

REFERENCE NO: CR/2020/0589/OUT

LOCATION: [CAR PARK, STATION WAY, NORTHGATE, CRAWLEY](#)
WARD: Three Bridges
PROPOSAL: OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF CAR PARK TO FORM MIXED USE RESIDENTIAL WITH INDICATIVE 15 UNITS AND COMMERCIAL SCHEME

TARGET DECISION DATE: 22 January 2021

CASE OFFICER: Mr H. Walke

APPLICANTS NAME: Simco Homes Ltd
AGENTS NAME: Urbana Town Planning Limited

PLANS & DRAWINGS CONSIDERED:

Drawing Number	Revision	Drawing Title
Utp 316		Block Plan
Utp 316		Site Location Plan
TL-4155-20-5		Proposed Site Plan
TL-4155-20-1	A	Proposed Ground & First Floor Plan
TL-4155-20-2		Proposed Second, Third & Fourth Floor Plan
TL-4155-20-3	A	Proposed North & South Elevations
TL-4155-20-4		Proposed North & Side Elevations
TL-4155-20-6		Proposed Construction Details & Sections

CONSULTEE NOTIFICATIONS & RESPONSES:-

- | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 1. | GAL Aerodrome Safeguarding | No objection subject to condition |
| 2. | Network Rail | Comments provided |
| 3. | WSCC Highways | Objection and comments provided |
| 4. | National Air Traffic Services (NATS) | No safeguarding objection |
| 5. | CBC Housing Enabling & Development Manager | Objection |
| 6. | CBC Contaminated Land | No objection subject to condition |
| 7. | CBC Environmental Health | Objection on noise grounds |
| 8. | CBC Refuse & Recycling Team | Comments provided |
| 9. | CBC Energy Efficiency & Sustainability | No response received |
| 10. | CBC Retail & Employment | Comments provided |
| 11. | Archaeology Officer | Comments provided and condition recommended |
| 12. | CBC Countryside & Open Space | Comments provided |
| 13. | CBC Economic Development | No response received |
| 14. | Thames Water | Comments provided |
| 15. | Heritage Consultant | Awaiting comments |

NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS:-

The application was publicised by a press notice (expiry date 25/11/20) and site notices (expiry date 24/11/20).

RESPONSES RECEIVED:-

A total of five objections have been received. Two are from residents, one from Arora Management Services and two from councillors.

The residents' objections state that provision of fifteen flats without any car parking is unacceptable. They query where residents will park and state that the surrounding roads are already congested. The area would become more dangerous in traffic terms. One letter queries why Crawley needs these new flats and where residents will come from, when the airport will not be back to capacity for years and when shops and other businesses are closing. It states that the flats will be buy to rent, occupied by people on benefits.

Cllr Peter Lamb objects to the proposal. He states that it offers no affordable and low cost housing or a commuted sum towards affordable housing or infrastructure. Drainage has not been dealt with. No car parking is proposed in an area where on street parking is controlled and availability limited. Nearby developments have made better off-street parking provision.

Cllr Morgan Flack also objects to the application. She states that there is no affordable housing provision in this area of needs. She also shares residents' concerns about the lack of parking in an area of high demand for spaces on street. This may particularly affect disabled people or people accessing services not served by the train station.

Arora are the developers who gained outline planning permission for the Overline House/Station Gateway site immediately to the east of the current application site. They object to the proposal for a number of reasons. They state that the lack of parking or disabled parking is unacceptable for this major residential development. There is no servicing space and the loading bay would force pedestrians to walk into the road when it is occupied by a large vehicle. The plans do not demonstrate that the bay could accommodate a larger refuse vehicle. Vehicles could block the pavement or the single lane leading to the level crossing, which could exacerbate delays. The ground floor residential units would be too close to the narrow pavement and busy road at the front and close to the railway line at the rear, creating uncomfortable living conditions. The south elevation looks onto the proposed communal garden for the Station Gateway development, where a fence or screen planting is likely for privacy and security. No Design and Access Statement has been provided, which is a legal requirement. The building would be far closer to Station Way than the planned Station Gateway scheme, which would be diminished by the poor quality of the proposal. It would be poorly aligned, excessively narrow and awkward. It would appear as a contrived awkwardly located scheme. The elevations are flat with no relief other than the balconies and there is no landscaping. The scheme lacks visual interest and is of poor quality. It does not step down from the Station Gateway proposals to reflect a transition down to the heritage assets of the conservation area, listed signal box and locally listed building. A standalone isolated building of this type is not the optimum way to develop this type of site. A comprehensive approach is needed coordinated with the Station Gateway scheme. There is no construction management plan showing how the site could be developed. Arora do not see scope to share their site and construction space with this proposal.

REASON FOR REPORTING TO COMMITTEE:-

The application is for 'major' development.

THE APPLICATION SITE:-

- 1.1 The application site contains a surface car park providing eleven car parking spaces. The site lies on the junction of High Street and Station Way. The existing vehicular access is at the western of the site, close to the High Street junction, and the exit is at the eastern end of the site. To the west, across the High Street, is the Taj Mahal restaurant. The application site's use has been to serve as a car park serving the restaurant. It has an area of 0.05 hectares.
- 1.2 Station Way is one way at this point, with three westbound lanes. There are traffic lights, a pedestrian crossing and traffic island to the north of the application site. The southern vehicular lane on Station Way provides access southwards along the High Street to the level crossing and then onwards to Brighton Road. The two northern vehicular lanes turn northwards up the High Street and lead onto other parts of the town centre. There is also a cycle lane in the middle of Station Way, which provides access to advanced stop lines for travel in both directions at the High Street junction.

- 1.3 To the south of the site is the Crawley to Horsham railway line, with a Network Rail owned strip of land between application site and the railway line itself. This Network Rail land contains a telecommunications mast. The Taj Mahal restaurant and the service yard for Asda supermarket lie to the west. There are commercial premises and flats to the north across Station Way.
- 1.4 The railway signal box to the south west is a Grade II listed building and the Brighton Road conservation area lies to the south of the railway line. The application site lies within an Archaeological Notification Area based upon the settlement of Medieval Crawley.
- 1.5 The site is within a defined railway buffer area that extends 10m from the railway land along the length of the line. The site is shown on Council records as being potentially contaminated. The site lies within the Local Plan's Town Centre boundary and within a Priority Area for a District Energy Network. It also lies within the Long Distance View Splay from Tilgate Park.

THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:-

- 2.1 Outline planning permission is sought for redevelopment of the site to form a mixed use residential and commercial scheme. Access, appearance, layout and scale are to be approved at this stage, with only landscaping reserved for future consideration.
- 2.2 The building would contain 15 flats (11 one bed and 4 two bed) within a five storey building at its eastern end, dropping to four, then three, then single storey towards the level crossing. The ground floor would contain 95.3 square metres of commercial (Class E) floorspace. No vehicle parking is proposed on site, with a single, shared surface loading bay shown on the public highway to the north. The proposed building almost entirely covers the site. The submitted drawings misleadingly show the land to the south as a 'Proposed Landscaped Area.' This land is not within the applicant's control, it is owned by Network Rail and part of the adjoining Station Gateway development. Residents of the proposed development subject of the current application would have no access to this land.
- 2.3 In support of the application, the applicant has submitted the following documents:
- Planning Statement
 - Built Heritage Statement
 - Archaeological Report
 - Sustainability and Energy Statement
 - Arboricultural Report
 - Transport Statement
 - Delivery and Servicing Plan
 - Contaminated Land Assessment
 - Viability Assessment
 - Air Quality Assessment
 - Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment

PLANNING HISTORY:-

- 3.1 There is little planning history on the site, with the following two applications being the only recent ones:
- **CR/2017/0593/FUL** – Installation of mobile hot food takeaway van. Two year temporary permission granted 1 September 2019.
 - **CR/2014/0739/FUL** – Installation of a self-contained coffee outlet based within a converted 6m ISO shipping container. Two year temporary permission granted 29 January 2015.
- 3.2 The adjoining Overline House/Station Gateway site to the east has the following relevant planning history:
- **CR/2019/0602/ARM** – Approval of reserved matters pursuant to CR/2016/0294/OUT for residential led mixed use redevelopment (multi deck car park removed from scheme). Current undetermined application.

- **CR/2016/0294/OUT** – Outline application (All matters reserved) for demolition of existing office building and integrated railway station building, footbridges and ancillary structures. Erection of 308 studio, 1, 2 and 3 bedroom residential apartments and associated parking (C3 use class); integrated railway station building, footbridges and ancillary structures; flexible use retail/coffee shop/business centre (A1/A3/B1 use classes); 120 space multi-deck station car park, vehicle drop-off lay-by and associated highway works and public realm enhancements. Approved following completion of S106 agreement 16 August 2016.

PLANNING POLICY:-

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019 as amended in June 2019)

- 4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Paragraph 8 states that achieving sustainable development means the planning system has three overarching objectives which are interdependent and need to be secured in mutually supportive ways. These are economic, social and environmental.
- 4.2 Section 4 – ‘Decision Making’ states that Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. It also recommends that applicants should take advantage of pre-application discussions. Paragraph 47 confirms the statutory requirement for decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan and as quickly as possible. Local Planning Authorities should consider whether development can be made acceptable through conditions or obligations. Paragraph 57 states that where up-to-date policies have set out the contribution expected from development, planning applications that comply with them should be assumed to be viable. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage. All viability assessments should be made publicly available.
- 4.3 Section 5 – ‘Delivering a sufficient supply of homes’ emphasises the need to boost housing supply and for the planning system to deliver a sufficient supply of homes, including affordable housing, and the need for LPAs to maintain and monitor the supply of housing against its housing requirement. Paragraph 62 states that, where a need for affordable housing is identified, policies should specify the type required and expect it to be met on-site unless alternative contributions can be robustly justified or an agreed approach creates mixed and balance communities. Paragraph 64 states that where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10% of the homes to be available for affordable home ownership unless this would exceed the level of affordable housing required in the area, or significantly prejudice the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups. Exemptions to this 10% requirement should also be made where the site or proposed development:
- a) provides solely for Build to Rent homes;
 - b) provides specialist accommodation for a group of people with specific needs (such as purpose-built accommodation for the elderly or students);
 - c) is proposed to be developed by people who wish to build or commission their own homes; or
 - d) is exclusively for affordable housing, an entry-level exception site or a rural exception site.
- 4.4 Section 6 – ‘Building a strong, competitive economy’ states that planning decisions should allow businesses to invest, expand and grow. Section 7 – Ensuring the vitality of town centres highlights the role that town centres play at the heart of communities.
- 4.5 Section 8 – ‘Promoting healthy and safe communities’ seeks to ensure planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which promote social interaction, are safe and accessible so that crime and disorder and fear of crime do not undermine quality of life and enable and support healthy lifestyles. Planning policies and decisions should promote public safety and take into account wider security (and defence) requirements.
- 4.6 Section 9 – ‘Promoting sustainable transport’ sets out transport considerations for new development including potential impacts on the existing transport network/s, opportunities for sustainable modes of transport and the need to focus development in sustainable locations. Paragraph 110 states that applications for development should give priority first to pedestrian, cycle and public transport

movements, address the need of people with disabilities in relation to all transport, create safe, secure and attractive places avoiding conflict between different transport users, allow for efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles and be designed to enable charging of plug-in vehicles.

- 4.7 Section 11 – ‘Making effective use of land’ states in paragraph 117 that *“Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.”* The redevelopment of underutilised land and buildings is encouraged, and LPA’s should take a positive approach to alternative uses of currently developed land which is not allocated for a specific purpose to meet identified development needs. Paragraphs 122 and 123 seek to ensure efficient use though achieving appropriate densities on each site.
- 4.8 Section 12 - ‘Well designed places’ states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that the planning and development process should achieve the creation of high-quality buildings and places. Paragraph 127 states:
“Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:
a) *will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
b) *are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;*
c) *are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);*
d) *establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;*
e) *optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and*
f) *create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users, and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.”*
- 4.9 Section 15 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment. Paragraph 180 states that planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life.

Crawley Borough Local Plan (2015-2030) (adopted December 2015)

- 4.10 The Development Plan for Crawley is the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015–2030 (adopted December 2015). The following Local Plan policies are relevant to this application:
- Policy SD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. This overarching policy states that there will be a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Development will be supported when it complements Crawley’s character as a compact town within a countryside setting, developed on a neighbourhood principle and maximises the use of sustainable travel. Development will be supported where it respects the heritage of the borough and protects, enhances and creates opportunities for Crawley’s unique green infrastructure and accords with other policies and objectives unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
 - Policy CH2: Principles of Good Urban Design seeks to assist in the creation, retention or enhancement of successful places. In particular development proposals will be required to:
“(a) respond to and reinforce locally distinctive patterns of development and landscape character and to protect and/or enhance heritage assets,
(b) create continuous frontages onto streets and spaces enclosed by development which clearly defines private and public areas,

(c) create public spaces and routes that are attractive, safe, uncluttered and which work effectively for all in society including disabled and elderly people,
 (d) make places that connect with each other and are easy to move through,
 (e) provide recognisable routes, intersections and landmarks to help people find their way around,
 (f) consider flexible development forms that can respond to changing social, technological and economic conditions,
 (g) provide diversity and choice through a mix of compatible development and uses that work together to create viable places that respond to local needs”.

