Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DISC/25/0384
Land North of Glebe Farm and Kings Barn Lane, Kings Barn Lane, Steyning, West Sussex

DESCRIPTION:
Application for Approval of Details Reserved by Conditions 4 (contamination); 5 (surface water drainage scheme); 6 (Construction Environmental Management Plan); 7 Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP: Biodiversity); 9 (archaeological works) parts (i) & (ii) ONLY and 11 (Arboricultural Method Statement) to approved application DC/21/2233 (Outline application for up to 265 dwellings).

DETAILED DESCRIPTION:
Planning Application DC/21/2233 was permitted in Nov 2024. Approval is now sought for discharge of Conditions 4 (contamination); 5 (surface water drainage scheme); 6 (Construction Environmental Management Plan); 7 Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP: Biodiversity); 9 (archaeological works) parts (i) & (ii) and 11 (Arboricultural Method Statement).

The details comprise a suite of control documents and allied plans, principally the JNP Group Construction Environmental Management Plan, dated May 2025 (revision P07b), and CEMP Biodiversity, GeoEnvironmental Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plans, and Drainage Strategy.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/21/2233	Outline application for up to 265 dwellings, demolition of No. 37 Kings Barn Lane to provide new pedestrian/cycle/emergency link, provision of vehicular access from the A283 Steyning by-pass, provision of public open space, community orchard, sustainable drainage and other ancillary and enabling works. All matters reserved except for vehicular access from A283.	Permitted 29/11/2024

CONSULTATIONS

Consultant Ecologist (2nd consultation response): *Recommend discharge*

West Sussex County Council Local Highway Authority (3rd consultation response): *Should LPA be minded to approve, recommend version be approved follows: BR31285-JNP-XX-XX-RP-G-1001 P07b dated 25 February 2025.*

West Sussex County Council Local Lead Flood Authority*: Information provided meets requirements of condition 5 of application DC/21/2233 and therefore able to recommend condition 5 is discharged*

HDC Tree Officer (2nd consultation response): *Advice – comments addressed in full- please determine as you see fit.*

HDC Environmental Health (SIXTH consultation response):
In respect to Condition 4

1. *From reviewing the ASL Report Site Investigation Report we note that exploratory holes were advanced at 31 locations across the site with samples subject to chemical analysis from 15 of these locations. From revisiting the Merebrook Report we note that 32 samples were subject to chemical analysis (although we note that heavy metals and TPH were subject to chemical analysis at only 26 locations).*
2. *With the above comments in mind, and with reference to section 9.7.2.3.3 of BS 10175:2026, we would welcome further commentary on the sampling density on this site (combing both investigations) and whether it is complaint with the aforementioned section of BS 10175.*
3. *In the context of the testing of the made ground and our request for further testing we note the comment 'Not needed as MG is shallow (to max 0.8m depth). Made ground will be removed by construction process or beneath garden areas as uncontaminated soil. MG to be removed as hazardous waste from MHP03 area with surface asbestos fragments'. Whilst we accept that on a number of sites we see much deeper made ground we are not entirely convinced that 0.8m is 'shallow' in the context of made ground depth. We also accept that the chemical testing of the deeper pockets of made ground have, to date, not found any elevated levels of contamination and if the areas investigated to date remain present under gardens this material is likely to present a low risk to future site users. This position is however based on the assumption that the made ground to be homogenous which, from experience of similar sites, is not always the case.*
4. *Given the above we therefore remain concerned that the made ground soils on the site, in particular the deeper pockets of made ground in the vincity of MTP109 and MTP112, have not been adequately characterised.*

In respect of Condition 6: *reviewed the JNP Group Construction Environmental Management Plan (dated May 2025, revision PO7b) and we are satisfied that condition 6 can be formally discharged.*

HDC Archaeologist Consultant: *The partial requirements of the condition have been satisfied, as the Council's consultant Archaeologist is satisfied with the content of the submitted Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation (WSI). The archaeological fieldwork should be implemented in accordance with the WSI. The archaeological site investigation and any post investigation assessment will require submission to and subsequent approval by the Local Planning Authority.*

REPRESENTATIONS

1 no. Objection received, content summarised below:

This is where the old Steyning harbour used to be and was still flooded in the 1920's. Given rising sea levels it is probably not the best place to build. Far better to build on existing brownfield sites in Steyning. Much better for the community.

