



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/25/2133

Beckley Stud , Reeds Lane, Southwater, West Sussex, RH13 9DQ

DESCRIPTION:

Erection of a new storage building and associated hardstanding and the retention of existing installed hardstanding.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/18/1622	Removal of existing mobile home and positioning of new mobile home (retrospective). Construction of 1.8m fencing along eastern/southern boundaries along with brick pillars and gates to entrance (retrospective). Proposed construction of 1.5m high fence along eastern/northern boundaries.	Application Permitted on 17.02.2020
DC/18/1826	Erection of a 60m x 30m sand school.	Application Permitted on 09.11.2018
DC/19/0278	Demolition of existing stable and erection of stables	Application Permitted on 06.08.2019
DC/20/0613	Retention and completion of horse walker with barn shelter and adjacent turnout pen	Application Permitted on 05.08.2020
DC/20/0615	Retention of bund	Application Permitted on 05.08.2020
DC/22/0388	Retention of existing green steel clad building and mono-pitch lean-to for storage and distribution use by Equine America UK and resulting mixed use of Beckley Stud as a whole for equestrian, residential and commercial purposes	Application Refused on 15.03.2023
DC/22/0565	Temporary retention of storage containers at Beckley Stud for a two year period	Application Refused on 15.03.2023
DC/25/1444	Change of Use of Equestrian Stables to Offices (Class E), including the enclosure of the existing stable roof overhang.	Under Consideration
DC/25/1494	Retention of an outbuilding for incidental domestic storage (Retrospective).	Application Permitted on 04.12.2025
DC/25/2023	Variation of condition 10 of previously approved application reference DC/22/0388 (Retention of existing green steel clad building and mono-pitch lean-to for storage and distribution use by Equine America UK and resulting mixed use of Beckley Stud as a whole for equestrian, residential and commercial purposes) relating to BNG measures.	Under Consideration

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

Beckley Stud is located on the corner of Colstaple Lane and Reeds Lane, the site is accessed via Reeds Lane. The site is stated as being a mixed-use equestrian and commercial enterprise, with a rural workers dwelling also present. The wider site contains storage buildings, stables and other

equestrian related development. Beyond the site dwellinghouses are set sporadically along Coltstaple Lane and Reeds Lane. To the southeast of the site, across the A24 lies Southwater.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The application seeks consent for the erection of a storage building on the site of an existing sand school. The storage building would have a footprint of approximately 45m x 35m, with an eaves height of 5.5m and a ridge height of 8.47m. The building would be clad in green steel sheeting with a grey corrugated roof.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):

Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development
Policy 3 - Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy
Policy 7 - Strategic Policy: Economic Growth
Policy 9 - Employment Development
Policy 10 - Rural Economic Development
Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection
Policy 29 - Equestrian Development
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

Southwater Neighbourhood Plan

Policy SNP1 – Core Principles
Policy SNP16 - Design
Policy SNP21 – A Growing Economy

Southwater Parish Design Statement

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

Policy 1: Sustainable Development
Policy 2: Development Hierarchy
Policy 6: Climate Change
Policy 7: Appropriate Energy Use
Policy 8: Sustainable Design and Construction
Policy 9: Water Neutrality
Policy 10: Flooding
Policy 11: Environmental Protection
Policy 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 14: Countryside Protection
Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 19: Development Quality
Policy 20: Development Principles
Policy 21: Heritage Assets and Managing Change within the Historic Environment
Policy 24: Sustainable Transport
Policy 25: Parking

Policy 29: New Employment
Policy 30: Enhancing Existing Employment
Policy 31: Rural Economic Development
Policy 33: Equestrian Development

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:

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

HDC Conservation: The proposed building will not harm the setting of listed buildings.

HDC Environmental Health: No comments.