- Policy CH3: Normal Requirements of All New Development states all proposals for development will be required to make a positive contribution to the area; be of a high quality urban design; provide and retain a good standard of amenity for all nearby and future occupants of land and buildings; be able to meet its own operational requirements necessary for the safe and proper use of the site; retain existing individual or groups of trees; incorporate “Secure by Design” principles and demonstrate how the Building for Life 12 criteria would be delivered. Development proposals must adhere to any relevant supplementary planning guidance produced by the council.
- Policy CH4: Comprehensive Development and Efficient Use of Land. Development proposals must use land efficiently and not unduly restrict the development potential of adjoining land, nor prejudice the proper planning and phasing of development over a wider area.
- Policy CH5: Standards for all New Dwellings states that new dwellings must create a safe, comfortable and sustainable living environment and sets out minimum sizes for each dwelling, based on the Nationally Described Space Standards, and be capable of adaption through meeting Building Regulations Part M Category 2. Residential developments should be designed to include amenity space standards adequate to meet basic privacy, amenity and usability requirements.
- Policy CH6: Tree Planting and Replacement Standards. Landscape proposals for residential development should contribute to the character and appearance of the town by including at least one new tree for each new dwelling, of an appropriate species and planted in an appropriate location. If on-site provision is not feasible or desirable, commuted sums will be sought in lieu.
- Policy CH8: Important views requires that the important views identified on the Local Plan Map should be protected and/or enhanced and development proposals should not result in a direct adverse impact or lead to the erosion of these views. The site is within the Long Distance View Splay from Tilgate Park.
- Policy CH12: Heritage assets states that all development should ensure that Crawley’s designated and non-designated heritage assets are treated as a finite resource, and that their key features or significance are not lost as a result of development.
- Policy CH13: Conservation Areas states all development within a conservation area should individually or cumulatively result in the preservation or enhancement of the character and appearance of the area. A Heritage Impact Assessment should be submitted in support of proposals. The policy also states that there may be structures within conservation areas that do not contribute positively, for which a case for demolition will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- Policy CH15: Listed Buildings and Structures requires works to listed buildings to be consistent with their character, appearance and heritage value. A Heritage Impact Assessment should be submitted to demonstrate how listed buildings will be protected.
- Policy EC1: Sustainable Economic Growth. Crawley’s role as the key economic driver for the Gatwick Diamond will be protected and enhanced. To ensure that Crawley’s recognised economic role and function is maintained and enhanced the council will: i) Build upon and protect the established role of Manor Royal as the key business location (B Use Classes) for Crawley at the heart of the Gatwick Diamond; and ii) Ensure that the town’s Main Employment Areas are the focus for sustainable economic growth.
- Policy EC4: Employment Development and Residential Amenity seeks to ensure that residential development within Main Employment Areas does not constrain the economic function of the area.
- Policy EC6: Development Sites within the Town Centre Boundary states that sites within the Town Centre boundary provide an important opportunity to promote town centre viability in a sustainable location through mixed use development that meets the economic and housing needs of the borough.

- Policy EC7 (Retail and Leisure Development outside the Primary Shopping Area) sets out the approach, taking the NPPF Town Centre First principle, by which edge or out-of-centre proposals will be assessed.
- Policy H1: Housing Provision. The council will positively consider proposals for the provision of housing to meet local housing need ensuring against town-cramming or unacceptable impact on the planned character or neighbourhoods or residential amenity.
- Policy H2: Key Housing Sites. This policy encourages residential uses in the town centre, identifying the area as a broad location for housing.
- Policy H3: Future Housing Mix. All housing development should provide a mix of dwelling types and sizes to address the nature of local housing needs and market demand. The appropriate mix of house types and sizes for each site will depend upon the size and characteristics of the site and the viability of the scheme. However, consideration should be given to the evidence established in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and its updates for market housing needs and demand in Crawley.
- Policy H4: Affordable and Low Cost Housing. 40% affordable housing will be required from all residential developments. In addition to the provision of 40% affordable housing, approximately 10% low cost housing will be sought on developments proposing 15 dwellings or more, offering up to 10% discount to first-time buyers.
- Policy ENV2: Biodiversity All development proposals will be expected to incorporate features to encourage biodiversity where appropriate.
- Policy ENV5: Provision of Open Space and Recreational Facilities. The impact of the increased population from residential development on open space and recreational facilities across the Borough will be mitigated by the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy which will be used to enhance existing areas of open space. This policy requires development to make provision for open space and recreational facilities.
- Policy ENV6: Sustainable Design and Construction. In order to maximise carbon efficiency, all homes will be required to meet the strengthened on-site energy performance standards of Building Regulations and any subsequent increased requirements along with the water efficiency standards.
- Policy ENV7: District Energy Networks requires that any major development proposal should demonstrate whether it can connect to an existing DEN network where available, and if not available how it may develop its own system, or how it may include site-wide communal energy systems, or be 'network ready' to connect to a DEN on construction or at some point after construction, all subject to technical or financial viability.
- Policy ENV8: Development and Flood Risk. Development proposals must avoid areas which are exposed to an unacceptable risk from flooding, and must not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.
- Policy ENV9: Tackling Water Stress. New dwellings should where viable and technically feasible, meet the Building Regulations' optional requirement for tighter water efficiency.
- Policy ENV10: Pollution Management and Land Contamination. Where a site is known or suspected to be at risk from contaminants or materials that present a hazard to health, information must be provided detailing the methodology through which risks will be addressed, and ensuring the treatment and/or removal of all such contaminants and materials prior to the commencement of development.
- Policy ENV11: Development and Noise advises that residential and other noise sensitive development will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that users of the development will not be exposed to unacceptable noise disturbance from existing or future uses. To achieve this, this policy should be read in conjunction with the Local Plan Noise Annex.
- Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision. Development will be permitted where it is supported by the necessary infrastructure both on and off site and if mitigation can be provided to avoid any significant cumulative effects on the existing infrastructure services. The council will seek to implement a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) through the relevant processes. The rate will be set following the adoption of the Charging Schedule.
- Policy IN2: Strategic Delivery of Telecommunications Infrastructure states that all proposals for residential, employment and commercial development of one unit or more must be designed to be connected to high quality communications infrastructure to ensure that fibre optic or other cabling does not need to be retrofitted.
- Policy IN3: Development and Requirements for Sustainable Transport. Development should be concentrated in locations where sustainable travel patterns can be achieved through the use of

the existing transport network, including public transport routes and the cycling and walking network. Developments should meet the access needs they generate and not cause an unacceptable impact in terms of increased traffic congestion or highway safety.