Other Considerations

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

Condition 4 (contamination)

Pre-commencement Condition: The development hereby permitted shall not commence until the following components of a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination, (including

asbestos contamination), of the site be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority:
(a) An intrusive site investigation, based on the findings and recommendations of the ASL Desk Study Report, to provide information for a detailed risk assessment to the degree and nature of the risk posed by any contamination to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site. (b) Full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken based on the results of the intrusive site investigation
(b) and a verification plan providing details of what data will be collected in order to demonstrate that the remedial works are complete.
The scheme shall be implemented as approved. Any changes to these components require the consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure that no unacceptable risks are caused to humans, controlled waters or the wider environment during and following the development works and to ensure that any pollution is dealt with in accordance with Policies 24 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015)

Amendments have been made to the submitted contamination report that seek to address issues raised by the Council's Environmental Health Officer. Whilst some of those issues have been raised, at the time of writing the issues below remain outstanding:

> *From reviewing the ASL Report Site Investigation Report we note that exploratory holes were advanced at 31 locations across the site with samples subject to chemical analysis from 15 of these locations. From revisiting the Merebrook Report we note that 32 samples were subject to chemical analysis (although we note that heavy metals and TPH were subject to chemical analysis at only 26 locations).*
> *With the above comments in mind, and with reference to section 9.7.2.3.3 of BS 10175:2026, we would welcome further commentary on the sampling density on this site (combing both investigations) and whether it is complaint with the aforementioned section of BS 10175.*
> *In the context of the testing of the made ground and our request for further testing we note the comment 'Not needed as MG is shallow (to max 0.8m depth). Made ground will be removed by construction process or beneath garden areas as uncontaminated soil. MG to be removed as hazardous waste from MHP03 area with surface asbestos fragments'. Whilst we accept that on a number of sites we see much deeper made ground we are not entirely convinced that 0.8m is 'shallow' in the context of made ground depth. We also accept that the chemical testing of the deeper pockets of made ground have, to date, not found any elevated levels of contamination and if the areas investigated to date remain present under gardens this material is likely to present a low risk to future site users. This position is however based on the assumption that the made ground to be homogenous which, from experience of similar sites, is not always the case.*
> *Given the above we therefore remain concerned that the made ground soils on the site, in particular the deeper pockets of made ground in the vicinity of MTP109 and MTP112, have not been adequately characterised.*

Accordingly, it is not possible to discharge the condition and hence this recommendation is split decision, with Condition 4 NOT discharged.

Condition 5 (surface water drainage scheme)

Pre-commencement Condition: *Prior to commencement of development, in accordance with the submitted FRA (Flood Risk Assessment, PJS Land Development, dated January 2022 with document reference PJSL20-11-FRA-01F) and drawing number PJSL20-11-004 Rev E (Drainage Strategy Plan, 21.07.23), detailed designs of a surface water drainage scheme incorporating the following measures shall be submitted to and agreed with the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter all development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details and no occupation of any dwelling shall take place until the approved works required to facilitate that dwelling have been completed. The scheme shall address the following matters:*

