



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/25/0037

Lock House, Lock, Partridge Green, West Sussex, RH13 8EG

DESCRIPTION:

Conversion of a single dwelling into 3no. dwellings and conversion of the existing garage block with flat into single dwelling. (Full Application).

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/24/1667	Conversion of a single dwelling to 5no. dwellings and conversion of the existing garage block with flat to single dwelling. (Full Application).	Application Refused on 17.01.2025
DC/24/1668	Conversion of a single dwelling to 5no. dwellings and conversion of the existing garage block with flat to single dwelling. (Listed Building Consent).	Application Refused on 17.01.2025

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The application site consists of a Grade II Listed Building positioned to the north-west of the access road, and located outside of any defined built-up area. The site is therefore located within the countryside in policy terms. The sites includes a number of detached buildings, swimming pool, and tennis court set within extensive grounds that slope to the south-east. Nearby residential properties are located at a distance of between 100m and 350m to the south-west and south-east respectively, with an area of woodland bounding the site to the north.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The application seeks full planning permission for the conversion of the existing dwelling to 3no. residential dwellings, along with the conversion of the existing garage to a single dwelling.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):

Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development

Policy 2 - Strategic Policy: Strategic Development

Policy 3 - Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy

Policy 4 - Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion

Policy 15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision

Policy 16 - Strategic Policy: Meeting Local Housing Needs

Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection

Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character

Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection

Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles
Policy 34 - Cultural and Heritage Assets
Policy 35 - Strategic Policy: Climate Change
Policy 36 - Strategic Policy: Appropriate Energy Use
Policy 37 - Sustainable Construction
Policy 38 - Strategic Policy: Flooding
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking

West Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan:

Policy 4 – Green Infrastructure: Existing Trees, Hedgerows, Habitats and Wildlife
Policy 9 – Car Parking

Paragraph 33 of the NPPF requires that all development plans complete their reviews no later than 5 years from their adoption. Horsham District Council is currently in the process of reviewing its development plan however at this stage the emerging policies carry only limited weight in decision making. As the HDPF is now over 5 years old, the most important policies for the determination of this application must be considered as to whether they are 'out of date' (NPPF paragraph 11d). This includes, for applications involving the provision of housing, whether the Council can demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (NPPF footnote 8).

The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, with the supply currently calculated as being 2.9 years. The presumption in favour of development within Paragraph 11d) of the NPPF therefore applies in the consideration of all applications for housing development within the District (unless footnote 7 or Paragraph 14 applies to relevant applications), with Policies 2, 4, 15 and 26 now carrying only moderate weight in decision making.

All other policies within the HDPF as itemised above have been assessed against the NPPF and are considered to be consistent such that they continue to attract significant weight in decision making.

Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19):

Strategic Policy 1: Sustainable Development
Strategic Policy 2: Development Hierarchy
Strategic Policy 3: Settlement Expansion
Strategic Policy 6: Climate Change
Strategic Policy 7: Appropriate Energy Use
Strategic Policy 8: Sustainable Design and Construction
Strategic Policy 9: Water Neutrality
Strategic Policy 10: Flooding
Strategic Policy 11: Environmental Protection
Strategic Policy 12: Air Quality
Strategic Policy 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Strategic Policy 14: Countryside Protection
Strategic Policy 15: Settlement Coalescence
Strategic Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 18: Local Green Space
Strategic Policy 19: Development Quality
Strategic Policy 20: Development Principles
Policy 21: Heritage Assets and Managing Change within the Historic Environment
Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport
Policy 25: Parking
Policy 32: Conversion of Agricultural and Rural Buildings to Commercial, Community and Residential Uses
Strategic Policy 37: Housing Provision
Strategic Policy 38: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Policy 40: Improving Housing Standards in the District

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

Planning Advice Notes:

Facilitating Appropriate Development
Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS RESPONSES

Where consultation responses have been summarised, it should be noted that Officers have had consideration of the full comments received, which are available to view on the public file at www.horsham.gov.uk

Consultations:

HDC Conservation: No Objection

Lock House is situated to the west of Partridge Green. The property is set within generous grounds located primarily to the southeast. The property is accessed via a driveway which follows the eastern boundary (it formally passed through the central archway of Gatehouse Cottages), with a second access to the west close to Grants Farmhouse itself (grade 2 listed).

Lock House is a grade 2 listed building, the main portion of which was constructed circa 1900 with further additions in the 1930's and then 1970's.

The application seeks to convert the existing property into 3 dwellings following the refusal of an earlier application for 5 dwellings. The house would be subdivided with parking for each unit, a private patio area and wider shared grounds. A new front door would be required for unit 3.

The justification for the conversion of the property relates to the lack of market demand for houses of this size, and the repair work that is required. Although the property is currently habitable it is understood that there is a need to replace the roof, replace windows, renew the heating system and replace the driveway as well as other works. Within the property there is evidence of water damage to some ceilings and externally some of the roofing tiles have failed.

The house has been marketed by different agents over some years and rented out. It has been marketed as a single dwelling, and also rented as such. The property was converted into a single dwelling after having been occupied as a convent.

As previously stated the optimum viable use for Lock House would be as a single dwelling. The property was built and designed as such, and the function and layout of its rooms supports its character as a large mansion house. As a single unit the grounds and outbuildings are utilised as a single entity without the additional demands of differing occupiers.

