Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DC/25/0546
Barn House, Barrow Hill, Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9DN

DESCRIPTION:
Erection of a two-storey residential dwelling, gym/games outbuilding, and associated landscape works.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/20/1400	Erection of a garden office.	Application 22.09.2020.	Permitted on
DC/20/1479	Subdivision of existing dwelling into two dwellings, Installation of an additional front door and installation of 2No. garage doors on existing car ports.	Application 29.01.2021.	Permitted on
DC/21/1014	Relocation of existing window on the east elevation.	Application 05.11.2021.	Permitted on
DISC/22/0172	Approval of details reserved by condition 6 to approved application DC/20/1479	Application 31.08.2022.	Permitted on

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The application site is an undeveloped infill plot within the settlement boundary of Henfield. Barn House is located between Nep Town Road and Barrow Hill, which is a detached dwelling. The proposed site comprises the rear garden of Barn House, a historic barn with an associated cowshed converted into a residential dwelling in the late 20th century. The application site is located within the boundaries of the Henfield Conservation Area. The site abuts the boundary of Rothery Field, a recreation ground with a football pitch. A Public Right of Way runs alongside the boundary.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The application proposes to erect a two-storey residential dwelling with a detached gym/games outbuilding and associated landscape works. The dwelling would be located within a subdivided plot which currently forms part of Barn House on Nep Town Road. The dwelling would have a kitchen/living/dining area, 4 bedrooms, 3 ensuites, a WC and shower room. Secure cycle storage would be provided on site. The application would create a hardstanding area and install a close-boarded timber fence with gate.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES
The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):
Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development
Policy 2 - Strategic Policy: Strategic Development
Policy 3 - Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy
Policy 4 - Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion
Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles
Policy 34 - Cultural and Heritage Assets

Policy 35 - Strategic Policy: Climate Change
Policy 36 - Strategic Policy: Appropriate Energy Use
Policy 37 - Sustainable Construction
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking

Henfield Neighbourhood Development Plan (2017-2031):
Policy 1: A Spatial Plan
Policy 4: Transport, Access, and Car Parking
Policy 12: Design Standards for New Developments

Paragraph 34 of the NPPF requires that all development plans complete their reviews no later than 5 years from their adoption. Horsham District Council is currently in the process of reviewing its development plan however at this stage the emerging policies carry only limited weight in decision making. As the HDPF is now over 5 years old, the most important policies for the determination of this application must be considered as to whether they are 'out of date' (NPPF paragraph 11d). This includes, for applications involving the provision of housing, whether the Council can demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites (NPPF footnote 8).

The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, with the supply currently calculated as being 1 years. The presumption in favour of development within Paragraph 11d) of the NPPF therefore applies in the consideration of all applications for housing development within the District (unless footnote 7 or Paragraph 14 applies to relevant applications), with Policies 2, 4, 15 and 26 now carrying only moderate weight in decision making.

All other policies within the HDPF as itemised above have been assessed against the NPPF and are considered to be consistent such that they continue to attract significant weight in decision making.

Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19):
Strategic Policy 1: Sustainable Development
Strategic Policy 2: Development Hierarchy
Strategic Policy 3: Settlement Expansion
Strategic Policy 6: Climate Change
Strategic Policy 7: Appropriate Energy Use
Strategic Policy 8: Sustainable Design and Construction
Strategic Policy 9: Water Neutrality
Strategic Policy 10: Flooding
Strategic Policy 11: Environmental Protection
Strategic Policy 12: Air Quality
Strategic Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Strategic Policy 19: Development Quality
Strategic Policy 20: Development Principles
Policy 21: Heritage Assets and Managing Change within the Historic Environment
Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport
Policy 25: Parking
Policy 46: Ancillary Accommodation

Supplementary Planning Guidance:
Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD (2017)
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2017)

Planning Advice Notes:
Facilitating Appropriate Development
Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS RESPONSES
Where consultation responses have been summarised, it should be noted that Officers have had consideration of the full comments received, which are available to view on the public file at www.horsham.gov.uk

Consultations:

HDC Arboricultural Officer: Comment

The application requires some loss of trees within the Conservation Area – this negative aspect of intensification of residential development needs to be mitigated in more specific detail.