HDC Landscape Architect: Due to the scale and incremental change experienced within the site, the proposed development is considered to give rise to adverse effects on the landscape character and visual amenity of the area. If the proposed development meets the essential to its countryside location provisos within HDPF 26, we recommend the reduction in size of the storage barn is explored and that mitigation measures, such as reinforcement of periphery planting and building materials to soften its appearance.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

Ecology Consultant: The mitigation measures identified in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Leith Ecology Consulting, December 2025) should be secured by a condition of any consent and implemented in full. This is necessary to conserve and enhance protected and Priority species particularly those recorded in the locality, including bats. Impacts will be minimised such that the proposal is acceptable, subject to recommended conditions.

Southern Water: Comment in respect of SuDS and soakaways.

WSCC Highways: The LHA previously provided comment on this application, dated 22/01/2026, requesting that a referenced "Transport Assessment" be submitted for review. The applicant has submitted a Transport Statement prepared by GTA Civils & Transport. However, would note that this appears to have been prepared for a previous application at this site, so the figures and data contained within are not necessarily relevant to the current proposals.

Request the applicant provide up to date information in regard to the anticipated transport impacts the proposed development will have. Namely the anticipated number of vehicle movements the proposed use will generate and the types of vehicles that will be using the existing vehicle access point. Appreciate that the site currently generates vehicle movements as existing, so a comparison between the existing and proposed uses in terms of vehicle use and movements would be beneficial in aiding the LHA to assess the proposals.

WSCC Lead Local Flood Authority: The Applicant has stated in their cover letter that a SuDS system is proposed to manage surface water for the development. However, cannot locate a drainage strategy on the planning portal.

Representations:

8 representations were received (from 5 individual addresses) objecting to the application for the following reasons: -

- Cumulative impact of development with different red line boundaries / conditions.
- Inappropriate development in the countryside.
- Harm to landscape character.
- Increased vehicular movements and impact on surrounding country roads.

- Impact on the setting of listed buildings.
- Inaccuracies on the submitted plans.

Parish Comments:

Objection: -

- Insufficient information for Sustainable Drainage system and compliance with national recommendations.
- Unacceptable development within the countryside and extensive increase in traffic generation.
- Overdevelopment of the site within the countryside.
- Increased traffic generation.

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

Policy 2 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (the HDPF) establishes that development should be focused in and around Horsham. Policy 26 states that outside of built-up area boundaries, a proposal must be essential to its countryside location, and must: 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 the area.

The Design & Access Statement sets out that the Beckley Stud site provides Equine America with a bespoke research and development facility to test and improve products, as well as a storage and distribution facility for the equine products. The separate covering letter provided by Equine America states that the scheme entails 'a storage and logistics only facility'.

As part of an earlier appeal on the site for a storage building (in the north-eastern corner of the site) the Inspector stated: -

"The Appellant owns a number of horses and at Beckley Stud has focused on the breeding and training of exceptional racehorses along with box rest and racehorse recuperation. Beckley Stud was first established to develop a successful breeding program to produce elite homebred British sports horses. It has a longstanding working relationship with The Billy Stud, a local stud farm. Alongside the breeding, training and rearing of horses at Beckley Stud, the Appellant runs EA. Since EA has taken ownership of the appeal site, these primary functions remain unchanged, and Beckley Stud continues to operate as a breeding facility working in partnership with The Billy Stud.

Beckley Stud provides EA with a bespoke research and development facility to test and improve our products. Beckley Stud continues to be a working equestrian facility complete with stables, sand school, and fields. It is home to a variety of horses, ponies and foals which compete and train across multiple disciplines, which makes it ideally

situated to trial new supplements and optimises existing products to ensure that EA supplies high quality equine products to the industry”.

The proposed development entails a new storage building sited on the existing sand school. The preceding appeal decision considered that the Beckley Stud represented a ‘*working equestrian facility complete with stables, sand school, and fields*’. The storage building would be sited on the existing sand school, which would be lost as a result of the proposal.

Policy 10 of the HDPF supports development in the countryside that sustains social and economic activity. It states that such development should be appropriate to the location and should contribute to farming enterprises in the district or the wider rural economy and/or promote recreation in, and the enjoyment of, the countryside.