The change of use of the property into 3 units would result in harm to the listed building. As noted in the Heritage Statement "elements of the floor plan, including surviving aspects of the master/servant hierarchy, are still evident." As identified in the previous response these elements provide an insight into the rigid class system that still remained in place during the first decades of the 20th century, and this would be diluted as part of the proposal. By subdividing the property into 3 units an appreciation of the hierarchy of spaces would be reduced because the ability to move through the building would be lost. This would prevent an opportunity to experience the contrast between polite rooms and service spaces. It is acknowledged however that the lessening of the number of units (from 5 previously) would enable larger areas of the property to be experienced within each individual unit and that the harm would be less than previously identified.

It is recognised that the subdivision of the property would in general echo the evolution of the building and the important interiors would be within one unit. However, as previously identified it is not just the physical separation of the property that needs to be considered. Consideration needs to be given to the impact on the appreciation of the property and primarily its architectural, artistic and historic significance.

The associated domestic paraphernalia of three units and the differing desires, and independence of the occupiers would blur an appreciation of the building as a pre war county house, although this level would be less than previously applied for. As a country house the property would have had an active staff in addition to family occupiers and there would have been a level of traffic and activity associated with this.

Although as previously noted there is a danger that the level of activity, parking, and paraphernalia of daily living would result in the cohesiveness of the building as a single unit becoming eroded, it would be considered on balance that the proposed reduction in numbers would limit the pressure for incremental changes by individual occupiers.

If it is accepted that the retention of the property as a single unit cannot be realistically ensured, the subdivision of the property needs to be sensitive to the significance of the building and its use as a county house. On balance the subdivision into 3 units would be more conducive to the nature and character of the building enabling an appreciation of the building as a cohesive whole.

It would be considered that the optimum use of the property would be as a single dwelling which is why it would still be considered that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm (at the lower end of the scale) to the significance of the building. However the proposal should be balanced against the public benefit as per paragraph 215 of the NPPF. If it is accepted that the building can no longer be realistically occupied as a single dwelling house then there would be a public benefit in ensuring a viable future for the building. It would be suggested that the conversion into 3 dwellings would offer the opportunity of a viable future to the building whilst balancing the significance of the building.

No objection would be raised to the proposed works to the garage with flat above.

HDC Landscape Architect: Comments

Little to no visual change is anticipated to be noted from the development proposals from public right of way (PRoW) 2368 or from PRoW 1863. The changes are considered appropriate to the countryside location and reflective of the existing vernacular, therefore no concerns are raised with the principle of development or likely effects on the character of the site and wider area or visual amenity of the area.

Notwithstanding the above, the site abuts Ancient Woodland (AW) on the northeastern boundary, and therefore proposals must not cause loss or deterioration of this irreplaceable habitat that is highly significant to both the character and the ecological function of the area.

In addition, a Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan should be submitted in order to deliver the landscape strategy, which may be secured via condition.

NatureSpace: Comment

The type of development is not considered to be relevant to the District Licensing Scheme in this case, and consider there would be no likely impact on Great Crested Newts or their habitats. Therefore, no comments to make at this time.

Ecology Consultant: Comment

Have reviewed the Bat Building Inspection Report (Phlorum Limited, October 2024) relating to the likely impacts of development on designated sites, protected & Priority species and habitats, and identification of appropriate mitigation measures.

Note from the Bat Building Inspection Report (Phlorum Limited, October 2024) that Building B3 (section of main house) has moderate/high bat roost potential. However, we understand that the works are internal, affecting the ground and first floor staircase only and will not impact the upper floors or roof space of the building. We therefore support the non-licensed Precautionary Method Statement for bats in Sections 4.1 to 4.5 of the Bat Building Inspection Report (Phlorum Limited, October 2024). This should be secured by a condition of any consent.

Also note from the Bat Building Inspection Report (Phlorum Limited, October 2024) that a Brown Long-eared bat roost was identified in Building Two. However, no works are proposed for this building. We also note that Buildings B1 (northern aspect of main house), B4 (section of main house) and B5 (section of main house) have negligible bat roost potential. Therefore, agree that no further surveys with regard to bats and these buildings is required. Satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination.

The mitigation measures identified in the Bat Building Inspection Report (Phlorum Limited, October 2024) should be secured by a condition of any consent and implemented in full. This is necessary to conserve and enhance protected and Priority Species. Also support the proposed reasonable biodiversity enhancements for protected, Priority and threatened species, which have been recommended to secure net gains for biodiversity, as outlined under Paragraph 187d and 193d of the National Planning Policy

Framework (December 2024). The reasonable biodiversity enhancement measures should be outlined within a separate Biodiversity Enhancement Layout and should be secured by a condition of any consent.

Natural England: Further Information Required

The following information is required:

- A Habitats Regulations Assessment that considers the potential impacts of increased abstraction within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone (SNWSZ) on the Arun Valley designated sites.
- If a 'likely significant effect' cannot be ruled out, information should be provided demonstrating how the proposed development will not result in increased levels of abstraction within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone.

Without this information, Natural England may need to object to the proposal.

Southern Water: Comment

The Environment Agency should be consulted directly by the applicant regarding the use of a septic tank drainage which disposes of effluent to sub-soil irrigation.

