from being more consistently applied as a grouping material for the lower floor windows. With the omission of the first floor brick banding, this appropriately allows the vertical articulation to dominate.
- The south elevation of block B better integrated balconies.
- The re-positioning of the rainwater downpipes from the front to the rear also provides a less cluttered appearance on blocks B and C.

P20 Delete the paragraph that begins ‘In terms of planning policy...’ and replace with ‘The site lies within the built up area as defined in the DP. This is because the built up area boundary in the DP has been drawn to include the land proposed for strategic development to the north and west of Burgess Hill, commonly referred to as the Northern Arc. Accordingly the principle of development on the site accords with policy DP6 of the DP.’

P44 Amend the first sentence in condition 4 to read ‘No development above ground level shall be carried out unless and until samples/a schedule of materials and finishes to be used for external walls / roofs / fenestration of the proposed dwellings have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.’

P44 Amend the first sentence in condition 4 to read ‘No development above ground level shall be carried out unless and until details of the materials for the access roads, parking areas and footpaths have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.’

Add an additional pre commencement condition to read ‘No development shall take place until an updated Ecological Assessment Report (prepared in accordance with Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management guidelines and including the appropriate mitigation measures), a Construction Environmental Management Plan and Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (prepared in accordance with BS42020:2013 Biodiversity-- Code of Practice for Planning and Development) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To safeguard the ecology of the area, and in the interests of bats to ensure that a habitat remains for them during and after development and to accord with Policy DP38 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014 – 2031.

Add an additional post construction condition to read ‘The proposed windows on the first floor of the north elevation of Block A shall be glazed with obscured glass. They shall be non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7m above the floor of the room in which the window is installed.

Reason: To protect the amenities and privacy of the adjoining property and to accord with Policy DP26 of the District Plan 2014 – 2031.

ITEM 7

Application DM/19/3969

P.67 BURGESS HILL TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS

OBSERVATIONS: Recommend Refusal

The application contradicted Neighbourhood Plan policies H2 and H3. It was a backyard development. It contradicted District Plan policy DP26. There were issues with surface water run-off, narrow access, the design and materials were out of keeping with the area, and there were no garden facilities. A 4 bedroom house was overdevelopment of the site.