The application states there are no trees on or adjacent to the site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the landscape character. No tree measured tree survey or AIA has been submitted.

The property is within the Conservation Area and the plans indicate that two of the protected trees within it will be removed to enable the development. These trees are of visual significance when viewed from the main road junction and in particular from the public recreation ground to the West.

To the East of the property boundary, beyond the PROW are a grouping of mature trees of mixed species subject of Tree Preservation Order No. 0500. These trees are of principal significance in views of the site from the surrounding area due to their size and maturity. From my informal observations, the key rooting of these trees would not likely be significantly detrimentally affected by development of the subject site.

HDC Conservation Officer: Objection

The application site is located within the Henfield Conservation Area, set behind the locally listed building of Barn House. Barn House was originally an agricultural building which was converted to residential use in the late 1970's.

The application seeks to construct a dwelling to the rear of Barn House, and a gym/games outbuilding. As noted in the Design and Access Statement incorporating the Heritage Statement "the character of Nep Town is largely defined by its semirural setting, created by areas of dense vegetation interspersed with a mix of timber-framed and later 19th- and 20th-century buildings."

The existing building on the site was formally part of a wider agricultural holding and an appreciation of its agricultural past is reflected in the adjoining open space of Rothery Field. The footpath to the side of the site and the views from the field reinforce the sense of moving from the built-up frontage of Nep Town Road towards the countryside beyond. The rear garden area of Barn House narrows to the south where the proposed building would be located. It would be considered that the introduction of a property of the size proposed would reduce the understanding of the former barn within its setting, lessening the transition between Nep Town Road and the countryside beyond the conservation area boundary.

The design of the building would have a hard industrial form, which would appear incongruous in this location due to the context within which it would sit. The building would be understood within the surroundings of the conservation area, and Barn House which is constructed using traditional materials, and building forms that reinforce its character. It is understood that the existing boundaries of the site would to some extent enclose the building from public view however this is reliant on the timber fence and hedges being retained to a certain height. Development should also be of a quality that is not reliant on enclosing boundary treatments, as this can too often be repeated to the detriment of the area as a whole. It would therefore be considered that the proposed development would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, resulting in less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area, at the lower end of the scale.

Natural England: No Objection [summary]

In order to mitigate these adverse effects and make the development acceptable, the following mitigation measures should be secured:

- The delivery, management and maintenance of any measures identified in the applicant's water neutrality statement that are required to ensure that the proposed development will not result in increased levels of abstraction within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone.

Southern Water: Comment

Proposed soakaways
The Council's Building Control officers or technical staff should be asked to comment on the adequacy of soakaways to dispose of surface water from the proposed development. No new soakaways should be located within 5 metres of a public or adoptable gravity sewer, rising main or water main.

No Soakaways should be connected to the public surface water sewer.

Insufficient Information provided
Construction of the development shall not commence until details of the proposed means of foul water drainage disposal have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Southern Water.

WSCC Highways: Comment
This application seeks the erection of a two-storey residential dwelling with gym/games outbuilding and associated landscape works. The site is located on Barrow Hill, an A-classified road subject to a speed restriction of 30 mph.

No vehicular access appears to be associated with the proposed development, whilst pedestrian access will utilise Public Footpath no. 2570_1. The applicant is advised that any proposed works to the Public Footpath will be subject to consent from WSCC Public Rights of Way.

I note that Manual for Streets states waste collection vehicles should be able to access within 25m of the bin storage point and that residents should not have to carry bins more than 30m where at all practical, although this is an amenity issue.

No vehicular parking is proposed for this development. Using the WSCC Car Parking Demand Calculator, the LHA would expect a dwelling of this size and location to provide three car parking spaces. As such, any car parking would have to be accommodated on-street. There does appear to be capacity on the nearby roads within 200m of the application site to accommodate this – whilst no highway safety or parking capacity concerns would be raised, the LPA may wish to consider the potential impacts on on-street parking from an amenity point of view.