- Policy IN4: Car and Cycle Parking Standards. Development will be permitted where the proposals provide the appropriate amount of car and cycle parking to meet its needs when it is assessed against the Borough Council's car and cycle parking standards. Car parking standards for residential development are based on the accessibility of the area, the levels of car ownership, and the size of any new dwellings.

Emerging Crawley Borough Local Plan 2020 – 2035 (January 2020)

4.11 The Local Plan Review 2020-2035 has been published for Regulation 19 consultation and therefore limited weight should be given to the following applicable policies:

- Policy SD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy CL1: Neighbourhood Principle
- Policy CL2: Making Successful Places: Principles of Good Urban Design
- Policy CL3: Local Character and Form of New Development
- Policy CL4: Effective Use of Land: Sustainability, Movement and Layout
- Policy CL5: Form of New Development – Layout, Scale and Appearance
- Policy DD1: Normal Requirements of All New Development
- Policy DD4: Tree and Landscape Character Planting
- Policy DD5: Tree Replacement Standards
- Policy IN1: Infrastructure Provision
- Policy IN3: Supporting High Quality Communications
- Policy H1: Housing Provision
- Policy H4: Future Housing Mix
- Policy H5: Affordable Housing
- Policy SDC1: Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy SDC2: District Energy Networks
- Policy ST1: Development and Requirements for Sustainable Transport
- Policy ST2: Car and Cycle Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Documents

4.12 The following Supplementary Planning Documents are non-statutory documents supplementing the policies of the Local Plan and are applicable to this application:

Urban Design SPD 2016

- 4.13 This SPD includes further guidance, examples and explanation of the principles of good urban design and public realm design.
- 4.14 In relation to massing and materials it advises that buildings within the urban realm should work harmoniously and complement each other and that “*All new elements within the urban realm should consider the scale and materiality within their immediate context, as well as the overall character of their setting*”. The document explains that building heights in Crawley have been dictated by the history of the town and new development should show consideration to the scale and massing of its immediate surroundings. Proposals should consider existing and important views, relationship to human scale, possible wind tunnels, overshadowing and existing trees/hedges.
- 4.15 The SPD states that developments should consider how the immediate space around them may be occupied/developed in the future and accommodate any potential development.
- 4.16 The SPD includes minimum rear window to window distances (21 metres for two storeys and 30 metres for three storeys or more), the minimum distance between a blank gable and rear of an adjacent building and outdoor amenity space standards.

- 4.17 In respect of multi-dwelling residential development (flats) the SPD seeks a *minimum of 5sqm of private outdoor space, where the smallest dimension is not less than 1500mm, is provided for 1 to 2 person flats plus an extra 1sqm for each additional occupant. For apartments and flats, a useable private space should also be provided for residents. While balconies provide a good solution, they may not be appropriate in all contexts and a semi-private outdoor, communal space may be suitable*. Guidance is given on the shape, orientation, privacy, layout and position of amenity space provision. Detailed advice is provided to ensure that flatted developments are integrated into the community. The SPD states *“Elements of the design, such as entrances, public and private spaces and routes through should be clear and easy to navigate. The scale, massing and form of the development should relate to the surrounding area. The openings on the façades should reflect the local vernacular in proportions and a balance should be achieved between solid walls and window/door apertures. The roof design should be considered during the initial design stage and not left to the end to be resolved. Details and decorations are encouraged in residential developments, as they will create more character and visual interest. The materials used can often help with creating such details and decorations with little other effort – for example, a change in material within the elevation can help break up the mass of a building. Flatted developments, in particular those with multiple buildings, should endeavour to provide visual interest through a variation in the elevational treatment. Parking provisions should meet the recommendations set in Annex 1.”*
- 4.18 It also includes the Crawley minimum car parking standards. For 1 bed and 2 bed flats in this location, the minimum standards are 1 car parking space per dwelling. Regarding cycle parking it is stated that: *‘All cycle parking must be sheltered and secure and in accordance with local guidance and best practice design. For one bed dwellings: One space per dwelling and 1 space per 8 dwellings for visitors will be required. For two bed dwellings or more: 2 spaces per dwelling and 1 space per 8 dwellings for visitors will be required’.*

Green Infrastructure SPD 2016

- 4.19 This SPD provides guidance on how to meet the requirements of Local Plan Policies in relation to Crawley’s Green Infrastructure assets. It provides further guidance on Policy CH6: Tree Planting and Replacement Standards. This document includes a costing of £700 per tree in lieu of on-site planting. It also sets out the open space standards and costings. The document also links to the Urban Design SPD in respect of considering landscaping as part of high quality design.

Town Centre SPD 2016

- 4.20 Supports regeneration and development to promote the economic growth, vitality and viability of the town centre, which forms a sustainable location for development. In this case, the site is not specifically allocated, but is situated adjacent to the Station Gateway site.

Planning and Climate Change SPD 2016

- 4.21 This SPD includes further guidance and justification on sustainability policies within the Local Plan (Policies ENV6, ENV8, ENV9 and IN3).

Affordable Housing SPD (adopted November 2017)

- 4.22 This SPD includes further guidance on the requirements of policies H3 and H4 in the Local Plan and when affordable housing would be sought from residential development.

Brighton Road Conservation Area Statement (adopted April 2018)

- 4.23 This Statement identifies the northern part of conservation area as forming a key gateway into the town centre. It states that the area immediately south of the level crossing:
“significantly contributes to the overall townscape value of Crawley, providing a historic entrance to the town centre. There are four important ‘focal’ buildings – the Listed signal box, the locally listed Nightingale House, the Imperial Cinema and the Railway Hotel – which together provide the Conservation Area with its most notable group of historic buildings.”

- 4.24 The statement recognises that buildings in the key commercial frontages are urban in character and close to the pavement. In terms of new development, the Statement highlights the need to fit with the historic townscape or be of a modern subservient design. Proportions, height and enhancement of important features are also key issues to be considered.

Crawley Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule 2016

- 4.25 The Crawley CIL Charging Schedule has been in effect since 17 August 2016 and is also relevant to this application as the proposal would create new residential flats.