i. If infiltration is proven to be unfavourable, then Greenfield runoff rates for the site shall be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. These post development runoff rates will be attenuated to the equivalent Greenfield rate for all rainfall events up to and including the 1% annual probability. The discharge location for surface water runoff will be confirmed to connect with the wider watercourse network.
ii. Provision of surface water attenuation storage, sized and designed to accommodate the volume of water generated in all rainfall events up to and including the critical storm duration for the 3.33% and 1% annual probability rainfall events (both including allowances for climate change).
iii. Detailed designs, modelling calculations and plans of the of the drainage conveyance network in the:
• 3.33% annual probability critical rainfall event plus climate change to show no above ground flooding on any part of the site.
• 1% annual probability critical rainfall plus climate change event to show, if any, the depth, volume and storage location of any above ground flooding from the drainage network ensuring that flooding does not occur in any part of a building or any utility plant susceptible to water (e.g. pumping station or electricity substation) within the development.
iv. The design of the basin will incorporate an emergency spillway and any drainage structures include appropriate freeboard allowances. Plans to be submitted showing the routes for the management of exceedance surface water flow routes that minimise the risk to people and property during rainfall events in excess of 1% annual probability rainfall event.
v. Finished ground floor levels of properties are a minimum of 300mm above expected flood levels of all sources of flooding (including the ordinary watercourses, SuDS features and within any proposed drainage scheme) or 150mm above ground level, whichever is the more precautionary.
vi. Details of how all surface water management features to be designed in accordance with The SuDS Manual (CIRIA C753, 2015), including appropriate treatment stages for water quality prior to discharge.
VII. A maintenance and management plan detailing the activities required and details of who will adopt and maintain the all the surface water drainage features for the lifetime of the development. Include following if appropriate. vii. Construction shall not begin until a detailed construction phase surface water management plan for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent flooding in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 163, 165 and 170 by ensuring the satisfactory management of local sources of flooding surface water flow paths, storage and disposal of surface water from the site in a range of rainfall events and ensuring the SuDS proposed operates as designed for the lifetime of the development, and to comply with Policy 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

The Local Lead Flood Authority was pleased to be satisfied with the drainage strategy submitted, the details of which covered all the points of detail required by the condition, on initial submission and without seeking amendment.

It has been therefore evidenced that the surface water control will prevent flooding by management of local sources of surface water flow paths, storage and disposal of surface water in a range of rainfall events, and ensuring the drainage operates as designed for the lifetime of the development, in accordance with recommended practice and industry standards, and the planning policy tests set out in national policy and planning practice guidance.

The details so submitted are therefore satisfactory to the reason for imposing of the condition.

Condition 6 (Construction Environmental Management Plan).

Pre-commencement Condition: *No development shall commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include details of the following relevant measures:*
i. An introduction consisting of construction phase environmental management plan, definitions and abbreviations and project description and location;
ii. A description of management responsibilities;
iii. A description of the construction programme which identifies activities likely to cause high levels of noise or dust;

iv. Site working hours and a named person for residents to contact;
v. Detailed Site logistics arrangements; the loading and unloading of plant, materials and waste; the storage of plant and materials used in construction of the development,
vi. Details regarding parking, deliveries, and storage by site operatives and visitors;
vii. Details regarding dust and noise mitigation measures to be deployed including identification of sensitive receptors and ongoing monitoring; viii. Details of the hours of works and other measures to mitigate the impact of construction on the amenity of the area and safety of the highway network; ix. Details of public engagement and Communication procedures with the local community prior to and during construction works
x. Details of traffic construction routing to and from the site
xi. Anticipated number, frequency and types of vehicles used during construction,
xii. The method of access and routing of vehicles during construction,
xiii. The erection and maintenance of security hoarding,
xiv. The provision of wheel washing facilities and other works required to mitigate the impact of construction upon the public highway (including the provision of temporary Traffic Regulation Orders)

The construction shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the details and measures approved in the CEMP for the related phase.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the amenities of the area, ecological and biodiversity interests, and in accordance with Policies 24, 33(2) and 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Amendments have been made to the submitted Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) at the request of the Local Highway Authority and the Council's Environmental Health Officer so that there is adherence to good practice and standards to safeguard highway safety and the amenities of the area. This is based on the 7th Edition (revision d) CEMP.

Note: during the life of the discharge application an approach was made by the applicant to include a second temporary access however this was subsequentially dropped.