The site is situated in a sustainable location within walking/cycle distance of local services, amenities, and public transport links in Henfield. Cycling is a viable option in the area and the applicant has demonstrated secure cycle parking provision in accordance with WSCC Parking Standards.

In summary, the LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

WSCC Rights of Way: No Objection
Having consulted the online documents I can confirm that the above referenced public footpath is the closest route but sits outside the red line boundary of the site therefore we have no objection.

Having said this there are a few points for the applicant to note. Firstly, the public footpath cannot be restricted or obstructed in any way as part of the proposed works. Any restriction or obstruction would be an offence under the Highways Act 1980.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:
Representations:
8 letters of Objection have been received from 6 addresses, objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Overdevelopment of the site
- Scale of proposed dwelling and outbuilding appear excessive in relation to surrounding properties
- Disrupt rural character of area
- Impact on local infrastructure and traffic
- Loss of privacy and increased noise to adjacent properties
- Environmental impact and loss of green space
- Insufficient justification for additional residential development
- No parking provision for cars
- Design should be sympathetic to existing architectural style and scale of conservation area
- Design does not echo local vernacular
- Visual intrusion – not sympathetic or subtle addition to local landscape
- Scale out of keeping with surroundings
- Lack of community benefit
- Ecological concerns
- Loss of trees in conservation area
- Materials not in accordance with those set out in Henfield Parish Design Statement

Parish Comments:
Henfield Parish Council: Objection

- Not a strategic site in the Local Plan
- Not a nominated site in the Neighbourhood Plan
- Does not maintain the quality and character of the area
- Does not demonstrate car parking requirements that can be accommodated within the immediate surroundings
- Does not complement the distinctive character and heritage of the area
- Loss of amenity o neighbouring property
- Scale and massing out of keeping and unsympathetic
- Does not preserve and ensure clear legibility of, locally distinctive vernacular building forms
- All six houses nearby affected by the loss of amenity

Member Comments:
None received.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUALITY:

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

Principle of Development:

Policy 3 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) ('the HDPF') states that development will be permitted within built-up area boundaries and that any infilling and redevelopment will be required to demonstrate that it is of an appropriate nature and scale to maintain characteristics and function of the settlement.

Policy 1.1 of the HNP states *development proposals located in these boundaries (Henfield Built-Up Area) will be supported, provided they accord with the other provisions of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan and the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF).*

The site is within the built-up area of Henfield. The principle of the development is therefore considered acceptable, subject to detailed considerations.

Design and Appearance:

Policy 32 of the HDPF states that good design is a key element in sustainable development and seeks to ensure that development promotes a high standard of urban design, architecture, and landscape. Policy 33 of the HDPF states that development proposals should make efficient use of land, integrate effectively with the character of the surrounding area, use high quality and appropriate materials, retain landscaping where feasible (and mitigate loss if necessary) and ensure no conflict with the character of the surrounding town or landscape.

Policy 12 of the HNP advocates for new development be of sound design and reflective of the character of the area. It aims to protect against inappropriate development by ensuring the design, scale, layout, and massing of development is appropriate to the immediate area. Development should be respectful to the conservation area and listed buildings if applicable.

The proposal seeks to erect a two-storey residential dwelling and a gym/games outbuilding. The proposed development would form part of a plot, which currently forms part of the rear garden of Barn House on Nep Town Road. The proposed dwelling would be located to the south-west of the site, with access from the south-east along the public right of way. The dwelling would comprise a shallow-pitched roof set behind a parapet, and would provide 4 bedrooms and other habitable living areas, spread across two floors, upper ground, and lower ground. One level of the proposed dwelling would be subterranean, with approximately 1.5m below ground level. There would be 2.4m head height at lower ground level and 2.5m at upper ground level. The overall height of the proposed dwelling above ground level is 4.4m. The GIA would be 181.08m2. Pre-cast fair faced concrete stairs provide access to the front and rear entrances with a metal cable balustrade and handrail either side.