The supporting documents make reference to drainage using Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Under certain circumstances SuDS will be adopted by Southern Water should this be requested by the developer. Where SuDS form part of a continuous sewer system, and are not an isolated end of pipe SuDS component, adoption will be considered if such systems comply with the latest Design and Construction Guidance (Appendix C) and CIRIA guidance.

WSCC Highways: Comment

The site is located on Lock Lane, a private road, consequently these comments are for advice only. Following an inspection of the application documents, WSCC in its role as Local Highway Authority (LHA) raises no highway safety concerns for this application.

The primary access is via Lock Lane which adjoins the public highway at Bines Road, a B-classified road subject to a speed restriction of 30 mph in this location. The private access is narrow with regular passing places. The site is prone to flooding few times a year due to the river Adur. During these times, the site is via a private access that adjoins the public highway at the A24.

There are no proposed changes to the existing access arrangements. An inspection of collision data provided to WSCC by Sussex Police from a period of the last five years reveals one recorded injury accident within the vicinity of the site. However, this was not attributed to the use of the site access or site operation. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest the site access has been operating unsafely, or that its continued use would exacerbate an existing safety concern.

The Transport Statement includes trip generation data ascertained from the TRICS database. The current use generates 49 two-way movements a day. The proposed use is estimated to generate 21 two-way movements a day, this is a reduction of 28 two-way movements a day. Therefore, the LHA are satisfied that the vehicular trips from the proposed use will not cause a material intensification of the local highway network.

The applicant proposes ten car parking spaces for this development. A development of this size in this location would require at least ten car parking spaces to WSCC Car Parking Standards. Therefore, the LHA is satisfied with the proposed level of parking provision.

A triple-bay garage will be lost as part of the proposals; however, the site exhibits sufficient room to accommodate parking on the existing hardstanding. From inspection of the plans, the proposed parking bays are suitably sized and on-site turning appears achievable. Secure cycle parking can be accommodated within existing storage areas.

The site is located within walking/cycling distance of Partridge Green where local services and amenities are located. Cycling is a viable option in the area. Regular buses are available from High Street. However, Lock Lane lacks footway or lighting so there may be some reliance on the private car.

The LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

WSCC Lead Local Flood Authority: No Objection

Due to the nature of the development, no objection on this occasion, as no increase in impermeable area is proposed.

WSCC Rights of Way: No Objection

Public Footpath 1863 runs along the drive to Lock House, in part, northwards from Lock Lane before diverging from the driveway to continue north-westwards through Grant's Copse. Public Bridleway 1864 runs along Lock Lane, generally west to east, from Lock House's driveway to the B2135.

The planning application makes little reference to the public rights of way running through the application site. It is understood that the application does not impact upon, or propose any alteration, to the Public Rights of Way (PROW). Therefore, the Public Rights of Way team offer no objection to the proposal.

Informative suggested.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:

Representations:

10 letters of Objection have been received from 8 addresses, objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Sporadic development in the countryside
- Visual intrusion into the countryside
- Increased traffic
- Impact on natural features
- Noise impacts
- Flood lighting impacts
- Detract from unique environment
- Overdevelopment
- Lack of diverse marketing
- Important features within building
- Subdivision would not represent a viable use
- Does not conform to Neighbourhood Plan
- Evidence on water use misleading
- Reliance on motor vehicles
- Impact on adjacent Listed Buildings
- Impact on wildlife
- Impact on public bridleway
- Insufficient benefits from subdivision
- Impact on visual amenity

Parish Comments:

West Grinstead Parish Council: No Objection

Subject to Conservation Officer's views/comments

Member Comments:

None received

HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUALITY:

The application has been considered having regard to Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act 1998, which sets out a person's rights to the peaceful enjoyment of property and Article 8 of the same Act, which sets out their rights in respect to private and family life and for the home. Officers consider that the proposal would not be contrary to the provisions of the above Articles.

The application has also been considered in accordance with Horsham District Council's public sector equality duty, which seeks to prevent unlawful discrimination, to promote equality of opportunity and to foster good relations between people in a diverse community, in accordance with Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. In this case, the proposal is not anticipated to have any potential impact from an equality perspective.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

Principle of Development:

The application site is located outside of a designated built-up area boundary and is therefore located within the countryside in policy terms. The site is located approximately 1.5km from the built-up area of Partridge Green, which is defined as a Medium Village under the settlement hierarchy. These settlements have a moderate level of services and facilities and community networks, together with some access to public transport. These settlements provide some day to day needs for residents, but rely on small market towns and larger settlements to meet a number of their requirements.

Policy 2 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) states that sustainable growth of the District will be met by focusing development in and around the key settlement of Horsham and allowing for growth in the rest of the District in accordance with the identified settlement hierarchy. This includes continuing to support in principle the sustainable development of settlements through an appropriate scale of development which retains the existing settlement pattern over the plan period, and managing development around the edges of existing settlements in order to prevent the merging of settlements and to protect the rural character and landscape.

Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF direct growth within the District and define the settlement hierarchy. Policy 3 outlines 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 in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. Policy 4 directs the growth of settlements outside of the built-up areas, and states that the expansion of settlements will be supported where: the site is allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan and adjoins an existing settlement edge; the level of expansion is appropriate to the scale and function of the settlement type; the development is demonstrated to meet the identified local housing need; the impact of the development individually or cumulatively does not prejudice comprehensive long term development in order not to conflict with the development strategy; and the development is contained within an existing defensible boundary and the landscape and townscape character features are maintained and enhanced.

