APPELLANT'S FINAL COMMENTS

Great Betley Farm Stonepit Lane

Henfield BN5 9QT

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE APP/Z3825/W/25/3361885

LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY REFERENCE DC/23/1072

(Appeal A - containers)

Pages 2 and 3 – Reason for refusal 1

The council has offered no justification for the different approach taken to this proposal compared with that taken in respect of application DC/24/0086 (Change of use of part of the building and land for industrial purposes) (see appendix 1 to the appellant's appeal statement).

Conditions

2 The development is already occupied.

The layout of the site already allows adequate temporary parking, turning and access facilities and no evidence has been put forward to show there have been problems related to vehicles. The condition is unnecessary.

4 There are no residential properties near enough to be affected by the use of the site and there is no reason for refusal relating to impact on residential amenities.

Private individuals who rent containers might have only weekends to visit the site. The condition is unnecessary.

Since the use is storage, which takes place 24 hours every day, the use of the word 'operated' in the suggested condition is uncertain. It would be more appropriate to refer to visits to the site.

5 The suggested conditions should refer to 'containers' rather than to 'building'

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE APP/Z3825/W/25/3361895

LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY REFERENCE DC/23/2180

(Appeal B – inside storage)

Page 3 – Reason for refusal 1 – paragraph 2

The council has offered no justification for the different approach taken to this proposal compared with that taken in respect of application DC/24/0086 (Change of use of part of the building and land for industrial purposes) (see appendix 1 to the appellant's appeal statement).

Page 4 – Reason for refusal 2 – paragraph 2

The reason given by the council for the different treatment of this proposal, compared with that taken in respect of DC/23/1072 / APP/Z3825/W/25/3361885 (containers) is not plausible. The construction of containers is not temporary. It is debatable whether the permanent use of land for accommodating containers is temporary. Regardless of that, the use of part of the building for lock-up storage is no more likely to use mains water than storage in containers. It is not clear what information a water neutrality statement could contain, given there is no water supply or use.

Conditions

2 The development is already occupied.

The layout of the site already provides adequate facilities for vehicle loading/unloading and no evidence has been put forward to show there have been problems related to vehicles. The condition is unnecessary.

4 There are no residential properties near enough to be affected by the use of the site and there is no reason for refusal relating to impact on residential amenities. However, the occupier requires access only 7:00-18:00 Monday to Saturday.

Since the use is storage, which takes place 24 hours every day, the use of the word 'operated' in the suggested condition is uncertain. It would be more appropriate to refer to visits to the site.

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE APP/Z3825/W/25/3361902

LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY REFERENCE DC/24/0265

(Appeal C – outside storage)

Page 3 – Reason for refusal 1 – paragraph 2

The council has offered no justification for the different approach taken to this proposal compared with that taken in respect of application DC/24/0086 (Change of use of part of the building and land for industrial purposes) (see appendix 1 to the appellant's appeal statement).

Page 4 – Reason for refusal 3 – paragraph 5

The reason given by the council for the different treatment of this proposal, compared with that taken in respect of DC/23/1072 / APP/Z3825/W/25/3361885 (containers) is not plausible. The construction of containers is not temporary. Use of the site for storage would be no more or less likely to be permanent than storage in containers. Outside storage would be no more likely to use mains water than storage in containers. It is not clear what information a water neutrality statement could contain, given there is no water supply or use.

Conditions

3 There are no residential properties near enough to be affected by the use of the site and there is no reason for refusal relating to impact on residential amenities. The condition is unnecessary.

Since the use is storage, which takes place 24 hours every day, the use of the word 'operated' in the suggested condition is uncertain. It would be more appropriate to refer to visits to the site.

4 The proposal is for outside storage. There is no building. This suggested condition would prevent the use for which planning permission has been applied and would be unreasonable.

2 May 2025

SPEER DADE Planning Consultants
29 Kings Drive, Hassocks BN6 8DX
01273 843737
roy@speerdade.co.uk
www.speerdade.co.uk