

Ref: SH/KJ/P16-2975
Date: 28th February 2020



Vail Williams LLP
Unit 4 Peveril Court
6-8 London Road
Crawley
West Sussex
RH10 8JE

Forward Planning Manager
Crawley Borough Council
Town Hall
The Boulevardre
CRAWLEY
West Sussex
RH10 1UZ

Tel 01293 612600
vailwilliams.com

Dear Sallie and Elizabeth

**Response on behalf of the Land Consortium on land adjacent to Jersey Farm for Crawley Borough Council
Local Plan Review 2035 Reg 19 Local Representations**

We are writing on behalf of our clients Ardmore Ltd and the consortium of 4 adjacent landowners, in regard to land to the North of Crawley and adjacent to Manor Royal.

As per our previous submissions to your Regulation 18 stage in September, and our submission to your Employment Land Trajectory, there are nine sites and five landowners which all wish to act as signatories to this letter and we are appointed by them under the lead member, Ardmore Limited.

To confirm, we have attached our masterplan and can confirm that the landowners are as follows:

Site no.	Land ownership	Site address	Site area
1	Ardmore	Land at Jersey Farm (A)	0.59ha
2	Ardmore	Land at Jersey Farm (B)	2.18ha
3	Ardmore	Land at Jersey Farm (C)	8.77ha
4	Willmott	Land at Little Dell Farm (A)	3.98ha
5	Ohm and Hill	Land at Little Dell Farm (B)	1.94ha
6	Ardmore	Land at Little Dell Farm (C)	0.26ha
7	Maxwell	Land at Poles Lane (A)	1.43ha
8	Rixon and Crook	Land at Poles Lane (B)	0.68ha
9	Ardmore	Land at Spikemead Farm	3.67ha

As per our previous representations, our main areas of comment will understandably be relating to the context, setting and landscape character of the land North of Manor Royal, as well as Gatwick Safeguarding and the Economic Growth policies.

Our detailed comments are as follows:

Listen Care



Innovate Lead



Policy SD3: North Crawley Area Action Plan

Our clients support the further clarification now provided by Policy SD3 in regard to the Gatwick Airport Ltd and the Aviation Strategy from National Government.

Whilst we appreciate that the Policy designates the area for new Area Action Plan (AAP), we would be grateful of more clarity on the timeline although we understand this information will be contained within the emerging Local Development Scheme (LDS).

We are also concerned that given our two permitted planning applications at Jersey Farm, Policy SD3 states that development which would be incompatible with the Western Link Road search corridor or prejudice to the future comprehensive development of the AAP, will not be permitted. Accordingly, we would like to see that the word 'new' is inserted to reflect our current consented schemes. For information, we are due to be submitting discharge of conditions to ensure this development is implemented as per its Decision Notice, within the next few months following the signing of our s106.

It is also noted that the policy reflects the Crawley Western Relief Road (CWRR) under policy ST4. Whilst we do not anticipate any further applications relating to the existing permission, we would seek assurance that our permitted applications would be a material consideration under this policy and policy ST4 in regard to any minor alterations that may be required.

However, we wish it to be noted that in principle we agree with the AAP proposal that will address opportunities within the area, should safeguarding be lifted. We acknowledge the unmet needs in particular relating to economic development and, the findings of the evidence base, especially the January 2020 Lichfield's Economic Growth Assessment (EGA) for the Northern West Sussex Area.

We also note that paragraph 3.22 states that safeguarding protection would remain until the Adoption of the AAP. At present, it is still unclear as to the length of time proposed for adopting the AAP and, this will further create uncertainty beyond the Adoption of the Local Plan currently programmed for December 2020.

We understand that the objective of the AAP as set out in Para 3.23, could look at higher growth scenarios than that of a constrained land supply position as stated in the EGA. We also understand that Para 3.23 looks to consider a comprehensively planned approach to economic development rather than piecemeal applications.

However, we are concerned that the comments in para 3.25 in relation to the CWRR in the AAP, state that:

Further work needs to be established to secure the optimum line of the Crawley Section of this route. Possible alignments of the route may move further north should work on the AAP demonstrate that land is not required for future growth of the airport."

Regardless of this, policy ST4 significantly safeguards some of our client's land. This policy together with the Reasoned Justification (RJ) for para 3.25 will unnecessarily blight a significant area of our site, as shown on the Proposals Map. It indicates that our land will form part of the current arbitrary corridor shown as part of the CWRR, without what appears to be any further justification to the current timeline for delivery, need, route, or

Listen Care



Innovate Lead



scale for this major highway's development. There is no clarity in any transport evidence base at this stage relating to the indicative road proposed, for us to consider. We therefore object to both the Policy ST4 in its current form and the Proposals Map allocation and the principle of safeguarding for a relief road. We consider this policy and search corridor to be premature. We further address this under Policy ST4, later in our letter, in regard to the impact of any potential road and the uncertainty this policy will create.