The planning statement states that the proposed arrangement of accommodation and curtilage offers high levels of privacy. The statement proceeds that the development will be moderate in scale and will respect the form, rural character, and local style of buildings in the immediate settings. It is further acknowledged that the proposed dwelling would be of sustainable construction, with the finished house designed with high levels of insultation. The materials would also accord with the Green Guide to housing specification, with double glazed low E coated seal windows and timber sourced from suppliers affiliated with certified schemes.

The gym/games outbuilding would be located against the north-west corner of the site and have an overall height of approximately 5.77m. The outbuilding has a pitched roof, with an eaves height of approximately 2.55m, the length would be 11m and the width would be 6.50m. The footprint of the gym building would be 71.51 sqm. The design of the outbuilding is more akin to a residential dwelling, with clay tiles and facing brickwork.

However, it is considered that the design of both the residential dwelling and outbuilding lack visual connection. While it is acknowledged that the residential dwelling would use sustainable materials and construction, the proposed design visually appears as an industrial and urban unit, presenting a utilitarian form. The design also lacks visual relationship to the materials in the wider conservation area,

with the use of metal standing seam cladding lacking any visual connection to Barn House, which utilises timber cladding and agricultural form. Furthermore, the design of the outbuilding reads as a residential dwelling, through the use of clay tiles and facing brickwork. These materials would be considered more appropriate for use within the conservation area, as there is visual reference in the surrounding residential development. The design of both buildings lacks visual connection, with these buildings positioned in very close proximity to each other but lacking any relationship. The outbuilding would be for incidental use in association with the main dwelling. However, as highlighted above, there is no visual connection. Each building would be viewed as separate dwellings as there is no apparent relationship between the two. The outbuilding must appear subservient to the main dwelling, and read in connection, however, the current proposal proposes two separate buildings which have no visual relationship.

Furthermore, the scale has not been justified. The outbuilding would be 1.37m taller than the residential dwelling, with a pitched roof proposed. No justification has been provided for the need to have a pitched roof on the outbuilding, where a flat roof would provide the same space but would appear less prominent. The site is of an adequate size; however, the two proposed buildings would be of a similar scale and therefore the cumulative impact of both would form cramped development on the plot. While the existing site boundaries would help enclose the development, screening this from some public views, this is reliant on the timber fence and hedging being retained at a certain height. The existing boundaries cannot be relied upon to screen development and development should be of a quality that does not rely upon enclosing boundary treatment. The proposal lacks justification on the reasoning for the scale of both buildings and the resultant form of the site creates a cramped development which would be considered overdevelopment.

The proposed development is considered to be of a scale and proportion that would detract from the character of the conservation area and result in a dominant built form which lacks any visual connection to each other and the wider characteristics of the Henfield Conservation Area. While it is acknowledged that the dwelling would be sustainably constructed, it is considered that the resultant building would have no visual relationship with the wider conservation area and a character and appearance that would be more akin to an outbuilding. The outbuilding itself, would visually appear as a residential dwelling. The lack of connection and the resultant scale of the two buildings on the site would combine to form a cramped development that is not in-keeping with the surrounding character. The proposal would be overdevelopment of the site, and as such, is considered to be contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Trees and Landscaping:

The proposal would result in the loss of trees within the conservation area. These trees are located towards the north of the site and removed to accommodate the proposed gym building. The application states there are no trees on or adjacent to the site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the landscape character. But no tree measured tree survey or AIA has been submitted. The applicant was advised that this information was required but no response was received.

The HDC Arboriculture Officer was consulted and requested more information as the property is within the Henfield Conservation Area and the plans indicated that two of the protected trees would be removed to enable the development. These trees are of visual significance when viewed from the main road junction and in particular from the public recreation ground to the West. The root protection area of mature trees towards the east of the property boundary would not likely be significantly detrimentally affected by development of this subject site. Without an appropriate scheme of landscape planting provided and more details relating to the removal of two trees within the conservation area, the proposal is not viewed favourably. It is acknowledged that trees in the conservation area would be removed, however, a condition could be attached to ensure the replacement of these trees.

