

February 2019



BUILT-UP AREA REVIEW

SOUTHWATER PARISH COUNCIL
BEESON HOUSE, 26 LINTOT SQUARE, RH13 9LA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Policy Context for Built-Up Area Boundaries.....	2
National Planning Policy.....	3
Development Plan for the Area.....	3
Horsham District Planning Framework 2015.....	3
Emerging Planning Policy.....	4
Methodology.....	5
Southwater Built-Up Area Review	7
Christs Hospital Built-Up Area Review	9
Appendix 1- Southwater Village Built Up Area Review Maps.....	10
Appendix 2- Christs Hospital Built Up Area Review Map	18

INTRODUCTION

This document has been prepared on behalf of Southwater Parish Council by Enplan to support the designation of a revised built-up area within the Southwater Neighbourhood Plan.

There are currently two settlements with defined built-up areas within the parish, namely Southwater and Christs Hospital. This document explores the legal and policy context for updating these areas within the neighbourhood plan, establishes a methodology for a built up area review and conducts that review

This document concludes by proposing new defined built-up areas for the settlements of Southwater and Christs Hospital.

POLICY CONTEXT FOR BUILT-UP AREA BOUNDARIES

When considering whether it is appropriate for the neighbourhood plan to undertake this review the legal requirements for a neighbourhood plan have been considered. For a neighbourhood plan to be put to a referendum and be made it must meet a set of basic conditions. The basic conditions are set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

The basic conditions are:

a. having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan..

d. the making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.

e. the making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).

f. the making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.

g. prescribed conditions are met in relation to the plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the neighbourhood plan.

It is considered that the most relevant conditions with regard to the built-up area boundary are a) and c).

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY

The term ‘built-up area boundary’ or ‘settlement boundary’ are often the topic of discussion and key in the interpretation of local planning policy. These terms are not explicitly mentioned in the National Planning Policy Framework as a policy tool but the term ‘built-up area’ is. To provide clarity within the plan area as to what is considered to be a built-up area’ it is considered appropriate to show these on a plan.

The Neighbourhood Plan must have regard to national policies and advice – it is considered that the use of built-up area boundaries meet this condition.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE AREA

The neighbourhood plan has to be in **general conformity** with the **strategic policies** contained in the development plan. It should be noted that this does not mean absolute conformity and some deviation from the strategic policies may be acceptable where justified.

HORSHAM DISTRICT PLANNING FRAMEWORK 2015

The current Built-Up Area Boundary’s in Southwater are set out by the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF).

Paragraph 4.7 confirms that the ‘...*designation of built-up area boundaries is based on an assessment on the role of a settlement and how it functions*’.

The HDPF also includes a definition for built-up area boundaries on page 150, this states:

‘Built-up Area Boundaries (BUAB): These identify the areas in the District of primarily built form, rather than countryside. They identify areas within which development of brownfield land may normally be appropriate, including infilling, redevelopment and conversions in accordance with Government Policy and Guidance (NPPF and NPPG). They do not include a presumption for the development of greenfield land such as playing fields and other open space. Identified built-up area boundaries do not necessarily include all existing developed areas.’

It is noted that the principle policies in the HDPF that talk of ‘built-up areas’ are Policy 1, Policy 2 and Policy 3 and the HDPF considers all of these to be ‘*Strategic Policies*’.

HDPF Policy 3 confirms that;

‘Development will be permitted within towns and villages which have defined built-up areas. Any infilling and redevelopment will be required to demonstrate that it is of an appropriate nature and scale to maintain characteristics and function of the settlement...’

HDPF Policy 3 goes on to set out which settlements should have built-up area boundaries. In the case of Southwater Parish this includes two separate settlements, Southwater and Christs Hospital.

It is clear that the strategic element of built-up areas is which settlements have a defined built-up area and not the exact delineation of the boundary of the built-up area. It is therefore considered that the neighbourhood plan can review the boundary and be in conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan.

EMERGING PLANNING POLICY

In April 2018 HDC carried out a consultation titled '*Issues and Options – Employment, Tourism and Sustainable Rural Development*' which was the first stage of consultation in the local plan review.

This consultation included a review of existing boundaries as '*in some areas, the built form of existing settlements has changed since the adoption of the HDPF, and in some cases small anomalies have arisen as a result of changes to OS base maps over time. Again the review of the boundary considers whether the land has a relationship with the built or existing urban form or the rural landscape.*'

This acceptance by HDC that the existing built-up areas are now in cases out of date is considered further justification to review the defined built-up areas through the neighbourhood plan.

METHODOLOGY

It is important that built-up area boundaries are applied in a uniform way across an area. As mentioned previously HDC have recently suggested amendments through their Issues & Options Consultation and this review for the neighbourhood plan has adopted the methodology set out by HDC with one addition.