It is not clear from the submission what equestrian activity remains at the site, with a separate application also under consideration for conversion of the existing stable block (in its entirety) to offices (ref: DC/25/1444). The absence of a sand school and any stables would clearly limit the continued use of the site for horse breeding and training purposes.

The preceding Inspector considered a separate storage building to be an acceptable form of ‘*diversification*’ and to relate to the wider equestrian activities taking place on the site. This was though for a significantly smaller scale of development which although at odds with the Council’s original decision, could be deemed as being complimentary to a rural based enterprise.

In contrast, the scale of the proposed development and its intended storage use would represent a significant change to the balance of uses across the site. It is considered that the scale and nature of the proposed development is such that there would be a material change in the character of the use taking place on the site, which rather than being an equestrian led facility would be dominated by non-equestrian activities. The storage of goods for the equestrian market does not necessitate a countryside location and there is no evidence to suggest this storage is directly linked to any equestrian activity remaining on the Beckley Stud site.

Policy 10 of the HDPF is also clear that countryside development must be contained where possible in suitably located buildings which are appropriate for conversion; or, result in substantial environmental improvement and reduce the impact on the countryside.

The application does not include any measures which could be considered a substantial environmental improvement. Policy 10 is also clear that the conversion of suitably located buildings must be considered first. There is no evidence to suggest a lack of available storage buildings within the immediate vicinity and there is no substantive evidence to demonstrate how this element of Policy 10 has been effectively considered.

The principle of the proposed use in this location therefore raises conflict with Policies 10 and 26 of the HDPF.

Landscape Character

Policy 25 of the HDPF requires that the natural environment and landscape character of the District, including the landscape, landform and development pattern, together with protected landscapes and habitats will be protected against inappropriate development.

Policy 26 of the HDPF states that outside built up area boundaries, the rural character and undeveloped nature of the countryside will be protected against inappropriate development. In addition, proposals must be of a scale appropriate to its countryside character and location, and not lead, either individually or cumulatively to a significant increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside and protects and / or conserve, enhances key features and characteristics of the landscape character in which it is located.

The site is located within both M1 Crabtree & Nuthurst Ridges & Ghylls and H1 Southwater & Christs Hospital Farmlands Landscape Character Areas as defined in the Horsham District Landscape

Character Assessment (2003). Nevertheless, the site and surrounding area is more closed aligned and representative of the key characteristics found within M1 Landscape Character Area (LCA).

The overall landscape character of M1 LCA is described as *a well wooded and enclosed landscape of steep wooded ridges and ghylls, as well as small valleys situated on the Tunbridge Wells sand. (...) It has a strong network of small to large sized woods, shaws and hedgerows, which enclose mainly small pasture fields. As result views are generally very confined, (...) Farmland ponds, hedgerow oaks and steep winding lanes are also distinctive features. Despite some localised suburban pressures the area retains a strong rural unspoilt character.*

Key characteristics found within the site and its context include:

- Steep wooded ridges and ghylls
- Strong pattern of woodlands, shaws and hedgerows,
- Ancient hedgerow oaks
- Small to medium size irregular and regular shaped pasture fields
- Field ponds
- Dispersed settlement patterns of farmsteads
- Confined views
- Traditional building materials

Relevant key issues identified include *decline in hedgerow management associated with expansion of horse paddocks and introduction of suburban features in localised area, e.g. intrusive gates, fences.*

The overall sensitivity to change *is high due to the many landscape qualities of the area and include incremental improvements to the character of minor roads, suburbanisation.*

Planning and Land Management Guidelines recommend:

- *Conserve the strongly rural unspoilt character*
- *Ensure any development responds to design and materials. Infill development between looseknit groups of cottages along lanes would erode character*
- *Conserve the strong pattern of woodland, shaws and hedgerows through coppice management, planting and natural regeneration*
- *Encourage the planting of tree groups around modern farm buildings*

The Design & Access Statement does not refer the landscape character assessment, essentially considering that the building would not appear isolated, being located amongst an existing cluster and this together with existing screening would be sympathetic to the surrounding built and natural environment. This view is not accepted.