In addition, Policy 26 of the HDPF outlines that outside built-up area boundaries, the rural character and undeveloped nature of the countryside will be protected against inappropriate development. Any proposal must be essential to its countryside location, and in addition, meet one of the following criteria: support the needs of agriculture or forestry; enable the extraction of minerals or the disposal of waste; provide for quiet informal recreational use; or enable the sustainable development of rural areas. In addition, proposals must be of a scale appropriate to its countryside character and location. Development will be considered acceptable where it does not lead, either individually or cumulatively, to a significant increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside, and protects, and/or conserves, and/or enhances, the key features and characteristics of the landscape character in which it is located.

Paragraph 83 of the NPPF states that "to promote development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby."

Paragraph 84 of the NPPF continues that "planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:

- a) there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;
- b) the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;

- c) the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;
- d) the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential dwelling; or
- e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it:
 - is truly outstanding or innovative, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and
 - would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

The term “isolated” is not defined within the National Planning Policy Framework, but case law has confirmed that it should be given its ordinary objective meaning of remote and far away from other places, buildings and people, and separate or remote from a settlement, services, and facilities. It was concluded in the Braintree Judgement that a settlement would not necessarily exclude a cluster of dwellings. The application site is located within close proximity to a number of residential dwellings and other buildings, and given this spatial context is not considered to be “isolated” in its truest sense, and does not therefore engage the considerations of paragraph 84.

The proposed development would be in conflict with the spatial strategy for housing within the development plan as set out in Policies, 2, 3, and 4 of the HDPF. In addition, the proposal would not meet any of the exceptions as identified within Policy 26 of the HDPF. It is however recognised that Policy 10 of the HDPF states that proposals for the conversion of rural buildings to business and commercial uses will be considered favourably over residential in the first instance.

The proposed development seeks to convert an existing residential dwelling to 3no. dwellings, with the conversion of a detached garage (with an existing flat above) to 1no. dwelling. The existing dwelling is a Grade II Listed Building, and represents a designated heritage asset. A single residential dwelling is considered to be the optimal use of the designated heritage asset, and while the proposal would subdivide the Listed Building, it is considered that the proposal would represent a viable use.

The proposal would involve the subdivision of an existing residential dwelling and residential outbuilding, in an area located outside of any defined built-up area boundary. While the subject dwelling is not considered to be isolated in the truest sense, the site is located within reasonable distance of the village centre of Partridge Green, which benefits from facilities, amenities, and services. The site is considered to be within a relatively sustainable location, where the proposed subdivision would contribute to an identified housing need. The principle of the development is therefore considered acceptable, subject to all other material considerations.

Design and Appearance:

Policies 25, 32, and 33 of the HDPF promote development that protects, conserves and enhances the landscape and townscape character from inappropriate development. Proposals should take into account townscape characteristics, with development seeking to provide an attractive, functional and accessible environment that complements the locally distinctive character of the district. Buildings should contribute to a sense of place, and should be of a scale, massing, and appearance that is of a high standard or design and layout which relates sympathetically to the landscape and built surroundings.

The proposed conversion of the main dwelling would result in no extensions to the building, with the internal subdivision of the spaces and minor alterations to the fenestration to install and replace windows and doors. The proposed alterations are considered to retain the overall character and appearance of the building, with the new windows and doors considered to be of a proportion and design that would sit comfortably within the context of the building.

The proposed conversion of the garage would infill north-eastern elevation, with the insertion of double doors opening to a kitchen/diner and 2no. bedrooms. It is however noted that these alterations are not reflected on the Proposed Elevations Plan. The proposal would retain the overall character of the building and would remain as a subservient building within the setting of the designated heritage asset.

For these reasons, the proposed development is considered to be of a design and appearance that would relate sympathetically to the characteristics and form of the host building, and the wider surroundings. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with the above policies.

Heritage:

Policy 34 of the HDPF recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and promotes positive management of heritage assets within the District. Development affecting heritage assets should reinforce the special character of the District's environment through appropriate siting, scale, form and design; including the use of traditional materials and techniques; and should make a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of the area. Development should preserve and ensure clear legibility of locally distinctive vernacular building forms and their settings, features, fabric, and materials. Policy 34 also recognises the importance of securing the viable and sustainable future of heritage assets through continued preservation by uses that are consistent with the significance of the heritage asset. Development should retain and improve the setting of heritage assets, including views, public rights of way, trees and landscape features.

Following consultation with the Design and Conservation Officer, Lock House is noted to be a Grade II listed building, the main portion of which was constructed circa 1900 with further additions in the 1930's and then 1970's. The application seeks to convert the existing property into 5 dwellings, with parking for each unit, a private patio area and shared grounds. The justification for the conversion of the property relates to the lack of market demand for houses of this size, and the repair work that is required. Although the property is currently habitable it is understood that there is a need to replace the roof, replace windows, renew the heating system and replace the driveway as well as other works. Within the property there is evidence of water damage to some ceilings and externally some of the roofing tiles have failed.