The assessment methodology as set out by HDC is below:

5) In many cases new areas of development will be included in the BUAB. However, it is necessary to consider what impact the potential sites for inclusion in the updated boundary will have on settlement coalescence and landscape /rural character. This includes consideration of the relationship and connectivity of the new development with the existing settlement. The criteria used in the assessment process are set out below. In general terms however, a starting point for the assessment was to ensure that as far as possible, BUABs follow logical and defensible boundaries such as roads / rights of way, curtilages of properties, water courses and woodland belts.

a) Settlement coalescence

- *Sites which significantly reduce the break / openness between settlements – **exclude***
- *Sites which generate urbanising impacts in the settlement gap beyond the development (e.g. artificial lighting, amendments to road layouts) – **exclude***

b) Landscape / rural character

- *Relationship with existing built-form – new development which does not have a clear relationship with the existing BUAB (e.g. is separated from the existing boundary due to topography / landform/ landscaping /open space)– **exclude***
- *Settlement form – amendments which would significantly alter settlement form / pattern (e.g. linear settlement form/ribbon development) – **exclude***
- *Historic environment – amendments to the BUAB which would have a significant adverse impact on the historic environment should infill or redevelopment to take place, including harm to listed buildings, conservation areas, archaeology (e.g. the setting of a listed building outside but close to the BUAB) – **exclude***
- *Areas of landscape importance – sites which through intensification of use could have adverse impacts on protected landscape – **exclude***
- *Connectivity with existing settlement – poor relation to existing settlement (e.g. lack of footpath / road connections) – **exclude***

c) Other factors – where the following features occur on the edge of an existing BUAB, these would normally be excluded, as these areas form a transition from the urban to rural environment and are generally protected from development through other policies (e.g. biodiversity / community facilities, leisure and recreation policies).

- *Allotments*
- *Playing fields / sports grounds (includes school playing fields)*
- *Designated wildlife sites / ancient woodlands and any associated buffers*
- *Flood plain*
- *Protected landscapes (AONB / proximity to SDNP)*

d) Gardens – In most instances garden land should be included in the BUAB as they will form part of the urban / townscape setting. It is however recognised that gardens can form an important part of the

transition between the rural and urban environment, and there may be some instances, particularly where there are houses located in larger plots, that the character of the area would be adversely affected as a result of increased development. Inclusion of these sites should therefore be made on a case by case basis. Where garden land relates more to the rural than urban landscape these sites should be excluded.

In addition to the broad HDC methodology above the following criteria has been used when reviewing the boundary:

- (1) Where the boundary runs along a public highway, the public highway should be excluded from the built up area boundary.
- (2) The boundary should whenever possible follow physical features (such as boundary fences).
- (3) If planning permission has been granted and development commenced, the boundary should be drawn as if the approved scheme were constructed.
- (4) Land allocated for development over the plan period should be included within the settlement boundary where it abuts the existing settlement. **It is anticipated that the boundary will be realigned in the following boundary review once the extent of development on the site is known.*

SOUTHWATER BUILT-UP AREA REVIEW

This review has resulted in an updated Built-up Area for Southwater Village being defined.

The extent of the changes can be seen on the plans in Appendix 1 and the reasons for the main changes are set out below. Very minor alterations are not set out below where they involve small realignments of around 5m or less so the boundary follows fence lines or other physical features.

Ref no.	Nature of change	Location	Reason
1	Extend/enlarge BUA	NW of village including Willow Croft, Courtlands and Welcome Place.	Recent development has resulted in the expansion of the settlement beyond the current settlement boundary. In doing so Willow Croft, which used to be a residential outlier on the edge of the settlement now abuts the rest of the developed area. Considered that the boundary be realigned to include all of these properties.
2	Extend/enlarge BUA	N of village (The Copse)	HDC have proposed that the main dwelling be included as it is a large property on Worthing Road and the southern part of the property has a clear relationship with the built form of Southwater in this location. The rear garden is large and well vegetated, creating a rural character which is considered to have a relationship with the countryside rather than Southwater. This assessment has reached the same conclusion and the boundary extended to include the property.
3	Reduce BUA	N of village - Land north of Compton Place	The existing boundary currently includes an area of woodland. Realign this boundary to run along the edge of residential properties as per methodology.
4	Reduce BUA	NE of village - Land east of Martindales	This area is allocated as a Key Employment Area in the HDPF. Include in BUAB.
5	Reduce BUA	E of village - Nyes Open Space	Area of open space on the edge of the settlement. As per methodology should be excluded from BUA.
6	Reduce BUA	Blakes Farm Road	Current boundary runs within public highway - realigned to edge of residential curtilages.
7	Reduce BUA	E of village – open spaces east of Charlock Way and along Easteds Lane.	Current BUA includes open spaces along eastern edge of settlement. As per the methodology these should be excluded. Edge of BUA therefore realigned so that open spaces on eastern edge of village outside the BUA.