Developer Contributions Guidance Note (published July 2016)

- 4.26 This sets out the Council's approach to developer contributions following the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy. It provides details of the CIL charges and when S106 contributions will be sought.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:-

- 5.1 The main issues for consideration for this planning application are:

- Principle of proposed development
- Design and heritage
- Housing mix and residential amenity for future occupants
- Impact upon neighbouring properties
- Highways, parking and operational requirements
- Sustainability
- Drainage
- Archaeology
- Noise and air quality
- Contamination
- Affordable housing and other infrastructure contributions

Principle of proposed development

- 5.2 The site lies within the Town Centre boundary defined by the Local Plan, but outside the Primary Shopping Area. The Local Plan recognises Crawley town centre as a sustainable and accessible location for a mix of uses, including residential and commercial. Policy H2 identifies the town centre boundary as a broad location for housing and one of the allocated Town Centre Key Opportunity Sites (Crawley Station and car parks) lies immediately to the east. The proposed residential use would introduce activity to this part of the town centre throughout the day, including in the evenings, and could aid the vitality of the surrounding area. The principle of residential use of the site therefore seems acceptable and in accordance with national and local planning policy, although a number of significant and detailed concerns are set out below.
- 5.3 The application proposes a 34sqm coffee shop and a 60sqm commercial unit on the ground floor. The Planning Statement includes a short sequential assessment. Although it finds no alternative sites within the town centre, which seems surprising, the application site is edge of centre and near to other main town centre uses in the High Street and Brighton Road. The Forward Planning team has commented that Class E commercial uses broadly fall within the definition of Main Town Centre uses. They state that other nearby commercial uses and the scale of development proposed "*does not give rise to concerns of a significant negative impact on the town centre. The site is well connected to the Primary Shopping Area, and the presence of a limited amount of ground floor commercial is likely to generate activity in this part of the town centre, adding to its overall vitality and viability.*" On this basis, the ground floor commercial use is also considered acceptable in principle.
- 5.4 Despite the acceptability of the proposed uses, the development represents coverage of almost the entire site. On most sites, that level of development and site coverage would be totally unacceptable and this site is no exception. For the reasons set out below in more detail, the scheme would fail to create a satisfactory impact upon to the streetscene and would form a cramped and unacceptable

form of development. There is an existing planning policy allocation and planning permission for development of the adjoining site to the east for 300 flats. The proposed development could prejudice that development coming forward, by virtue of its poor relationship to the proposed adjoining scheme. There is also a small area of land to the south which would be rendered undevelopable by the proposal. The scheme fails to take a comprehensive view or to consider adjoining sites. The excessive site coverage and the failure to reflect and satisfactorily address adjoining sites to the south and east is wholly unacceptable. As a result, and for the detailed reasons set out below, development in the form proposed is considered to be overdevelopment and therefore unacceptable.

Design and heritage

- 5.5 Detailed approval is sought for appearance, layout and scale as part of this outline application. The application includes elevation drawings and floor plans. No Design and Access Statement has been submitted, although the Planning Statement purports to cover design issues.
- 5.6 Station Way and the application site are not particularly attractive at present. Much of the south side of Station Way is used for surface car parking and the landscaping is fairly poor. Station Way though is a key focal point for regeneration in Crawley as part of the Growth Programme. Outline permission for 300 flats and a revitalised railway station has been granted and supporting major public realm improvements along Station Way have secured public funding. The intention is to transform the area into a more attractive and welcoming gateway to the town.
- 5.7 The Council's Urban Designer objects to the current proposal. He considers that the *“form of development is wholly inappropriate and that the positioning and massing show little understanding of the site constraints nor a reasonable response to the layout and setting of the adjoining context. Particularly unacceptable is the relationship with the adjoining site to the rear, the overall impact of the massing and massing on the adjoining conservation area and its relationship with the approved outline application to the east.”*
- 5.8 The proposed block would almost fully cover the application site. The minimal space remaining along Station Way would need to be made available for use by pedestrians using or passing the site. There would be no opportunity for landscaping around the building. This lack of vegetation would exacerbate the poor quality and dominant elevations and offer no softening or relief to the scheme. This would be unacceptable, particularly in a prominent and busy location like this.
- 5.9 The proposed building would project forward of the adjoining Station Gateway proposal by approximately five metres. This would expose the majority of its five storey blank side elevation to anyone approaching from the east. The dominance and lack of design interest of this elevation, together with the prominent location, is considered unacceptable in urban design and streetscene terms. To the rear, the building would sit hard on the boundary of an area of land currently proposed to be used as communal outdoor space for the adjoining Station gateway development. The scheme's relationship with both adjoining sites is very awkward.
- 5.10 The detailing of the building also appears to be very poor. The windows seem to have no significant recess from the brickwork. This, combined with the siting on the back of the pavement, would create claustrophobic and unacceptably flat north elevation. The residential entrance is poorly defined and looks little different to the adjoining bin store and plant room doors. The windows to the commercial unit are small and residential in appearance. Overall, the elevations are plain with little relief or design quality.
- 5.11 The site is in a sensitive location in heritage terms. The Brighton Road conservation area lies immediately to the south of the railway and the nearby signal box is a Grade II listed building. Nightingale House is a locally listed building. The site, which has no above ground development, is currently screened in views from south of the railway by the low level vegetation on the land between the site and the railway. Clearly the relationship would change if the proposed development were to proceed. Comments are awaited from the Council's Heritage consultant and the Planning Committee will be updated on these.

- 5.12 The site lies within the Long Distance View Splay from Tilgate Park. The five storey height though would be viewed in the context of the town centre though and would not have a significant impact upon the Long Distance View.
- 5.13 Overall, the proposed scheme's layout, appearance, design, detailing and scale is extremely poor and totally unacceptable in this location. Refusal is recommended on this basis.

