From: GLENCAIRN Ltd [redacted]
Sent: 09 October 2026 17:29
To: East 2 [redacted]
Subject: 6012595 Winstons Farm, Muttons Lane, Ashington, Pulborough, RH20 3AL

Dear Sir or Madam,

Winston's Farm, Muttons Lane, Ashington, Pulborough, RH20 3AL
Application DC/25/2104 – Appeal APP/6012595

Having reviewed the Council's final comments, I respectfully submit that they introduce additional evidence and a new concern regarding the relationship between the proposed dwelling and a separately notified agricultural building. Please accept this email as the Appellant's response to those matters.

The agricultural buildings notified under reference DC/26/1234 serve the wider agricultural holding. This is entirely consistent with the appeal proposal, which concerns the redevelopment of an existing lawful stable building. Agricultural and equestrian uses can coexist within the same landholding without every building or parcel of land sharing the same planning use.

The existing stables were authorised under planning permission DC/17/0250 for equestrian purposes. The keeping of horses for recreational or equestrian purposes is distinct from agriculture as defined by section 336 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The relevant consideration is therefore the lawful use and development of the land concerned, rather than simply its inclusion within an agricultural holding.

Importantly, the Council expressly acknowledges in its Statement of Case that the appeal site constitutes previously developed land and that the proposal accords with Policy S5(1)(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework updated on 17 August 2026. The subsequent agricultural notification does not displace that acknowledged position. The Appellant continues to rely on the lawful stable development and its associated developed land, rather than claiming brownfield status for the wider agricultural holding.

Policy S5(1)(d) provides a route for the redevelopment of previously developed land outside settlements, subject to the policy balance and other relevant national policies. The proposal should therefore be assessed on that basis.

The Council's concerns about noise, odour and disturbance require an assessment of the proposed building's intended use and likely effects. Proximity alone does not establish that acceptable living conditions cannot be achieved. Any genuine incompatibility must be considered at the Permission in Principle stage, while detailed layout and mitigation measures can be assessed through Technical Details Consent.

Finally, the Council's suggested agricultural occupancy restriction cannot be secured through a Planning in Principle application.

I respectfully invite the Inspector to retain the distinction between the lawful equestrian development and the wider agricultural holding, and to determine the appeal under the appropriate previously developed land policy framework.

Yours,

Robert

--
GLENCAIRN
Unit G02 Eurocity,
Europort Avenue,
Gibraltar, GX11 1AA
+44 (0)7539687790