



Westering
Bines Green
Ashurst
RH13 8EH.

Horsham District Council.
Planning Department. (Sam Nye)
Horsham.

11.05.2026.

Dear Mr Nye,

Please see my objection to the amended Planning Application. I request that you list my objection as - Westering 2 - in the relevant documents listing.

Regards,

Terence Bown

Application No Ref : DC/26/0502 : Representation - Westering 2.

Regarding Class Q Development at Stanford Farm RH13 8EH. **Increase from 5 Houses to 6 Houses and Submitted Plan exceeds the effective Curtilage (area needed) of the Barns Footprint immediately failing the C3 requirements. Class Q.3(1)(b) of the GPDO.**

OBJECTION: Prior Approval – Stanford Farm, RH13 8EH

I am writing to express my strong concerns regarding the proposed additional development at Stanford Farm. This application highlights a significant trend that threatens the rural integrity of Ashurst and raises serious questions regarding the limits of Permitted Development, encouraging all Farm owners to consider converting their Farm Yards into small communities with the urbanisation of rural areas. It should also be noted that the Smallest Tin Building - Barn B, as shown on the Plan, was used as a Workshop for the Farm owners HGV Business not Agriculture - **Class B2 (General Industrial) or Sui Generis**. **The proposed development relies on a Public Footpath for vehicular access. Under the Horsham District Planning Framework and West Sussex County Council (WSCC) standards, a footpath is fundamentally designed for pedestrian safety and amenity, this is non-compliant for a 6-dwelling residential development with provision for 12 further Cars plus visitors and service vehicles. The attempt to increase the density to 6 dwellings further exacerbates the structural and curtilage non-compliance and will inevitably introduce significant levels of residential paraphernalia eroding the agricultural character of**

Stanford Farm, causing a level of visual harm that cannot be mitigated by landscaping.

1. The "Structural Integrity" vs. "New Build" Test

The conversion of these three galvanised corrugated tin barns must be scrutinized against the "gold standard" set by **Hibbitt v Secretary of State**. [1] Under Class Q, the proposal must be a *conversion*, **not** a *rebuild*. These structures are lightweight agricultural shells; if the development requires a new internal load-bearing frame or significant structural reinforcement to support residential cladding and insulation, it is a de-facto new build. The massive financial "bonus" available to landowners—often creates a clear incentive to push "conversions" that are, in reality, new houses, in the open countryside.

"The Council must determine if these barns are truly 'converted' or if they are merely being used as a structural 'packing case' for an entirely new load-bearing dwelling, which would constitute a rebuild and thus fall outside the scope of Class Q."

(Quotation from the Judges remarks) **STRUCTURAL SURVEY REQUIRED to confirm the present Barns qualify.**

2. Strict Curtilage Constraints

National planning policy is clear: the "**Curtilage**" of a Class Q development must be **no larger** than the footprint of the original building. This area must accommodate **all** residential requirements, **including :-**

- Vehicle parking and turning circles. (Case Law - Oliver v Symons)
- Visitors and Service Vehicles Parking within Curtilage.
- No reversing Parked Cars onto a Footpath or Agricultural Farm Yard. (Section 72 of the Highways Act 1835,)
- Sewerage treatment plants and drainage fields.
- Refuse Bin storage for 24 Bins and 6 Domestic Heating Oil/Gas Storage Tanks.
- Domestic Garden areas.
- If any of these elements fall outside the precise footprint of the existing barns, the development fails to meet the criteria of the General Permitted Development Order.
- **A Swept Path Analysis** is required as Fire Engines and Refuse Lorries are unlikely to be able to manoeuvre within the Curtilage of the Barns to comply with Class Q requirements and if they cannot this application should be refused.

*The Council must require a Swept Path Analysis based on the **11.997m 'Large Refuse Vehicle'** (4-axle) standard utilized within the District. Given the legal requirement that all residential activity—including the 21.6m+ turning circle required for such a vehicle—must be contained **entirely within the original building's footprint**, the applicant must*

demonstrate how such manoeuvres are possible without encroaching onto agricultural land. Failure to contain these essential service movements within the footprint renders the proposal non-compliant with the General Permitted Development Order." (Extract from Mid Sussex District Council)

- Given that the Class Q curtilage is restricted to the building footprint, the development lacks the physical space to accommodate these essential manoeuvres. Any reliance on the adjacent farm yard for turning is **legally inadmissible**, as that land falls outside the permitted residential curtilage. Consequently, the development fails the 'Transport and Highways' test under Prior Approval and should be refused.
- "Upon review of the Proposed Site Plan, the residential curtilage provided for the 6 dwellings extends significantly beyond the external footprints of Barns A, B, and C. This violates the '**lesser of** rule in **Class Q.3** and represents an unlawful expansion of residential use within the open countryside."

3. The Cumulative Impact of "Unplanned Villages"

While these rights were intended for farm diversification, their application here risks the creeping urbanisation of our countryside. If every farm in the district with surplus tin barn space follows this precedent, we are witnessing the birth of "unplanned villages" without the infrastructure, transport links, or services to support them. We must ask if this is the legacy our political masters intended for the West Sussex landscape.

I urge the Council to demand a rigorous, independent structural survey and a detailed block plan to ensure this application does not exceed the strict legal boundaries of Class Q Permitted Development.