It is not possible to eliminate all impacts arising from the construction phase (including disturbance onto neighbours) and a balance needs to be struck between the objective of safeguarding living conditions and amenity in general and highway safety, and the efficient build out of the development, in part in recognition that there is a degree of neighbour tolerance built into practice and procedural standards.

Planning Officers believe the 7th Edition CEMP (revision d) now provides sufficient safeguards to amenities to the satisfaction to the reason for imposing of the condition.

Condition 7 (Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP: Biodiversity)

Pre-commencement Condition: As part of each reserved matters application and prior to commencement of development, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following:
i. Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
ii. Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".
iii. Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
iv. The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
v. The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works. vi. Responsible persons and lines of communication.
vii. The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
viii. Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.
ix. Details of any lighting required.

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To conserve protected and Priority species and allow the Local Planning Authority to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority habitats & species) in accordance with Policy 31 of the Horsham District Local Plan and Policy 1 of the Steyning Neighbourhood Development Plan (2022).

The Council's Ecologist is satisfied that the initially submitted CEMP Biodiversity offers sufficient provisions to conserve protected and Priority species and allow the Local Planning Authority to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations, without further amendment.

The details so submitted are therefore satisfactory to the reason for imposing of the condition.

Condition 9 (archaeological works) parts (i) & (ii)

Pre-commencement Condition: *No development shall take place until a programme of archaeological work has been secured in accordance with an overarching Written Scheme of Investigation that has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.*
i. Each phase of the development (as set out in the above Written Scheme of Investigation and which shall be in accordance with the phasing shown on drawing P20-2253_18-1), including enabling and groundworks, shall not be commenced until a corresponding phase of on-site archaeological fieldwork has been completed to a scope agreed with the Local Planning Authority and their archaeological advisors to allow development of that phase to begin.
ii. An initial summary report will be provided following completion of each phase of onsite archaeological fieldwork.
iii. Following the completion of the archaeological fieldwork for all phases of the site, a scheme of assessment reporting, analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition will be undertaken to a scope that is to be agreed in advance with the local planning authority and their archaeological advisors.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental as the site is of archaeological significance and it is important that it is recorded by excavation before it is destroyed by development in accordance with Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015)

The Council's consultant archaeologist is satisfied the partial requirements of the conditions (parts i and ii) have been satisfied, as the Council's consultant Archaeologist is satisfied with the content of the submitted Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation (WSI). The archaeological fieldwork should be implemented in accordance with the WSI. The archaeological site investigation and any post investigation assessment (part iii) will require submission to and subsequent approval by the Local Planning Authority.

The details so submitted are therefore satisfactory to the reason for imposing of the condition.

Condition 11 (Arboricultural Method Statement)

Pre-commencement Condition: *No development shall commence, including demolition pursuant to the permission granted, ground clearance, or bringing equipment, machinery or materials onto the site, until an Arboricultural Method Statement informed by the already submitted ARBORICULTURE TECHNICAL NOTE Glebe Farm, Steyning 1234_R07a_10th October 2022_RL_JP_CW by Tyler Grange detailing on a plan all trees/hedgerows on site and adjacent to the site to be retained during construction works, and measures to provide for their protection throughout all construction works, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, and until the following preliminaries have been completed in the sequence set out below: - All trees on the site shown for retention in the approved Arboricultural Method Statement, as well as those off-site whose root protection areas ingress into the site, shall be fully protected throughout all construction works by tree*

protective fencing affixed to the ground in full accordance with section 6 of BS 5837 'Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations' (2012). - Once installed, the fencing shall be maintained during the course of the development works and until all machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. - Areas so fenced off shall be treated as zones of prohibited access, and shall not be used for the storage of materials, equipment or machinery in any circumstances. No mixing of cement, concrete, or use of other materials or substances shall take place within any tree protective zone, or close enough to such a zone that seepage or displacement of those materials and substances could cause them to enter a zone. Any trees or hedges on the site which die or become damaged during the construction process shall be replaced with trees or hedging plants of a type, size and in positions agreed by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented and thereafter carried out at all times strictly in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure the successful and satisfactory protection of important trees and hedgerows on the site in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policies 1 and 2 of the Steyning Neighbourhood Development Plan (2022).