Housing mix and residential amenity for future occupants

- 5.14 The proposal would comprise two 1 bedroom (1 person) flats, nine 1 bedroom (2 person) flats, three 2 bedroom (3 person) flats and one 2 bedroom (4 person) flats. Policy CH5 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 states that the minimum size of all dwellings should equate to the Nationally Described Space Standards. These state that the gross internal floor area of a 1 bedroom 1 person unit should be at least 39 sqm, a 1 bedroom 2 person unit should be at least 50 sqm, a 2 bedroom 3 person unit at least 61 sqm and a 2 bedroom 4 person unit at least 70 sqm. All of the units proposed would meet or slightly exceed these floor areas. The proposal includes a mix of unit sizes. Although focussed on smaller units for 1-2 people, there are some larger, potentially family sized, units and the proposed mix is considered to accord with local policy.
- 5.15 Each flat would have a recessed balcony or roof terrace. These broadly comply with the minimum space requirements, although for many the externally opening door will effectively reduce the usable external space. Five of the recessed balconies are both the minimum 5 sqm in area and also north facing. They would receive no direct sunlight and would overlook Station Way. They would form dark, noisy areas and would not form attractive usable private amenity space. There would be six similar sized, south facing balconies/terraces. These would receive direct sunlight. However, they would be likely to suffer railway related disturbance and, for the two at ground floor level, sunlight could be blocked by the boundary treatment immediately to the south. The remaining three balconies/roof terraces would be west facing. Unfortunately the second floor recessed western balcony has been designed with a southerly side wall that would block a significant amount of daylight. The west facing balconies would all be likely to suffer noise disturbance from the road, level crossing and railway. Overall, despite meeting the minimum size requirements, the proposed outdoor private amenity space is considered to be of extremely poor quality and to be contrary to Policy CH5 and the content of the Urban Design SPD.
- 5.16 The two ground floor units would have both bedroom and living room windows facing directly onto the pavement outside the block. The bedrooms would be single aspect and north facing. Residents would be likely to suffer considerable disturbance from pedestrian and vehicle related movements directly outside their windows. In terms of privacy, outlook, noise and defensible space, these flats are considered wholly unacceptable. Their south facing living room/kitchen windows would face directly onto the site's southern boundary. This is currently marked by railings and the applicant has no control over potential fencing or other enclosure to the south. This could result in a fence of up to two metres in height being erected immediately outside these windows. One flats is located between the building's plant room, commercial bin store and commercial unit. The upper floor flats are all either single aspect north facing units or contain bedrooms that are north facing.
- 5.17 No BRE Daylight/Sunlight assessment or overheating assessment has been submitted with the application. In the absence of such an assessment, it is considered that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the north facing habitable rooms and north facing single aspect flats would benefit from adequate levels of natural light or that the south facing units would be acceptable in terms of overheating.
- 5.18 Outlook from all the flats would be poor, with the lower levels suffering particularly badly. The building would be located at the back of the pavement, offering no separation distance or scope for landscaping between the building and Station Way. Station Way at this point is busy and frequently the subject of queuing traffic due to the traffic lights and level crossing. To the south is an outlook onto a currently poorly landscaped area of land containing a telecommunications mast, with the railway beyond. Although the landscaped area may be improve as part of the Station Gateway proposals, the flats would generally suffer from an extremely poor outlook.

Impact upon neighbouring properties

- 5.19 There are existing residential properties to the north on the opposite side of Station Way in Bastable House. These have some south facing windows. These windows would be approximately 18 metres from the proposed building at the nearest point. The proposal would be three storeys high at this point. Although the distance falls below the 30 metre distance that would normally be sought between windows for buildings of this height, the relationship is across a busy street and there are similar relationships between residential properties in the vicinity. Some overlooking and possible overshadowing may result but, in this location, is not considered sufficient to warrant refusal.
- 5.20 To the south is the Railway public house, which has flats above. The distance between existing and proposed windows would be 23 metres. These are probably secondary windows to the flats and any views would be across the railway line. The proposal, as it lies to the north, would not overshadow The Railway public house. The relationship is considered satisfactory in residential amenity terms.
- 5.21 It is possible that residential use occurs on the first floor of the Taj Mahal restaurant, although the lawfulness of that has not been established. The window to window distance would again be around 23 metres and the relationship is considered similar to others in the vicinity.
- 5.22 The proposed Station Gateway development lies immediately to the east. It has outline planning permission and there is a current undetermined Reserved Matters application for the block adjoining the current application site. The east elevation of the proposed building would be blank. The proposed adjoining Station Gateway building would have side windows (to rooms primarily facing north), the nearest of which would be around four metres from the blank side wall of the proposal. Although these side windows are secondary in nature, the side elevation of the proposal, due to its height and projection forwards, would be visually dominant upon these flats and would block afternoon sunlight. The other side windows in the Station Gateway scheme would face onto the land between the current application site and the railway. This is proposed to form a communal garden for the Station Gateway residents. Although angled views may be possible between the current proposal and the Station Gateway building, this should not result in direct or unacceptable levels of overlooking. However, the proposed south facing windows would directly overlook the proposed communal garden area to the south. Whilst less privacy can be expected in a communal garden, its users would certainly feel themselves overlooked.
- 5.23 Overall, the proposed development is considered to have a satisfactory relationship to existing neighbouring buildings in terms of overshadowing and overlooking. However, it has not been designed to properly take account of the proposed development on the allocated site to the east or the proposed garden area for the separate adjoining Station Gateway scheme to the south.

Highways, parking and operational requirements

- 5.24 The proposed scheme would provide no on-site vehicle parking. A lay-by would be provided at the front of the site, in a shared surface form with the pavement. A small commercial bin store would be located immediately adjacent to the loading bay. The residential bin store is proposed further east adjacent to the entrance to the flats.
- 5.25 The Local Highway Authority has confirmed that it objects to the current layout proposed. With regard to the proposed loading bay, they state that a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and swept path tracking diagrams are required to demonstrate the safety of the bay and its usability by larger vehicles, including refuse vehicles. These have not been provided. The proposed layout leaves insufficient space between the loading bay and the north elevation to meet even the minimum footpath width of 1.5 metres. Ideally two metres would be sought to allow for satisfactory wheelchair space. Vehicles within the bay would leave only around 0.85m to the main north elevation. This would not allow wheelchair access and fails to meet the required minimum footpath width. The problem would be exacerbated during commercial refuse collections, since opening the doors would completely block the footpath and force pedestrians onto the road itself to pass. The Local Highway Authority also recognises that there are proposals to alter the road network in the vicinity, which may impact upon the bay.
- 5.26 The Council's Refuse and Recycling team considers the proposed residential bin store to be of adequate size, but raises some concern about the orientation of the containers. They also express

concern about the pull distance from the bin store to the temporary loading bay. Revision to the scheme is sought to achieve a maximum pull distance of ten metres and, as with the highway authority, clarification is sought that a refuse vehicle would fit into the bay. A dropped kerb and parking restrictions to the loading bay are sought to ensure its availability for collections.