The house has been marketed by different agents over some years and rented out. It has been marketed as a single dwelling, and also rented as such. The property was converted into a single dwelling after having been occupied as a convent.

The optimum viable use of the building is considered to be as single dwelling. The property was built and designed as such, and the function and layout of its rooms supports its character as a large mansion house. As a single unit, the grounds and outbuildings are utilised as a single entity without the additional demands of differing occupiers.

The change of use of the property into 3no. units would result in harm to the Listed Building. As noted within the Heritage Statement, "elements of the floor plan, including surviving aspects of the master/servant hierarchy, are still evident". These elements provide an insight into the rigid class system that still remained in place during the first decades of the 20th century, and this would be diluted as part of the proposal. By subdividing the property into 3no. units, an appreciation of the hierarchy of spaces would be reduced because the ability to move through the building would be lost. This would prevent an opportunity to experience the contrast between polite rooms and service spaces. It is however acknowledged that the reduced number of units as now proposed, would enable larger areas of the property to be experienced within each individual unit, and that the harm would be less than previously identified.

It is recognised that the subdivision of the property would in general echo the evolution of the building and the important interiors would be within one unit. However, as previously identified it is not just the physical separation of the property that needs to be considered. Consideration needs to be given to the impact on the appreciation of the property and primarily its architectural, artistic and historic significance.

The associated domestic paraphernalia of three units and the differing desires, and independence of the occupiers would blur an appreciation of the building as a pre war county house, although this level would be less than previously applied for. As a country house the property would have had an active staff in addition to family occupiers and there would have been a level of traffic and activity associated with this. Although as previously noted there is a danger that the level of activity, parking, and paraphernalia of daily living would result in the cohesiveness of the building as a single unit becoming eroded, it would be considered on balance that the proposed reduction in numbers would limit the pressure for incremental changes by individual occupiers.

If it is accepted that the retention of the property as a single unit cannot be realistically ensured, the subdivision of the property needs to be sensitive to the significance of the building and its use as a county house. On balance the subdivision into 3 units would be more conducive to the nature and character of the building enabling an appreciation of the building as a cohesive whole.

It would be considered that the optimum use of the property would be as a single dwelling which is why it would still be considered that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm (at the lower end of the scale) to the significance of the building. However, the proposal should be balanced against the public benefit as per paragraph 215 of the NPPF. Evidence has been provided regarding the marketing

of the building as a single dwelling, where it has been shown that there has been limited interest. The conversion of the building to 3no. dwellings would secure the continued use of the building, where it's conversion would sufficiently retain the historic elements of the building. The development would contribute to the identified housing supply and would result in public benefit in this regard.

For these reasons, while the development would result in less than substantial harm, it is considered that the public benefits would outweigh this limited impact.

Residential Amenity:

Policy 32 of the HDPF states that development will be expected to provide an attractive, functional, accessible, safe, and adaptable environment that contribute a sense of place both in the buildings and spaces themselves. Policy 33 continues that development shall be required to ensure that it is designed to avoid unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupiers/users of nearby property and land.

The proposed subdivision would be designed and laid out to limit potential overlooking and loss of privacy between the properties, with sufficient distance retained between the principal dwelling and adjacent detached garage to limit overlooking and loss of privacy. Furthermore, it is considered that the site is well contained and set away from nearby residential properties so that the proposal would not result in harm to the amenities of nearby residential properties through overlooking, loss of privacy, or loss of natural light.

It is noted that a number of objections have been received raising concerns with increased traffic and loss of amenity. While it is acknowledged that the subdivision of the property and conversion of the garage would increase the number of dwellings provided on the site, it is not considered that the proposal would result in a greater number of vehicle movements or level of activity over and above the existing situation. It is not therefore considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable level of noise and disturbance, nor detrimental impact on the accessibility and usability of the Public Rights of Way.

For these reasons, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties, nor users of nearby land, in accordance with the above policies.

Highways Impacts:

Policies 40 and 41 of the HDPF promote development that provides safe and adequate access, suitable for all users.

The proposal would utilise the existing access from Lock Lane which extends from the B2135. Following consultation with WSCC Highways, it is noted that the required visibility splays are achievable in both directions, with no evidence to suggest that the access junction has been operating unsafely. The proposal would result in no greater vehicle movements than the existing situation, and it is not considered that the proposal would result in a material intensification of the local highway network.

A sufficient level of parking would be provided at the site, and it is not anticipated that the proposal would result in overspill parking onto the public highway.

For these reasons, the proposal is considered to accord with the above policies.

Ecology:

Policy 31 of the HDPF states that development will be supported where it demonstrates that it maintains or enhances the existing network of green infrastructure. Development proposals will be required to contribute to the enhancement of existing biodiversity and should create and manage new habitats where appropriate.

Circular 06/2005 identifies that the presence of protected species is a material consideration when considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat. Therefore, it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed application, is established before planning permission is granted. Information on biodiversity impacts and opportunities should inform all stages of development, and an ecological survey is usually necessary where the type and location of development are such that the impact on biodiversity may be significant and existing information is lacking or inadequate.