Heritage and Archaeology:

Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework states that the Council will sustain and enhance its historic environment through positive management of development affecting heritage assets.

The application site is located within Henfield Conservation Area. The heritage statement provided stated that Barn House was originally an agricultural building which was converted to residential use. The HDC Conservation Officer stated that the existing building on the site was formally part of a wider agricultural holding, and an appreciation of its agricultural past is reflected in the adjoining open space of Rothery Field.

The Officer noted that the introduction of a property of the size proposed would reduce the understanding of the former barn within its setting, lessening the transition between Nep Town Road and the countryside beyond the conservation area. The design of the building would have a hard industrial form, which would appear incongruous in this location. The proposed building would be understood within the surroundings of the conservation area and Barn House, built from materials that reinforce its character.

The existing boundaries enclose the site from public views; however, this is reliant on the timber fence and hedges being retained to a certain height. The development should be of a quality that does not rely on existing screening and boundary treatment. The proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area. The proposed development is not considered to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, with the proposed building of a built form which would be unusual for this location. The proposal lacks a reflection of the existing design and character of the local vernacular and is sited in a place which would disconnect Barn House, a previously historic agricultural barn, from the surrounding character. The proposed development would therefore not be in compliance with Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

In addition to the above, the Conservation Officer has noted that the development would result in less than substantial harm (on the lower end of the scale). Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states:

> *Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.*

No public benefits have been identified as a result of the development. Whilst the provision of one dwelling would contribute towards the Council's present undersupply of housing delivery, the overall provision would be negligible, offering limited weight in its favour. This limited weight would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm as identified above. Therefore, the proposal is also contrary to Paragraph 215 of the NPPF.

Residential Amenity:

Policy 33 of the HDPF states that permission will be granted for development that does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of the occupiers/users of nearby properties and land.

It is acknowledged that there were 8 representations received that objected to the application. This was due to several reasons, mainly relating to the development of the site, parking provision and design.

While the proposed dwelling would be located towards the rear of the existing residential garden of Barn House, it is considered that the site slopes down towards the south. There would be approximately 31.88m distance from the proposed dwelling to Barn House. The gym however would be approximately 16.71m to Barn House. A 1.8m close boarded timber fence with gate would subdivide the gardens between the dwellings. There would, however, be limited amenity space retained at Barn House due to the subdivision of the plot. It is considered though that the retained amenity space would not be significantly harmful to the enjoyment of occupiers at Barn House. The dwellings to the East of the site would be approximately 20m away from the proposed development. It is considered that there would be sufficient distance maintained between existing residential development and proposed.

Due to the positioning of the dwelling and low-level design, the proposal would not create any views to neighbouring properties or land which would be unusual or unexpected in a location such as this, and no harmful loss of privacy would result.

The impact of the proposal on amenity is considered to not cause detrimental harm to nearby amenity and is in accordance with the above policy.

Highways Impacts:

Policy 40 of the HDPF deals with sustainable transport and seeks new developments to provide safe and suitable access for all vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists, horses riders, public transport, and the delivery of goods. Policy 41 which relates to parking requires adequate parking and facilities to be provided within developments to meet the needs of anticipated users.

Policy 4.4 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan states that *adequate off-road car parking should be provided for all developments in accordance with West Sussex Parking Standards.*

The proposed dwelling sits behind Barn House, which fronts the main road. The dwelling would be located down a public footpath. The proposed site plan indicates no areas provided for vehicular parking, there has been no justification for the lack of parking, with the planning statement stating that the traffic generated will remain compatible with the environmental character of the area and can be accommodate adequately on the surrounding road network West Sussex Parking Standards requires a 4-bedroom dwelling within Henfield to provide a minimum of 2.7 parking spaces. The anticipated parking demand for the development is therefore 3 parking spaces. The dwelling does not seek provide any new vehicle parking to accommodate this need and would result in the shortfall of on-site parking.