Following advice from the Council's Tree Officer, amendments to the wording of the Arborcultural Method Statement, including supervision and site monitoring and tree protection fencing, have been made. Those trees and hedgerows important for protection will therefore be secured.

The details so submitted are therefore satisfactory to the reason for imposing of the condition.

Recommendation: Split Decision

In respect of conditions 5, 6, 7, 9 and 11 discharge is GRANTED

In respect of condition 4 discharge is REFUSED for the following reason(s):

1 Insufficient information has been provided pursuant to condition 4 to fully address contamination.

NOTES TO APPLICANT

Regarding Condition 4

The following issues below remain outstanding from HDC Environmental Health:

From reviewing the ASL Report Site Investigation Report we note that exploratory holes were advanced at 31 locations across the site with samples subject to chemical analysis from 15 of these locations. From revisiting the Merebrook Report we note that 32 samples were subject to chemical analysis (although we note that heavy metals and TPH were subject to chemical analysis at only 26 locations).

With the above comments in mind, and with reference to section 9.7.2.3.3 of BS 10175:2026, we would welcome further commentary on the sampling density on this site (combing both investigations) and whether it is complaint with the aforementioned section of BS 10175.

In the context of the testing of the made ground and our request for further testing we note the comment 'Not needed as MG is shallow (to max 0.8m depth). Made ground will be removed by construction process or beneath garden areas as uncontaminated soil. MG to be removed as hazardous waste from MHP03 area with surface asbestos fragments'. Whilst we accept that on a number of sites we see much deeper made ground we are not entirely convinced that 0.8m is 'shallow' in the context of made ground depth. We also accept that the chemical testing of the deeper pockets of made ground have, to date, not found any elevated levels of contamination and if the areas investigated to date remain present under gardens this material is likely to present a low risk to future

site users. This position is however based on the assumption that the made ground to be homogenous which, from experience of similar sites, is not always the case.

Given the above we therefore remain concerned that the made ground soils on the site, in particular the deeper pockets of made ground in the vicinity of MTP109 and MTP112, have not been adequately characterised.

Regarding Condition 9:

The Council's consultant archaeologist is satisfied the partial requirements of the conditions (parts i and ii) have been satisfied, as the Council's consultant Archaeologist is satisfied with the content of the submitted Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation (WSI). The archaeological fieldwork should be implemented in accordance with the WSI. The archaeological site investigation and any post investigation assessment (part iii) will require submission to and subsequent approval by the Local Planning Authority.

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: DISC/25/0384
(The approved plans will form Condition 1 on the Decision Notice of all Permitted applications)

Schedule of plans/documents **approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Plan	Tree Protection Plan Sheet 3 of 5	VYH24820-03 REV E	27/02/2026
Plan	SMS areas over work phases plan		04/12/2025
Plan	Area D - PX Plan		04/12/2025
Plan	Area G -PX plan		04/12/2025
Plan	Impermeable Areas Plan Sheet 1 of 2	BR31285 JNP XX XX DR C 2005 REV P05	04/12/2025
Plan	Impermeable Areas Plan Sheet 2 of 2	BR31285 JNP XX XX DR C 2006 REV P05	04/12/2025
Plan	Flood Routing Layout	BR31285-JNP-XX-XX-DR-C-2013 REV P05	04/12/2025
Plan	Mains Drainage Layout	BR31285 JNP XX XX DR C 2016 REV P05	04/12/2025
Plan	Tree Protection Plan Sheet 1 of 5	REV C VYH24820-03	04/12/2025
Plan	Tree Protection Plan Sheet 2 of 5	REV C VYH24820-03	04/12/2025
Plan	Tree Protection Plan Sheet 4 of 5	REV C VYH24820-03	04/12/2025
Plan	Tree Protection Plan Sheet 5 of 5	REV C VYH24820-03	04/12/2025
Supporting	BR31285-JNP-XX-XX-RP-G-1001 P07d May		03/03/2026