It is considered that the proposed building would be clearly experienced from the public footpath and surrounding lanes through the intervening vegetation, which is deciduous in nature and therefore scarce in winter. The development would be of a scale which would dominate existing surrounding buildings on the site, which are more reflective of a rural equestrian enterprise, and would lead to an appreciable erosion of the rural character of the site and surrounding area.

While the Design & Access Statement suggests additional landscaping could be provided ('if necessary') none has been included as part of the submission. In any case, reinforcement of boundary planting could not be relied upon in perpetuity, and native planting would inevitably result in clearer views across the site during certain times of the year. It is not therefore considered that additional planting could overcome fundamental concerns relating to the scale and design of the proposed development.

The proposed building would give rise to adverse effects to the character and visual amenity of the area due to its scale and loss of tranquillity as result of the increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside location, contrary to the above policies.

Design and Appearance

Policy 32 of the HDPF states that good design is a key element in sustainable development and seeks to ensure that development promotes a high standard of urban design, architecture and landscape. Policy 33 of the HDPF states that development proposals should make efficient use of land, integrate effectively with the character of the surrounding area, use high quality and appropriate materials, retain landscaping where feasible (and mitigate loss if necessary) and ensure no conflict with the character of the surrounding town or landscape.

The scale of the proposed building would introduce a dominant feature to the site and surrounding landscape, and there would be a reasonable expectation that the design acknowledge this impact and seek to reflect a more rural vernacular. However, while modern agricultural-style buildings would not be unexpected in a rural location such as this the proposed storage building is of no particular design merit, and the possibility of a more natural finish, such as timber cladding to the elevations, to soften its impact does not appear to have been explored.

The building is not and cannot be screened from all views, and these concerns support the landscape consideration set out above, and the proposed scale and design of the development conflicts with the aims of the above policies.

The application also seeks retention of hardstanding which has been created at the site. The hardstanding covers a substantial area and is subject of an enforcement notice requiring its removal, with this notice also requiring the removal of storage containers which have been sited above the hardstanding. While, in isolation of the containers the hardstanding is not particularly visible from outside of the site boundaries its presence would (potentially) facilitate outdoor storage which could result in harm to landscape character and visual amenity. The presence of the hardstanding also reinforces concerns relating to the proliferation of built-form and incremental development at the site, the cumulative impact of which leads to the landscape and design concerns set out above.

Newfoundout East, located on the opposite side of Reeds Lane, and Kings Farmhouse on the opposite side of Coltstaple Lane are Grade II listed buildings. It is considered that despite the landscape and design concerns, the separation distances between the proposed building and these heritage assets is such that there is no adverse impact on their setting or significance. As such no conflict with Policy 34 of the HDPF has been identified.

Residential Amenity

Policy 33(2) of the HDPF states that development will be permitted if it does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupiers or users of nearby properties and land. A number of representations have been received raising concerns relating to noise and general disturbance, with noise from barking dogs a particular concern.

There are multiple existing planning permissions on the site with further planning applications under consideration for further development. Within this there are several different red lines denoting the extent of development proposals, with, for example, the current application having a different red line to the proposed stable conversion to offices (ref: DC/25/1444). This apparent piecemeal approach to development on the site, and the lack of any holistic approach, raises concerns as to what constitutes the planning unit of the site and the potential for incremental creep in terms of impact on neighbouring amenity.

A preceding appeal decision for an existing storage building on the site, ref: DC/22/0388, considered that, *"that this rural area is reasonably quiet. There are also residential properties located close to the site on Coltstaple Lane and Reeds Lane, and therefore the area remains a noise sensitive environment in which the potential for and effect of any additional noise and disturbance must be carefully considered"*.

This is reflected by conditions attached to the (allowed) appeal decision, which included the following: -

- 2) There shall be no more than 12 employees working across the appeal site, in connection with equestrian use of the appeal site, at any one time, without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
- 7) The development hereby permitted shall not result in more than 8 lorry deliveries and collections per week on Mondays to Fridays inclusive between the hours of 08.00 to 18.00, and there shall be no deliveries by articulated vehicles. There shall be no lorry or articulated vehicles deliveries outside of these times, including the weekend and bank holidays.