Chapter Four: Character, Landscape and Development Form

We welcome the approach to combine under one chapter, the issues which were previously separated into Character & Design, and then Landscaping & Landscape Character.

We recognise the need for **Policy CL2: Principles of Good Urban Design** and the inclusion of criteria a) which adds the need for development proposals to consider the movement corridors, distant views, landmarks and views into and out of adjoining areas.

This is considered to have been important given the existing planning consent for the building on Jersey Farm approved at committee January 2020, and it transition from the urban area of Manor Royal to the Countryside and rural fringe.

In regard to **Policy CL3: Local Character and the form of new development**, whilst we appreciate the approach of the policy which builds on Regulation 18 policy CD3, there is concern that this policy would require all development to submit such information. Whilst the RJ shows that the area wide character and design assessment programme will also be brought forward and, for more major development this will need to be supported by developers, we are concerned that the degree of work for minor alterations or smaller scale development will require significant information and assessment on behalf of clients. We look to work with the Council in their preparation of any assessments, especially those in relation to our site adjacent to the Northern Boundary of Manor Royal.

Policy CL5: Form of New Development – Layout, Scale and Appearance

This amended policy now requires a significant level of information for all major development in regard to Masterplans or Development Briefs. Whilst we appreciate larger strategic sites will be required and should do so, this is very onerous if you are using the major development definition. It is also not clear what "larger schemes" are. We would therefore suggest that further clarity is added to this policy especially in regard to criteria a) which states that Development Briefs and Masterplans would be required in areas "*where there is a need to guide and promote change*".

Policy CL8: Development Outside the Built-Up Area

We are aware that our site is within the Upper Mole Farmlands Fringe and that this was an important factor in determining our recent planning applications. We assume that further details of the Landscape Character Assessment will evolve as part of the AAP process and the wider Character Assessments that are being brought forward by the Council. We acknowledge paragraph 4.78 regarding the interim position for development coming forward ahead of the AAP adoption.

Listen Care



Innovate Lead



Chapter 9: Economic Growth

Further to representations at the Regulation 18 stage, we welcome the restructure of this Chapter and the evolution of the policies as you read the document. As previously mentioned under Policy SD3, we recognise that unmet employment needs are considered to be addressed as part of the AAP process, following the adoption of this Local Plan.

We also support the recognition in paragraph 9.6 that states that Manor Royal is the focus for business led economic growth in the Borough and that the Main Employment Areas will be required to make effective use of the land within them.

The Northern West Sussex Area EGA (January 2020) shows that in a constrained land supply scenario, there is a need for 33ha of business land over the plan period, with an existing deficit of 21ha and 12ha identified in the Employment Land Trajectory (ELT).

We support the text in paragraph 9.10 which states that further growth would exist in an unconstrained land supply position, and that for employment land a Strategic Employment Location (SEL) to the north of Manor Royal and south and/or east of the Airport, would be the most likely location.

We also support paragraph 9.12 which states that given the limited land available, business land supply is not undermined. However, this does appear to be at odds with policy ST4 which safeguards further land for the potential delivery of the CWRR.

However, we do support the latter text in paragraph 9.12 relating to small extensions to Manor Royal which will be supported where they positively contribute to business-led economic growth.

Our client wishes to support the recognition of the Local Plan and the EGA, that in an unconstrained scenario 113 ha of B-class business land would be required. We therefore support paragraphs 9.13 and 9.14 which suggest a SEL in the AAP area would be the most appropriate area, as per the call for sites and the ELT. Whilst we note that in the immediate timeframe Crawley will work with other surrounding LPAs regarding its unmet need, we would also consider that the timeframe for the AAP is such that the need can be met locally if safeguarding is lifted.

Our specific comments on the policies within Economic Growth Chapter are as follows:

Policy EC1: Sustainable Economic Growth

We support the continued acknowledgement of Crawley's key role as a key economic driver in the Gatwick Diamond, and the current 21 ha deficit in a constrained land supply position. We also support the retention of the B-use classes within Manor Royal, and criteria iv) which supports small extensions to Manor Royal.

As stated previously, we also support the role of the AAP in principle to determine the location of any SEL. However, we urge this process to be completed as quickly as possible to provide clarity over the location of any proposals to meet unmet employment land need.

Listen Care



Innovate Lead



We consider that we could identify potentially 23.6 ha of land, providing between 49,000 sqm and 52,200 for B-use class floorspace as part of our site proposals, as considered in our initial indicative layouts. This considers both a CWRR scenario and a non CWRR scenario.

We would also wish to engage with CBC in further discussions to discuss this further, as the Local Plan Review and AAP progresses.

Policy EC2: Economic Growth in Main Employment Areas

We acknowledge the Council's commitment to retaining economic growth and supporting the economic function of the Borough's Main Employment Areas.

We support the recognition in the policy that, employment generating development is supported within the designated areas *"where it makes for an efficient use of land or buildings and contributes positively to sustainable economic growth [...] and to the overall economic function of Crawley."*

Policy EC3: Manor Royal & Policy EC4: Employment and Skills Development

We support these two policies however, we do wish to seek further clarification on how speculative development will be considered.