Doc	2025 Construction Environmental Management Plan Glebe Farm, Steyning by JNP Group		
Supporting Doc	Arboricultural Method Statement REV E Dated 16/02/2026 Ref: VHY24820ams by ACD Environmental		18/02/2026
Supporting Doc	Ref: JAC01000 September 2025 by rpsgroup WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL MITIGATION WORKS: STRIP, MAP AND SAMPLE Kings Barn Lane, Steyning, West Sussex Site Code: SGL25 NGR: 518336 111517		16/12/2025
Supporting Doc	Ref: JAC01000 June 2025 by rpsgroup ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION Kings Barn Lane, Steyning, West Sussex Site Code: SGL25 NGR: 518336 111517		16/12/2025
Supporting Doc	REF JAC01000 March 2025 by rpsgroup WRITTEN SCHEME OF INVESTIGATION FOR AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION Kings Barn Lane, Steyning, West Sussex Site Code: SGL25 Planning Ref: DC/21/2233 NGR: 518336 111517		16/12/2025
Supporting Doc	Drainage Strategy Addendum BR31285-JNP-XX-XX-RP-C-1006 Dated 30/10/2025 by JNP Group		04/12/2025
Supporting Doc	ASE Project No. 250330/ASE Report No. 2025281 Areas D and G Interim Report		04/12/2025
Supporting Doc	Steyning P03 Network: Storm 20/05/2025 Page 1 P03 by JNP Group Consulting Engineers		04/12/2025
Supporting Doc	Drainage Strategy by JNP Group Technical Note 23/05/2025 BR31285-JNP-XX-XX-RP-C-1003-P04		04/12/2025
Supporting Doc	BR31285-JNP-XX-XX-RP-C-1004 REV P01 Date My 2025 SUDS Management and Maintenance Plan Glebe Farm, Steyning by JNP Group		04/12/2025
Supporting Doc	Site-Specific Flood Risk Modelling BR31285-JNP-XX-XX-RP-C-0001 REV P01 Glebe Farm, Steyning May 2025 by JNP Group		04/12/2025
Supporting Doc	Ref: PJSL20-11-FRA-01F Flood Risk Assessment by PJS September 2022 Richborough Estates Land off Kings Barn Lane, Steyning, West Sussex BN44 3YR		04/12/2025
Supporting Doc	TECHNICAL NOTES (BATS) by EcoSupport Dated 23rd June 2025		04/12/2025
Supporting Doc	Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP): Biodiversity Glebe Farm, Steyning by EcoSupport Ltd Status Final Date of Issue 23rd May 2025		04/12/2025
Supporting Doc	SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN REV A GLEBE FARM STEYNING VISTRY GROUP SWMP-21949AH-25-183 MAY 2025 by Idom Final Date Issued 20/05/25		04/12/2025

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

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date

Supporting Doc	GEOENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, GLEBE FARM GEA-21949AH-25-544 MARCH 2026 REV B 04/03/26 by Merebrook Consulting (Part 1)		05/03/2026
Supporting Doc	GEOENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, GLEBE FARM GEA-21949AH-25-544 MARCH 2026 REV B 04/03/26 by Merebrook Consulting (Part 2)		05/03/2026
Supporting Doc	GEOENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, GLEBE FARM GEA-21949AH-25-544 MARCH 2026 REV B 04/03/26 by Merebrook Consulting (Part 3)		05/03/2026
Supporting Doc	ASL Report No. 288-20-087-10R1 September 2021 GROUND INVESTIGATION LAND OFF KING'S BARN LANE STEYNING		25/02/2026
Supporting Doc	LAND CONTAMINATION ASSESSMENT by Merebrook Consulting GLEBE FARM STEYNING, WEST SUSSEX VISTRY CLA-21949AH-25-458 NOVEMBER 2025		04/12/2025

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Matthew Porter Date: 05-03-2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial Adrian Smith Date: 06/03/2026