Ref no.	Nature of change	Location	Reason
8	Reduce BUA	SE of village – Southwater Country Park / Great Lime Kilns	Existing boundary follows no on the ground routes and has been roughly drawn. Boundary realigned to follow edge of the country park / curtilages around it as per methodology.
9	Reduce BUA	Roman Lane & Turners Close Open Space	Area of recreational open space & sport area on edge of settlement. Currently included in BUA. Propose to remove this from the BUA in line with the methodology.
10	Reduce BUA	Roman Lane	Realign BUA to exclude public highway as per methodology.
11	Extend/enlarge boundary	S of village - Opposite Roman Lane junction onto Mill Straight to south of The Fieldings	Expand settlement boundary to parish/plan area boundary to accommodate Centenary Road. However, this plan does not have the ability to extend BUA beyond the parish/plan area therefore BUA extended to parish boundary.
12	Reduce BUA	West of Rascals Close	Reduce edge of BUA so that it follows the edge of residential curtilages.
13	Extend/enlarge boundary	Forest Lodge, Shipley Road	Forest Lodge is currently outside of the BUAB. This property sits at the end of a track that serves a number of dwellings. Considered appropriate to include the dwelling in the BUA (but not its garden).
14	Extend/enlarge boundary	Broadacres Development / HDPF Allocated Land West of Southwater	This site is allocated for development in the HDPF and permission has been granted. HDC have noted that <i>'once development commences the site will need to be included in the updated built-up area boundary.'</i> Development has already commenced on this site and outline layout approved. Confirmation has been received from developer that this layout will not change substantially. As per methodology boundary drawn to follow the anticipated extend of the built up area.
15	Extend/enlarge boundary	Proposed N.Plan Allocation west of Southwater	Proposed Allocation within N.Plan – as per the methodology the allocation boundary becomes the BUA boundary.


CHRISTS HOSPITAL BUILT-UP AREA REVIEW

This review has resulted in an updated Built-up Area for Christs Hospital being defined.

The extent of the changes can be seen on the plans in Appendix 2 and the reasons for the main changes are set out below. Very minor alterations are not set out below where they involve small realignments of around 5m or less so the boundary follows fence lines or other physical features.

Ref no.	Nature of change	Location	Reason
1	Reduce BUA	Northgate House & open space north and west of it.	This area is undeveloped and marks a distinctive break in the settlement. As per the methodology this should be removed. Christs Hospital built up area is split in two as a result.
2	Reduce BUA	Land east of Bluecoat Pond	Area of undeveloped land east of Bluecoat Pond is currently within settlement boundary however there is no development or defined edge present. Realign boundary of BUA to run along rear of gardens.
3	Reduce BUA	Parking area south of Christs Hospital Road	Area contains an area of hardstanding that is well related to the Bluecoat Pond development. This area is considered developed. Current BUA includes a spur of undeveloped land to the south – this should be removed as it is not well related to the existing built area.

**APPENDIX 1- SOUTHWATER VILLAGE BUILT UP AREA REVIEW
MAPS**




Southwater Built-Up Area Boundary Review (Map 1 of 7) - Key Map



- HDPF Built Up Area Boundary
- Proposed Build Up Area Boundary






Southwater Built-Up Area Boundary Review (Map 2 of 7) - INSET MAP 1


-  HDPF Built Up Area Boundary
-  Proposed Build Up Area Boundary






Southwater Built-Up Area Boundary Review (Map 3 of 7) - INSET MAP 2


-  HDPF Built Up Area Boundary
-  Proposed Build Up Area Boundary






Southwater Built-Up Area Boundary Review (Map 4 of 7) - INSET MAP 3




-  HDPF Built Up Area Boundary
-  Proposed Build Up Area Boundary





Southwater Built-Up Area Boundary Review (Map 5 of 7) - INSET MAP 4

-  HDPF Built Up Area Boundary
-  Proposed Built Up Area Boundary






Southwater Built-Up Area Boundary Review (Map 6 of 7) - INSET MAP 5



- HDPF Built Up Area Boundary
- Proposed Build Up Area Boundary






Southwater Built-Up Area Boundary Review (Map 7 of 7) - INSET MAP 6

-  HDPF Built Up Area Boundary
-  Proposed Build Up Area Boundary

0 100 200 300 400 m

APPENDIX 2- CHRISTS HOSPITAL BUILT UP AREA REVIEW MAP



Christ's Hospital Built-Up Area Boundary Review

-  HDPF Built Up Area Boundary
-  Proposed Build Up Area Boundary