Chapter Fifteen: Policy SDC1 Sustainable Design & Construction

We acknowledge and support the requirements for new non-domestic development as set out in the policy, to ensure that development meets the 'minimum standard' of BREEAM Excellent for Energy and Water categories.

We acknowledge that development will need to actively seek to minimise energy consumption, in line with National planning policy requirements for tackling climate change. We note that within the policy, an Energy Hierarchy is provided which all development is required to follow in order to mitigate against climate change. This now includes specific reference to use of available roof-space for solar PV, where possible. Given the constrained land availability, we consider this to be appropriate, subject to detailed guidance in regard to proximity to the airport.

We also note that the policy has been amended to include more detail with regard to the cooling hierarchy, for adapting to the impact of climate change. This now sets out a requirement for energy efficient design and includes specific detail on how development can reduce heat entering a building during spells of hot weather.

Policy SDC2: District Energy networks

We support a requirement for major development proposals to incorporate an energy development strategy, in accordance with the hierarchy set out in the policy. This has already been integrated into our current proposals.

We also recognise that paragraph 15.33 identifies Manor Royal and Forge Wood as areas where district heating schemes development should be actively encouraged to meet demand and support proposals for *"additional large-scale development and possible linkages with Manor Royal"*.

Listen Care



Innovate Lead



However, no reference is made to the proposal for SEL to the north of Manor Royal and south and/or east of the Gatwick Airport, as set out in Chapter 9. Whilst this is likely to be addressed in the AAP process, we would seek assurance that any future development opportunity within the AAP would be considered.

SDC3: Tacking Water Stress

We recognise that Crawley sits within an area of serious water stress and that this is expected to worsen in the future as a result of climate change. Given this, we support the Council's decision to retain the existing Building Regulations 'optional' requirement of 110 litres/person/day, and if necessary, raise this in line with any tighter national standards introduced over the Plan period.

We also note that the policy text has been amended and now reads that *“development should plan positively to minimise its impact on water resources, including protecting against deteriorating water quality, and promote water efficiency”*.

We also acknowledge that this policy requires new non-residential buildings to meet the minimum stands for BREEAM 'Excellent' within the Water category. Again, this has been achieved in our current application.

Chapter Seventeen: Sustainable Transport

Policy ST4: Safeguarding of a search corridor for a CWRR

This policy is significant and relevant for our client's site. The identification of the indicative search corridor for the relief road, as shown on page 214 and on the Proposal Map, indicate that there is an area that will be safeguarded against all development throughout the plan period.

As stated in our Regulation 18 letter, the undulating shape of the search corridor safeguards against any development that will be incompatible with the future delivery of a full western relief road. However, it is unclear where the boundaries of the safeguarded area have come from and indeed the degree of land take that would be required in order to deliver the Crawley Western Relief Road (CWRR).

As stated above, we cannot find any further information in the evidence base that determines the need, scope or trajectory of the relief road, including the need for it to be in this location. In addition, the supporting text infers that the requirement is due to new development to the East of the town, in part at Kilnwood Vale however, this was permitted as part of the AAP with Horsham District Council and land was not at that time, indicated to be required to be safeguarded in this location.

Whilst we are aware that Horsham are going out for consultation on their Regulation 18 stage of the Local Plan (between 17th February and 3rd March 2020) and the strategic allocations for shortlisted sites include West of Ifield, this has not been confirmed as suitable nor is it adopted into policy. Therefore, we object to policy ST4 and consider it premature.

We would also note that whilst the issue of the AAP to the North of Manor Royal is left to after the adoption of the Local Plan, the boundaries in the Local Plan also cover much of the AAP area, and therefore this issue could be evidenced further and form part of the AAP, rather than under the Local Plan Review.

Listen Care



Innovate Lead



As you are aware, the safeguarding land impacts on the land that already has planning consent under the 2015 application, and the recent approval at Committee in January for a B8 development.

We have therefore sought Counsel advise on this matter and would welcome further dialogue with the Council in this regard. Their response reiterated the risks posed to our client's land and applications as a result of the safeguarding of land for a CWRR. The same conclusions were drawn for the risks posed to the wider Land Consortium as a result of the AAP however, we would seek to engage with the preparation of the AAP, following the adoption of the Local Plan Review.

Given the extent and boundary currently shown, the Land Consortium surrounding Jersey Farm would urgently seek further clarity as to why the boundary and land take would be needed. However, there is also concern over the principle of safeguarding for the land for a western relief road, given that it is not evident how such a development may, or could come forward in the Local Plan period.

Conclusions

We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on the Regulation 19 Consultation and would seek further to engage directly with the Council in regard to the key matters regarding the AAP, the Crawley Western Relief Road and general economic policies.

Should have any further questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S Holloway'.

Suzanne Holloway BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI
Partner
For and on behalf of Vail Williams LLP
Mob: 07796 938554
Email: sholloway@vailwilliams.com

Listen Care



Innovate Lead