The Applicant has submitted a Bat Building Inspection Report reference 13324 V2 by Phlorum dated October 2024. This outlines that parts of the subject dwelling have been assessed as having negligible

potential to support roosting bats, with bats found to be present in the central section of the subject building. In addition, the southern section of the main building has therefore been assessed as having moderate/high potential to support roosting bats. The Report outlines that as works are proposed to the ground and first floor only, which may cause minor disturbance to bats, the level of disturbance is not considered to be significant. The Report recommends that any works to renovate the internal areas of the building commence outside of the hibernation period, and that a suitably licenced Ecologist should oversee the start of the works and reinspect the southern part of the building. Enhancements are also recommended in the form of bat boxes.

Following consultation with the Council's Ecologist, it is considered that sufficient ecological information has been provided for determination. The mitigation measures identified in the Report are considered appropriate and would be secured by condition. In addition, the biodiversity enhancement measures are supported. Subject to the securing the mitigation and enhancement measures by condition, there are no ecology concerns raised.

Water Neutrality:

The application site falls within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone as defined by Natural England which draws its water supply from groundwater abstraction at Hardham. Natural England has issued a Position Statement for applications within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone which states that it cannot be concluded with the required degree of certainty that new development in this zone would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites.

Natural England advises that plans and projects affecting sites where an existing adverse effect is known will be required to demonstrate, with sufficient certainty, that they will not contribute further to an existing adverse effect. The received advice note advises that the matter of water neutrality should be addressed in assessments to agree and ensure that water use is offset for all new developments within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone.

The Applicant has submitted a Water Neutrality Statement dated 08.01.2025. The Water Neutrality Statement outlines that the proposed development would comprise the following units:

- 2no. 3-bed dwellings
- 2no. 5-bed dwellings

Based upon Building Regulations, the water demand for each dwelling is calculated to be 125 litres per person per day. Based on average occupancy levels, the water demand for the dwellings is calculated to be as follows:

- 617.5 litres per day (2.47 occupancy per dwelling)
- 772.5 litres per day (3.09 occupancy per dwelling)

The total water demand for the proposed development is therefore calculated to be 1,390 litres per day.

It is proposed to reduce the water consumption of the proposed dwellings to 110 litres per person per day, where this would be compliant with Policy 37 of the HDPF. Based on the above average occupation levels, the resulting water demand would be as follows:

- 543.4 litres per day
- 679.8 litres per day

The total water demand for the proposed development would therefore be 1,223.2 litres per day.

The Water Neutrality Statement outlines that the site comprises a 14-bed dwelling and 1 -bed flat, along with inside and outside swimming pools. Appendix C of the Water Neutrality Statement refers to an Existing Flow Survey carried out at the site. This indicates a water demand of 140.3 litres per person per day. The total water demand is calculated on the basis of 11 individuals occupying the 14-bed dwelling, where it is suggested that the existing water demand equates to 1,543.3 litres per day. Appendix C refers to the water usage of the existing swimming pool, outlining that the water demand equates to 240 litres per day.

The average occupancy figure of 1.32 has been applied to demonstrate the water demand arising from the existing flat on the application site. It is outlined that the demand arising from this residential unit is 149.49 litres per day. The use of average occupancy figures to demonstrate existing baseline does not accord with the Council's accepted methodology, and it is unclear whether the water demand as evidenced by the Check Meter includes this existing flat. There is uncertainty whether this figure reflects the actual

water consumption at the site, where the Statement outlines that this is currently vacant. It is therefore excluded from the overall calculation.

The Statement also refers to an office, where it is outlined that 4 individuals occupy this. The baseline water demand given is 51.5 litres per person per day, where the total demand is calculated to be 206 litres per day. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that this office use takes place and that the stated number of individuals occupy the office. There is therefore uncertainty with this figure and it is therefore excluded from the overall calculation.

Based upon the exclusions as outlined, the total water demand arising from the dwelling and indoor swimming pool equates to 1,783.3 litres per day.

It is noted that the Applicant has confirmed that a Check Meter was installed on 23.01.2025, where the metre was recorded on 30.01.2025 to read 20 cubic metres. The Applicant outlines that this equates to roughly 20,000 litres of water consumed in 7 days, or 2,850 litres per day. While this does evidence a greater water demand than that calculated about, it is acknowledged that this is only a small snapshot in time and has not been evidenced over a three-month period. It cannot therefore be relied upon to demonstrate a greater water demand than calculated from the Flow Survey.

For the above reasons, the overall existing baseline is therefore considered to amount to 1,783.3 litres per day.

The Water Neutrality Statement relies on an existing baseline calculated on the basis of 11 individuals occupying the site, along with the demand arising from an indoor swimming pool. The demand is based off an Existing Flow Survey which has calculated the demand to be 1,783.3 litres per day.

The proposal seeks to meet the optional Building Regulation standard of 110 litres per person per day, where this would be compliant with Policy 37 of the HDPF. Based upon the installation of water efficient fixtures and fittings to achieve 110 litres per person per day, the overall demand from the development would amount to 1,223.2 litres per day. The resulting demand would therefore be less than the existing water demand without additional mitigation beyond the policy compliant optional Building Regulation standard.