As no parking has been provided on site, any car parking would have to be accommodated on-street. While there is unrestricted parking on nearby roads within 200m of the application which could accommodate this, this not considered suitable to rely on to provide provision for 3 car parking spaces. It is acknowledged that the site lies within a sustainable location as it is within the built-up area and within walking distance of local services, amenities, and public transport links in Henfield. It is noted that there are opportunities available to cycle and walk to the site that would reduce the need to travel by car. Secure cycle storage has been provided on site. WSCC Highways does not raise any highway safety or parking capacity concerns, however, as stated by Policy 41, adequate parking and facilities must be provided within the development to meet the needs of the anticipated users.

While noted that parking in the locality is both restricted and unrestricted, it is noted that there are existing on-road parking pressure along Nep Town Road, with one lay-by close to the site for parking for Rothery Field. Given this situation, further on-road parking pressure would not be welcomed, and it would be anticipated that any new development would provide an adequate level of on-site parking provision to mitigate the current pressure. The proposal includes a shortfall of parking spaces, and while there would be opportunities available for occupiers to walk and cycle to shops, facilities, and services, it is still considered that an adequate level of on-site parking provision would be necessary given the current pressure on the local road network. The Planning Inspector for an appeal at 33 Spencers Road (ref: APP/Z3825/W/24/3343959) highlighted that while the accessibility of the location may enable future occupiers to travel by modes other than private vehicle, there would be no means to ensure that they would in fact do so. Nor could it be guaranteed that occupiers would not also have a private vehicle that they may seek to park locally. This is considered to be relevant to this application.

Therefore, while it is recognised that the application site is located within the built-up area, and within close proximity to Henfield, which is classified as a small town and larger village, Policy 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework states that adequate parking and facilities must be provided within development to meet the needs of anticipated users. The proposed development would result in an under-provision of off-road parking spaces, and while the town centre location is noted, the existing parking pressure is considered to be a material consideration of great weight to justify the need for adequate and sufficient on-site parking provision.

It is noted that the Local Highways Authority does not consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in severe cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway. However, while balancing the issues, it is considered that the under-supply of on-site parking, as required by Policy 41 of the HDPF, given the context of the site, would result in sufficient harm to justify a reason for refusal.

The proposed development, given the shortfall of parking spaces and in the context of the existing current parking pressure on the local road network, is considered to result in an inadequate level of on-site parking provision that would not meet the demand of anticipated users and would result in poor amenity and environment within the locality. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Policy 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Water Neutrality:

The application site falls within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone as defined by Natural England which draws its water supply from groundwater abstraction at Hardham. Natural England has issued a Position Statement for applications within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone which states that it cannot be concluded with the required degree of certainty that new development in this zone would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites.

Natural England advises that plans and projects affecting sites where an existing adverse effect is known will be required to demonstrate, with sufficient certainty, that they will not contribute further to an existing adverse effect. The received advice note advises that the matter of water neutrality should be addressed in assessments to agree and ensure that water use is offset for all new developments within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone.

The submitted Water Neutrality Statement outlines that the existing baseline consumption is 0 l/d. The proposed development represents a water demand of 211.06 litres/day (73.8 l/p/d x 2.86). Rainwater Harvesting is proposed for 100% of the water demand both potable and non-potable water. The total roof area is 170.58m2 and the rainwater harvesting demand has been calculated to account for 35-day and 60-day drought period. A 15,000-litre potable rainwater harvesting tank would be installed and suitable treatment would be installed to ensure the water meets drinking water regulations. The Water Neutrality Statement outlines the robust maintenance and management plan for the system. The strategy demonstrates that the proposed water demand could be fully offset with the collection of rainwater and the proposed use would be equal to the existing – 0 l/d. Officers are therefore satisfied that subject to the imposition of conditions to secure these measures, the development would be water neutral.