Further conditions were imposed restricting outdoor activities and controlling operating hours for the storage unit.

The submission sets out a 58% increase in employment on the site as a result of the proposal (from 12 to 19). This is suggestive of an appreciable increase in the level of activity on the site, as is befitting of a building of the scale proposed. Condition 2 (as set out above) would not restrict employment outside of any equestrian use of the site and it is not apparent whether the proposed storage use would represent an 'equestrian use', which is not defined either within the condition or the related appeal decision.

In contrast to the preceding appeal scheme, the current application is not accompanied by a Transport Statement and there is limited detail within the Design & Access Statement relating to anticipated vehicular movements. It is considered reasonable that a storage building of the scale proposed will create additional activity and further considerations to those in the above appeal, which related to a storage building of approximately 560 sq m.

Condition 7 creates significant issues relating to enforcement and monitoring, with the terms of the condition easily breached over a sustained period. This is reflected in a number of representations received on the application which alleged breaches of conditions associated with earlier permissions on the site, with these allegations currently being investigated by the Council's Compliance Team.

It is considered onerous, unreasonable and in practical terms unenforceable to restrict by way of condition the number of vehicular movements to and from the site across a working week. The scale of the proposed development and the related level of activity on the site has significant potential to result in an unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity, and this harm could not be addressed through conditions seeking to control individual behaviour (as opposed to regulating the use of the land).

Given the scale of the proposed development and the underlying ambiguity as to the use of the site, and whether it remains / would remain in genuine equestrian use rather than simply for the storage and distribution of equestrian products, it would not be considered appropriate to restrict the use of the building for solely '*equine related products*'. This approach could not therefore overcome the potential for unacceptable harm.

In the absence of information to indicate otherwise it has not been demonstrated that the scale of the development would not lead to unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity by way of the increase level of activity on the site and related vehicular movements. The development is therefore contrary to Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Highways Impacts

Policy 40 of the HDPF emphasizes the importance of transport access and ease of movement for the local economy, with a focus on sustainable transport and safe access. Policy 41 of the HDPF further specifies that developments must ensure adequate parking provision.

The application is accompanied by a Transport Statement which relates to a preceding development on the site and is not specific to this current proposal. As such the details of anticipated trip generation and type of goods vehicle movements have not been detailed either in relation to the existing use(s) on the site or those anticipated as a result of the proposed development.

There are no restrictions which would prevent heavy goods vehicles operating to or from the site, with condition 7 of DC/22/0388 not seeking to define the term 'lorry' and not preventing the use of articulated lorries. There are concerns, given the nature of Reeds Lane and the relationship with surrounding properties, that an increase in (large) HGVs entering and exiting the site and using the lane could result in undesirable impacts, with the Local Highway Authority unable to provide detailed comments on the basis of the available information. This would need to be resolved were the application to be approved.

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 application is accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal which provides sufficient information to be able to assess the impacts on protected species / habitat. It is considered that subject to suitable mitigation and enhancement measures, which if necessary could be secured through condition, there would be no adverse impacts and the proposal would be acceptable in ecology terms.

Water Neutrality

A 2021 Position Statement from Natural England identified that it could not be concluded with the required degree of certainty that new development in the Sussex North Water Supply Zone would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites. As a consequence, and to comply with the legal duties set out in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (known as the Habitat Regulations), all new development since has been required to demonstrate water neutrality.

On 31st October 2025 Natural England formally withdrew the 2021 Position Statement, citing a package of measures that they were satisfied would safeguard the Arun Valley sites. Principal amongst these measures is a reduction in the Southern Water abstraction licence 'by March 2026'. However, given the licence change has not yet taken place Horsham District Council, as competent authority under the Habitats Regulations, cannot yet be certain that new development will not result in adverse impacts on the Arun Valley sites.