For this reason, the development has been screened out as there is no clear or compelling evidence to suggest the nature and scale of the proposed development would result in a more intensive occupation of the site necessitating an increased consumption of water that would result in a significant impact on the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. The grant of planning permission would not therefore adversely affect the integrity of these sites or otherwise conflict with policy 31 of the HDPF, NPPF paragraph 194 and the Council's obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

Drainage and Flood Risk:

Policy 38 of the HDPF states that development proposal will follow a sequential approach to flood risk management, giving priority to development sites with the lowest risk of flooding and making required development safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Paragraph 174 states that the sequential test should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding, except in situations where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates that no built development within the site boundary, including access or escape routes, land raising or other potentially vulnerable elements, would be located on an area that would be at risk of flooding from any source, now and in the future.

Paragraph 175 continues that the sequential test should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding, except in situations where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates that no built development within the site boundary, including access or escape routes, land raising or other potentially vulnerable elements, would be located on an area that would be at risk of flooding from any source, now and in the future (having regard to potential changes in flood risk).

Paragraph 181 of the NPPF continues that when determining any application, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should also be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment. Development should only be allowed in areas at risk

of flooding where, in the light of this assessment (and the sequential and exception tests, as applicable) it can be demonstrated that:

- a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location;
- b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment;
- c) it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate;
- d) any residual risk can be safely managed; and
- e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.

The Applicant has provided a Flood Risk Assessment which outlines that the application dwelling and outbuilding are located within Flood Zone 1, with part of the access (namely Lock Lane) and associated bridge located within Flood Zone 3. The Assessment states that the flood plain and occasionally Lock Lane, are flooded as part of the Adur North strategy of preventing flooding in Steyning, Bramber and Shoreham when high levels of rainfall coincide with high tide. It is stated that in the event the access is flooded, an alternative rear access directly onto the A24 off Grinders Lane is available. It is stated that Lock House has a specific right of way over this route. The Report concludes that the development is at very low risk to fluvial flooding, low risk from groundwater flooding, and negligible risk of surface water flooding.

It is noted that the site benefits from a secondary access which falls outside of the Flood Zone. This would provide safe access in the event of flooding of the primary access, and is considered sufficient so that no concerns in respect of flooding are raised.

Climate Change:

Policies 35, 36 and 37 require that development mitigates to the impacts of climate change through measures including improved energy efficiency, reducing flood risk, reducing water consumption, improving biodiversity and promoting sustainable transport modes. These policies reflect the requirements of Chapter 14 of the NPPF that local plans and decisions seek to reduce the impact of development on climate change. The proposed development includes the following measures to build resilience to climate change and reduce carbon emissions:

- Requirement to provide full fibre broadband site connectivity
- Dedicated refuse and recycling storage capacity
- Cycle parking facilities
- Electric vehicle charging points

Subject to these conditions the application will suitably reduce the impact of the development on climate change in accordance with local and national policy.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG):

Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021) mandates that every development must achieve at least a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) (unless the development qualifies as exempt under the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024) and that every planning permission granted for the development of land in England shall be deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that development must not be begun unless a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority and the planning authority has approved the Plan.

The Applicant has demonstrated that the development is exempt from the requirement to achieve a minimum 10% BNG as the development qualifies as 'de minimis' under Regulation 4 of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024.

Conclusions:

The proposed development would convert the Grade II Listed Building to 3no. dwellings, along with the conversion of an existing garage building with flat to 1no. residential dwelling. The proposal would secure

the continued viable use of the designated heritage asset and would contribute toward the identified housing need within the District. These would result in public and social benefits that are of weight in the planning balance, and these are considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm as identified.

The proposal would not result in harm to the amenities of neighbouring residential properties and users or land, and would not result in harm to the function and safety of the public highway network. In addition, the proposal would be water neutral, and would not result in adverse harm to habitats and priority species.

For these reasons, the proposed development is considered acceptable, in accordance with relevant local and national planning policies.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

Horsham District Council has adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule which took effect on 1st October 2017.

It is considered that this development constitutes CIL liable development.

Use Description	Proposed	Existing	Net Gain
District Wide Zone 1	2030.46	2030.46	0
	Total Gain		
	Total Demolition		

Please note that the above figures will be reviewed by the CIL Team prior to issuing a CIL Liability Notice and may therefore change.

Exemptions and/or reliefs may be applied for up until the commencement of a chargeable development.

In the event that planning permission is granted, a CIL Liability Notice will be issued thereafter. CIL payments are payable on commencement of development.

Recommendation: Application Permitted

Conditions:

- 2 **Standard Time Condition:** The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 3 **Pre-Commencement (Slab Level) Condition:** No development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy for Protected and Priority species has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The content of the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy shall include the following:

- (a) Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed enhancement measures;
- (b) Detailed designs to achieve stated objectives;
- (c) Locations of proposed enhancement measures by appropriate maps and plans;
- (d) Persons responsible for implementing the enhancement measures;
- (e) Details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant).

The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

Reason: As these matters are fundamental to safeguard the ecology and biodiversity of the area in accordance with Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), and to enhance Protected and Priority Species/habitats and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority Habitats & Species).