Natural England were consulted on the water strategy following the carrying out of an Appropriate Assessment by officers, and raised no objection, subject to the delivery, management and maintenance of measures identified in the water neutrality statement to achieve water neutrality. The information available and the mitigation measures proposed are considered to provide the necessary certainty to demonstrate that the proposed development would be water neutral. Appropriate mitigation measures have been demonstrated and are considered sufficient to avoid adverse effects on the integrity of the interest features of the Arun Valley SPA, SAC, and Ramsar site from the development either alone or in combination with other plans and projects, in accordance with Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Paragraphs 192 and 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority habitats and species).

Other Matters:

<u>Climate Change</u>:

Policies 35, 36 and 37 require that development mitigates to the impacts of climate change through measures including improved energy efficiency, reducing flood risk, reducing water consumption, improving biodiversity, and promoting sustainable transport modes. These policies reflect the requirements of Chapter 14 of the NPPF that local plans and decisions seek to reduce the impact of development on climate change. The proposed development includes the following measures to build resilience to climate change and reduce carbon emissions:

- Requirement to provide full fibre broadband site connectivity
- Dedicated refuse and recycling storage capacity
- Opportunities for biodiversity gain
- Cycle parking facilities

- Electric vehicle charging points

Subject to these conditions the application will suitable reduce the impact of the development on climate change in accordance with local and national policy.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG):

Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021) mandates that every development must achieve at least a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG (unless the development qualifies as exempt under the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024) and that every planning permission granted for the development of land in England shall be deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that development must not be begun unless a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority and the planning authority has approved the Plan.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must show how the development will achieve the required minimum 10% BNG using the statutory biodiversity metric tool and must demonstrate how the habitats will be managed and maintained for 30 years, starting from the date the development is completed. Off-site gains and significant on-site enhancements will be secured over this period by way of a Legal Agreement.

The Applicant has demonstrated that the development is exempt from the requirement to achieve a minimum 10% BNG by reason of:

- The development qualifies as 'self-build or custom housing' under Regulation 8 of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024

Conclusions:

The proposal is not considered to accord with relevant local and national planning policies and is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation: Application REFUSED

Reasons for Refusal:

1 The proposed development, by reason of its design, scale and layout, would result in a visually discordant and cramped form of development that fails to respect the character of the Henfield Conservation Area, resulting in less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area, with no public benefits identified to outweigh this harm. As such, the development is contrary to Policies 32, 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Policy 12 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan, and paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

2 The proposed development, given the shortfall of parking spaces and in the context of the current parking pressure on the local road network, would result in inadequate level on-site parking provision that would not meet the demands of anticipated users and would result in poor amenity and environment within the locality. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

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: DC/25/0546
Schedule of plans/documents **not approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Elevation plan		2501BA_R0.1_209	01.04.2025
Section plan		2501BA_R0.1_300	01.04.2025
Section plan		501BA_R0.1_301	01.04.2025
Elevation & Floor plan		501BA_R0.1_400	01.04.2025
Design & Access Statement	Planning	NONE	01.04.2025
Design & Access Statement	Heritage	NONE	01.04.2025
Supporting Statement	Water neutrality report and management plan	NONE	01.04.2025
Location plan		2501BA_R0.1 _000	01.04.2025
Layout plan	Existing and proposed survey	2501BA_R0.1_001	01.04.2025
Block plan		2501BA_R0.1_002	01.04.2025
Floor plan		2501BA_R0.1_200	01.04.2025
Floor plan		2501BA_R0.1_201	01.04.2025
Roof plan		2501BA_R0.1_202	01.04.2025
Elevation plan		2501BA_R0.1_203	01.04.2025
Elevation plan		2501BA_R0.1_204	01.04.2025
Elevation plan		2501BA_R0.1_205	01.04.2025
Elevation plan		2501BA_R0.1_206	01.04.2025
Floor plan		2501BA_R0.1_207	01.04.2025
Elevation plan		2501BA_R0.1_208	01.04.2025

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Bethan Tinning Date: 23.05.2025

Authorising Officer sign/initial RHERMITAGE Date: 27.05.2025