To ensure development can come forward as water neutral in the meantime, the Council has agreed with Natural England to use the significant water savings made by Southern Water in 2024/25 through their programme of leakage reduction (amongst other measures). This has generated some 3,240,000 litres per day of water savings that can now be attributed to new development without increasing water abstraction in the Arun Valley beyond baseline. These savings were previously to be used to launch the Sussex North Water Certification Scheme (SNWCS), however following the withdrawal statement SNWCS will no longer be launching. Natural England standing advice dated 10 November 2025 raises no objection to using these savings to enable development to come forward. The standing advice

clarifies that it functions as Natural England's formal response pursuant to Regulation 63(3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 to all relevant planning applications which seek to achieve water neutrality using the above Southern Water savings.

Officers have undertaken an Appropriate Assessment which demonstrates that the anticipated increase in mains water consumption from this development, alongside all other development granted since the 31st October 2025, will not exceed 3,240,000 litres per day.

Accordingly, Officers consider that the proposed development will not have an Adverse Effect on the Integrity of the Arun Valley Site, either alone or in combination with other plan and projects, thereby complying with Regulations 63 and 70 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, HDPF Policy 31, and paragraph 193 of the NPPF.

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. The application is part-retrospective, in respect of the hardstanding, and would therefore be exempt from BNG requirements.

Drainage

The development, of both the hardstanding and building, has potential to change surface water drainage flows at the site, with the LLFA noting that additional information would be required in respect of the reference to SuDs within the submission. It is considered that if necessary, given the nature of the site and development, this information could be secured through condition.

Conclusion and Planning Balance

The development would provide some contribution to the wider rural economy through additional employment opportunities. It has not though been demonstrated that the development is essential in this countryside location, there would also be an adverse impact on the landscape character of the site and surrounding area, with the development failing to achieve the substantial enhancements required by Policy 10 of the HDPF, and it has not been demonstrated that there would be no unacceptable impacts on neighbouring amenity.

On the balance of these considerations, it is considered that the identified harm arising from the development would outweigh the benefit(s). While no harm has been identified in respect of the remaining matters, this represents a neutral consideration which would not alter the above view.

It is appreciated that the proposed development would essentially replace a temporary marquee structure and storage containers already in place on the site. These structures are however unauthorised and subject of enforcement notices requiring their removal. The removal of structures which are of a significantly different character and appearance, and which do not benefit from any form of planning consent, is not considered to be a benefit which would attract a level of weight which would outweigh the identified harm.

It is therefore recommended that planning permission be refused.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. The development would not be essential to its countryside location and, by reason of its scale and design, would be detrimental to the rural landscape character and tranquillity of the site and surrounding area, including the amenity of nearby Public Rights of Way, and would fail to result

in substantial environmental improvements. The development is therefore contrary to Policies 10, 25, 26, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy SNP16 and SNP21 of the Southwater Neighbourhood Plan.

2. It has not been demonstrated that the scale of the development would not lead to unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity by way of the increase level of activity on the site and related vehicular movements. The development is therefore contrary to Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy SNP16 of the Southwater Neighbourhood Plan.

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/25/2133

(The approved plans will form Condition 1 on the Decision Notice of all Permitted applications)

Schedule of plans/documents **not approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location plan		NONE	19.12.2025
Block plan	Proposed	NONE	19.12.2025
Block plan	Existing	NONE	19.12.2025
Supporting Statement	PHASE I GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ("DESK STUDY") Part 1 of 3	LS8882 REV A	19.12.2025
Supporting Statement	PHASE I GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ("DESK STUDY") Part 2 of 3	LS8882 REV A	19.12.2025
Supporting Statement	PHASE I GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ("DESK STUDY") Part 3 of 3	LS8882 REV A	19.12.2025
Plans	Parking	NONE	19.12.2025
Supporting Statement	Preliminary Ecological Appraisal	EA151225 REV 1	19.12.2025
Design & Access Statement		NONE	19.12.2025
Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed Storage	DSE/BS/PL/01	19.12.2025
Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed Storage Barn	DSE/BS/PL/01	19.12.2025

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Guy Everest Date: 20.03.2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial Tamara Dale

Date: 20.03.2026