- 5.27 The applicant has submitted a Delivery and Servicing Plan. Whilst useful that these issues are being considered, it is considered unsatisfactory in a number of respects. The plan suggests that, if the lay-by outside the site is occupied, alternatives will be available outside the proposed Station Gateway development. The pull distances to the Station Gateway lay-bys would though far exceed those required by the Refuse and Recycling team. Reference is also made to a number of issues, such as the use of quieter electric vehicles, over which the applicant has no control.
- 5.28 Station Way is one way so, by the time drivers were able to see that the application site's proposed bay is occupied, they would be beyond the Station Gateway lay-bys, unable to access them and committed to a left turn over the level crossing. A 3 kilometre drive along Brighton Road, Southgate Drive, Southgate Avenue and back along Station Way would be required to return to the same point. Clearly the temptation for drivers to simply park on the pavement or block the southern lane on Station Way would be considerable.
- 5.29 Whilst this site is in a sustainable town centre location where a low level of parking can be acceptable, the proposal is considered unacceptable in parking terms due its specific siting on a difficult junction close to the level crossing. Any development generates a level of traffic movements and, for fifteen flats, a coffee shop and a commercial unit, this would be likely to be significant. The inability of vehicles to vacate the highway here is likely to exacerbate queues caused by the level crossing and may lead to the southern lane of Station Way being blocked. Other developments to the east along Station Way have incorporated a level of parking below the minimum standards, whilst not being car free, and it is considered that a scheme with no vehicle parking in this awkward location is not acceptable.
- 5.30 Cycle storage for 18 cycles is proposed for the residential units. This represents a shortfall of 1-2 cycle parking spaces against the parking standards. The store, whilst securely located within the lobby, would involve use of a roller shutter and pushing cycles in/out of the lobby area. It is likely to prove awkward to use and may also inconvenience pedestrians entering/leaving the building. No provision is shown for the commercial units, for which two spaces would be required. A sheltered Sheffield stand may suffice for the commercial units, but it is difficult to see how that could be provided without further blocking the footpath.
- 5.31 Network Rail has also objected to the scheme. They raise *“serious concerns that the proposed development could obstruct the view of the Crawley High Street level crossing and the level crossing signals. When approaching the level crossing from Station Way onto the High Street (A2219) there is a sharp left turn, this combined with vehicles often needing to stop south of the level crossing to turn right onto Springfield Road and an obstructed view of the level crossing for the approaching cars results in an increased risk of an accident occurring on or near the crossing. It is therefore essential that good visibility of the crossing is maintained. Further discussions with Network Rail is needed to ensure that the proposed development does not increase the risk to the operational railway by reducing the visibility of the level crossing.”* The applicant appears not to have addressed these serious concerns with Network Rail and, in the absence of agreement on this, the proposal is considered to have an unacceptable relationship to the level crossing.
- 5.32 The scheme fails to properly address its access, servicing or parking requirements and its relationship to the level crossing. It is considered unacceptable in transport terms as it stands. Refusal is recommended on this basis.

Sustainability

- 5.33 The applicant has submitted a Sustainability and Energy Statement. The report states that the scheme can achieve carbon reduction and energy efficiency measures in line with local policy. It also states that BREEAM Excellent for energy and water credits can be achieved and is targeted. Although a District Energy Network is not in place to serve the development, the proposed

communal heating system could be connected at a later date. The dwellings would have water efficient fittings to meet the requirements of Policy ENV9.

- 5.34 Whilst further detail would be required by condition if the scheme were acceptable, it is considered that the application provides sufficient information to demonstrate that the scheme could meet the required sustainability levels.

Drainage

- 5.35 The application site is not in an area at risk from flooding according to Environment Agency records. Thames Water responded that the applicant should follow the sequential approach to disposal of surface water. Thames Water approval would be required for surface water discharge to a public sewer. Groundwater discharges to a sewer should be minimised. No objection is raised on waste water infrastructure grounds. It is considered that drainage matters associated with the scheme could be satisfactorily resolved by condition if the scheme were otherwise acceptable.

Archaeology

- 5.36 The site lies within an Archaeological Notification Area based on the Medieval settlement of Crawley. The Medieval settlement was a focus for iron working and the site lies at its southern end. The applicant has submitted an archaeological assessment. The report concludes that no further work is needed given the site's location at the southern bounds of the settlement, its small size and possible subsequent physical impact on the site. The Council's Archaeological consultant does not accept the report's conclusions that no further work is necessary. However, she is satisfied that archaeological remains of a standard to warrant preservation in situ are unlikely and that a condition could be attached requiring agreement and implementation of a programme of archaeological investigation. This condition would have been recommended if the scheme were otherwise acceptable.

Noise and air quality

- 5.37 The applicant has submitted noise and air quality reports. The site lies in a noisy location, with three lanes of traffic running immediately to the north and trains running to the south. It is also close to the level crossing. Traffic speeding up and slowing down, as caused by the traffic lights outside the site, can be particularly noisy. Environmental Health officers have considered the applicant's noise report and raised a number of concerns. They do not consider that the report adequately characterises noise on the site. Its noise monitoring was primarily undertaken at the Taj Mahal restaurant opposite, rather than on the site itself. A limited attempt to compare the off-site monitoring with on-site monitoring was undertaken for a single unrepresentative hour. The results revealed significant differences between the two monitoring locations.
- 5.38 Environmental Health comments that the noise levels are, at best, within the Significant Observable Adverse Effect level. Given the limitations of the survey work, it is possible that the site falls within the Unacceptable Adverse Effect Level, where development would be strongly resisted.
- 5.39 In summary, Environmental Health state *"the development site experiences significant noise from a variety of sources. These have not been adequately characterised and the findings incorporated into the decision making for determining whether or not development is appropriate. Even if development can be shown to be appropriate, there is still a requirement for good acoustic design which this application does not contain. It is quite possible that the sound levels are such that permission should be refused in accordance with local and national policy. We recommend that the application is refused."* Refusal is recommended on this basis.
- 5.40 Comments on the air quality report are awaited and the Planning Committee will be updated on this later.

Contaminated land

- 5.41 The site was formerly used as railway land, with the original Crawley station being to the south. Adjoining land formed a wood yard and railway service yard. The applicant has submitted a

Preliminary Risk Assessment suggesting that further intrusive investigation should be carried out. The Contaminated Land officer has reviewed the report and accepts its findings. He recommends a condition to address contamination, which could have been attached if the proposal were otherwise acceptable.