- 4 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be first occupied until full details of all hard and soft landscaping works shall have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include plans and measures addressing the following:

- (a) Details of all existing trees and planting to be removed and retained
- (b) Details of all proposed trees and planting, including schedules specifying species, planting size, densities and plant numbers and tree pit details
- (c) Details of all hard surfacing materials and finishes

The approved landscaping scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details within the first planting season following the first occupation of any part of the development. Unless otherwise agreed as part of the approved landscaping, no trees or hedges on the site shall be wilfully damaged or uprooted, felled/removed, topped or lopped without the previous written consent of the Local Planning Authority until 5 years after completion of the development. Any proposed or retained planting, which within a period of 5 years, dies, is removed, or becomes seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development that is sympathetic to the landscape and townscape character and built form of the surroundings, and in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 5 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a landscape management and maintenance plan (including long term design objectives, management responsibilities, a description of landscape components, management prescriptions, maintenance schedules and accompanying plan delineating areas of responsibility) for all communal landscape areas has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscape areas shall thereafter be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development and in the interests of visual amenity and nature conservation in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 6 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a plan showing the layout of the proposed development and the provision of car parking spaces for vehicles has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling (or use) hereby permitted shall be occupied or use hereby permitted commenced until the parking spaces associated with it have been provided in accordance with the approved details. The areas of land so provided shall thereafter be retained for the parking of vehicles.

Reason: To ensure that adequate and satisfactory provision is made for the parking of vehicles clear of all highways in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015)

- 7 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a fast charge electric vehicle charging point for that dwelling has been installed. As a minimum, the charge point specification shall be 7kW mode 3 with type 2 connector. The means for charging electric vehicles shall be thereafter retained as such.

Reason: To mitigate the impact of the development on air quality within the District and to sustain compliance with and contribute towards EU limit values or national objectives for pollutants in accordance with Policies 24 & 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 8 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until details of secure and covered cycle parking facilities for the occupants of, and visitors to, the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied or use hereby permitted commenced until the approved cycle parking facilities associated with that dwelling or use have been fully implemented and made available for use. The provision for cycle parking shall thereafter be retained for use at all times.

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate provision for the parking of cycles in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 9 **Regulatory Condition:** The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the ecological mitigation and enhancement measures set out in Bat Building Inspection Report reference 13324 V2 by Phlorum dated October 2024.

Reason: As these matters are fundamental to safeguard the ecology and biodiversity of the area in accordance with Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), and to enhance Protected and Priority Species/habitats and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority Habitats & Species).

- 10 **Regulatory Condition:** The dwelling(s) hereby permitted shall meet the optional requirement of building regulation G2 to limit the water usage of each dwelling to no more than 110 litres per person per day. The subsequently installed water limiting measures shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: To limit water use in order to improve the sustainability of the development in accordance with Policy 37 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 11 **Regulatory Condition:** No external lighting or floodlighting shall be installed other than with the permission of the Local Planning Authority by way of formal application.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the locality and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 12 **Regulatory Condition:** All building works, finishes, and making-good, both internal and external, shall match the relevant existing work in respect of method, detail, and finished appearance unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Where new materials are to be used externally, the colour match shall make allowance for future weathering.

Reason: To ensure that the significance of the designated heritage asset, and the character, appearance and integrity of the building, is not prejudiced, thereby preserving the special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, and to comply with Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 13 **Regulatory Condition:** The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the Flood Emergency/Evacuation Plan reference AEG6137_RH13_Partridge Green_07 by aegaea dated 17.11.2024.

Reason: To the reduce risk of flooding in accordance Policy 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 14 **Regulatory Condition:** No new plumbing, pipes, soil stacks, flues, vents, ductwork or the like, shall be fixed to any external face of the building other than as shown on the drawings hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure that the significance of the designated heritage asset, and the character, appearance and integrity of the building, is not prejudiced, thereby preserving the special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, and to comply with Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

15 **Regulatory Condition:** All new partitions shall be scribed around existing ornamental mouldings.

Reason: To ensure that the significance of the designated heritage asset, and the character, appearance and integrity of the building, is not prejudiced, thereby preserving the special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, and to comply with Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

POSITIVE AND PROACTIVE STATEMENT

Statement pursuant to Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received, in order to be able to, where possible, grant permission.

Plans list for: DC/25/0037

Schedule of plans/documents **approved:**

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Plans	Garage and Flat Block Proposed	NONE	27.01.2025
Floor plan	Proposed Basement	NONE	13.01.2025
Supporting Docs	Flood Emergency/Evacuation Plan by aegaea dated 17.11.2024	AEG6137_RH13_P artridge Green_07	13.01.2025
Floor plan	Proposed Second No Change	NONE	13.01.2025
Floor plan	Proposed Basement	NONE	13.01.2025
Floor plan	Proposed Garage and Flat	NONE	13.01.2025
Location plan		NONE	13.01.2025
Supporting Docs	Bat Building Inspection Report by Phlorum dated October 2024	NONE	13.01.2025
Elevation plan	Existing and Proposed West	NONE	20.01.2025
Floor plan	Proposed Ground	NONE	20.01.2025
Elevation plan	Proposed North and South	NONE	20.01.2025
Floor plan	Proposed First	NONE	20.01.2025
Floor plan	Proposed First	NONE	20.01.2025
Floor plan	Proposed Ground	NONE	20.01.2025
Elevation plan	Existing and Proposed East	NONE	20.01.2025
Plans	Existing and Proposed Windows	NONE	16.01.2025

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Tamara Dale Date: 20.02.2025

Authorising Officer sign/initial RHERMITAGE Date: 07.03.2025
