

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 September 2026 19:39:10 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/1199
Categories: Comments Received

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 09/09/2026 7:39 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Priory Fields Monastery Lane Storrington West Sussex RH20 4LN
Proposal:	Demolition of existing timber shed and erection of replacement timber building.
Case Officer:	Sam Nye

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Hill View Kithurst Lane Storrington
----------	-------------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Other
Comments:	Subject: Objection to planning application DC/26/1199 - Priory Fields, Monastery Lane, Storrington Dear Planning Officer, I am writing to object to planning application DC/26/1199, for the demolition of the existing timber shed and erection of a replacement wooden shed at Priory Fields. I would ask that the application is considered carefully in the context of the full planning history of this site, as well as the particular sensitivity of its rural location close to the South Downs National Park.

1. This is not simply a like-for-like replacement

The applicant describes the proposed building himself as a "more substantial shed". The existing shed is stated to be approximately 2.5m (though it is actually 3m) x 5m and 2.8m high, whereas the proposed building would be approximately 20% larger, differently orientated and have a ridge approximately 3.5m above existing ground level.

I therefore do not consider it appropriate to regard the proposal simply as the replacement of an existing modest timber shed.

The increase in footprint is accompanied by an increase in height, a change in orientation and an increased roof pitch. The resulting visual and physical impact should therefore be assessed as a new and substantially more permanent structure, rather than merely as a replacement of the existing building.

I would ask the planning authority to require the precise proposed floor dimensions, footprint, eaves height and ridge height to be clearly established so that the scale of the proposal can be properly assessed.

2. The proposed construction appears considerably more substantial and permanent

The applicant proposes a building constructed with three courses of brickwork, concrete foundations and a solid oak structural frame, with oak boarding externally. He also proposes solar panels and an upgraded battery/inverter system.

This is a considerable increase in permanence and construction quality compared with the existing timber shed.

I therefore ask Horsham DC to consider whether this scale and method of construction is genuinely necessary for the stated storage purpose and whether the resulting building is appropriate in this sensitive countryside location.

3. The planning history of the site is highly relevant

I am particularly concerned that this application should not be considered in isolation from the extensive planning history of Priory Fields.

There have been previous applications and appeals relating to residential development and residential use of buildings on the site. More recently, the site has also seen the progression of an agricultural/storage building towards residential accommodation. Given this history, I consider it important that the Horsham DC establishes the precise intended use of the proposed replacement building and considers whether the proposal could facilitate or contribute to the further residentialisation and intensification of the site.

I am not suggesting that the Authority should refuse an otherwise acceptable shed simply because of the applicant's previous planning applications. However, the history is sufficiently extensive that I believe it is a material consideration when assessing the stated purpose, scale and permanence of this new building

4. Concern regarding incremental residentialisation

The cumulative pattern of development at the site gives me concern that individual buildings and changes of use could

progressively alter the character of what is presently a rural site. Horsham DC should therefore consider whether the proposal represents incremental intensification of the site, rather than assessing the replacement shed entirely in isolation. In particular, I would ask the Horsham DC to establish why a substantially larger and more permanent building is required now that the site has undergone significant changes in its planning and accommodation history.

5. Landscape and visual impact

The location is particularly sensitive because of its relationship with the South Downs National Park and surrounding countryside. The proposed increase in size, increased ridge height, changed orientation and more substantial construction could result in a materially greater visual presence than the existing shed.

I ask that particular consideration is given to:

- the increased footprint and massing;
- the increase in ridge height;
- the changed orientation;
- the increased roof pitch;
- the proposed brick base and oak frame;
- the visibility of the building from surrounding land and public viewpoints;
- its relationship to existing hedgerows and vegetation;
- its relationship to the wider landscape and the setting of the South Downs National Park; and
- the cumulative visual impact of the various buildings already present on the site.

The applicant's photographs themselves demonstrate the rural and heavily vegetated character of the site and its surroundings.

6. Solar panels and change of orientation

The applicant states that the building is to be angled and the roof pitch increased so that the roof can face south (actually it would face towards the East) and accommodate solar panels, because the existing solar panels are insufficient for the pond pump.

I appreciate that renewable energy provision is a legitimate consideration. However, the resulting change in orientation and roof form should still be assessed in terms of its landscape and visual impact.

I would ask whether the stated energy requirement could be met without creating such a substantially larger and more prominent structure.

7. Pond and drainage

The proposal also refers to extending the existing pond and creating a reed bed (part of the previous planning request for the house for which permission was denied).

Given the proposed concrete foundations and the proximity of the building to the existing pond, I would ask the Horsham Planning to ensure that the relationship between the proposed foundations, drainage, surface water, pond and proposed reed bed is properly understood before determining the application.

8. Potential future residential use

Given the site's extensive history of attempts to obtain residential

development and the subsequent residential use of another building on the site, I would ask the Horsham Planning Dept to consider whether the design and construction of this building are consistent with the stated non-residential purpose.

If the building is genuinely intended only for storage, I would ask that this is clearly established and that any permission contains appropriate conditions necessary to prevent an unauthorised change to residential use.

I would also ask the Authority to consider whether any potential future residential use would raise issues concerning water neutrality, the Arun Valley protected sites and other environmental considerations which have previously been relevant to residential proposals at this site.

Conclusion:

For the reasons above, I respectfully object to application DC/26/1199.

I ask that the application is assessed not merely as the replacement of an existing shed, but in terms of the resulting scale, height, permanence, orientation, visual impact and cumulative effect of the proposed development, taking full account of the extensive planning history of Priory Fields.

I also ask that the Authority is satisfied as to the precise intended use of the building and that the proposal does not facilitate further incremental residentialisation of this sensitive rural site.

I respectfully request that planning permission is refused.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**

Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane E aton