Affordable housing and other infrastructure contributions

- 5.42 Policy IN1 of the Local Plan requires developments to make provision for their on and off site infrastructure needs and confirms that the Council will implement a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The proposed development would be liable for a CIL contribution.
- 5.43 Policy H4 of the Local Plan and the Affordable Housing SPD are both relevant to this proposal. The Local Plan policy seeks provision of 40% affordable housing and an additional 10% low cost housing within the scheme. Of this, a minimum of 70% should be Affordable Rent or Social Rent, with up to 30% being Intermediate tenure. The applicant has submitted a Viability Assessment. This does state that the scheme would be viable with a financial contribution of £116,006 towards affordable housing. The report states that this represents 25% of the required contribution. That contribution is not offered though and the report concludes *“only a nil affordable housing scenario generates a profit which we consider to be marginally viable (at 6.99% on GDV / 7.51% on cost). Even at this level of profit, the developer will need to take a view as to whether they can access funding at a reasonable rate given the returns fall below the 20% on GDV benchmark which lenders often require.”* No affordable housing contribution, either on-site or off-site, has been offered by the applicant.
- 5.44 The Council’s Housing Enabling and Development Manager has reviewed the assessment. He raises strong concerns about a number of aspects of the applicant’s assessment. The applicant incorrectly assumes an off-site contribution would be sought under Policy H4. For this major development, an on-site contribution would be sought. The Housing Enabling and Development Manager comments that this would have the knock-on effect of reducing the CIL contribution. He also states that the build costs used are *“exceptionally high,”* that the existing use value as a car park has been *“over-inflated”* and that the allowance for external works is excessive given the site coverage. The Housing Enabling and Development Manager objects to the application if the applicant is not willing to make the required affordable housing contribution.
- 5.45 Policy CH6 of the Local Plan deals with replacement and additional tree planting to maintain Crawley’s tree cover and character. An additional tree is sought for every new residential unit. Ideally these would be planted on site but, with the site coverage proposed, tree planting is clearly is not possible in this case. A contribution of £10,500 (15 units x £700 per tree) in accordance with the policy and the Green Infrastructure SPD would therefore be sought. The applicant’s Planning Statement fails to address this issue.
- 5.46 Policy ENV5 of the Plan and the supporting Green Infrastructure SPD deal with the need for open space and recreation facilities arising from increased residential population. Provision of such facilities on-site or contributions towards provision off-site will be sought where shortfalls are identified. In this case, the proposal has no capacity to accommodate on-site open space and recreation due to the site coverage by the proposed building. The Forward Planning team has assessed the scheme in respect of this provision. Given likely occupancy and shortfalls in the area, contributions would be sought towards provision for children/teenagers, amenity green space, allotments, outdoor sports space, parks and natural green space. Using the methodology set out in the SPD, a total contribution of £12,741.25 is sought. Again, the applicant’s Planning Statement fails to address this issue or support a contribution.
- 5.47 The applicant’s position on affordable housing provision, tree planting, open space and recreation is unacceptable. Refusal is recommended on these grounds as a result.

CONCLUSIONS:-

- 6.1 The footprint of the proposed development would almost entirely cover the application site. The proposed design is poor and would have an unacceptable relationship to both the streetscene and the proposed high quality development and public realm improvements along Station Way. It would

also relate poorly to the built development and communal amenity space proposed within the adjoining allocated Station Gateway scheme. No parking is proposed on-site, the proposed loading bay is considered unsatisfactory to meet the building's needs, use of the cycle parking would be awkward and the development would have an unacceptable impact upon pedestrians and vehicles passing the site. It also fails to satisfactorily address the operational requirements of the railway. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal is acceptable in terms of noise and the proposed layout and design is unacceptable in terms of amenity for future residents. The application fails to make appropriate provision for affordable housing, trees or open space and recreation. Overall, the proposal is considered to be of extremely poor quality and to represent substantial overdevelopment of the site. Refusal is strongly recommended.

RECOMMENDATION RE: CR/2020/0589/OUT

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its site coverage, layout, scale, massing, relationship to adjoining sites and proximity to Station Way, represents substantial overdevelopment of the site and is contrary to policies CH2 and CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan, the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development, by reason of its siting, design, massing, scale and external appearance, would form a dominant and unattractive building that would fail to respect the existing or proposed Station Way streetscene. There would be no opportunity to soften the building through the use of landscaping and its set back from the Station Way carriageway is totally inadequate. It represents a wholly unacceptable form of development and is contrary to policies CH2 and CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan, the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The proposed development, by reason of the orientation of the flats and their amenity space, together with their proximity to Station Way, would suffer an unacceptable loss of privacy, provide extremely poor outlook and provide inadequate natural light and sunlight to windows and balconies. As such, the proposal would fail to create a satisfactory residential environment for future residents contrary to policies CH3 and CH5 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan, the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. The applicant has provided insufficient evidence to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the occupiers of the proposed noise sensitive residential (C3) development would not suffer significant disturbance and be harmed by noise from nearby road and railway sources. The applicant has also failed to demonstrate that acceptable mitigation can be put in place to address these significant noise concerns. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policy ENV11 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Noise Policy Statement for England.
5. The proposed development would have an unacceptable and over dominant relationship to the development proposed on the adjoining allocated Station Gateway site and would dominate and overlook the landscaping area to the south. It fails to take a comprehensive approach to development in this area. The proposal is contrary to policies CH2, CH3 and CH4 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan, the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.
6. The proposed development, with its lack of on-site vehicle parking, below standard cycle parking and reliance on a single loading bay, fails to provide for the vehicular traffic that it would generate. Insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed servicing arrangements could operate satisfactorily without adversely affecting either the free flow of traffic along Station Way and over the level crossing or the safe movement of passing pedestrians and wheelchair users. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not affect the safe and acceptable operation of the nearby railway level crossing. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies IN1, IN3 and IN4 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan, the parking standards set out in the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed residential refuse and recycling arrangements would be suitable to enable the development to meet its own operational needs, taking into account the orientation of the store, the required container sizes and the travel distance to the loading bay. The proposal is thus contrary to policies CH3 and IN1 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030.
8. The proposal would not make any provision towards affordable housing, despite the significant and demonstrated need in Crawley. Non-viability of the scheme has not been demonstrated. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policy H4 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030, the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document and paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
9. An agreement is not in place to ensure that the appropriate contributions for tree planting and open space are secured. The development is therefore contrary to policies CH6, ENV5, and IN1 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 and the Green Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document.

1. NPPF Statement

In determining this planning application, the Local Planning Authority assessed the proposal against all material considerations and has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions where possible and required, by:

- Informing the applicant of identified issues that are so fundamental that it has would not be possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward due to the harm that would be caused.
- Providing advice on the refusal of the application to solutions that would provide a satisfactory way forward in any subsequently submitted application.

This decision has been taken in accordance with the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework, as set out in article 35, of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015.



ArcGIS Web Map

Crawley Borough Council
Town Hall, The Boulevard,
Crawley, West Sussex,
RH10 1UZ
Tel: 01293 438000



1:750

