For official use only (date received): 25/02/2026 16:12:41

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/Z3825/W/25/3376429

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference	APP/Z3825/W/25/3376429
Appeal By	MR SHAWN KELF
Site Address	Land To The Rear of The Rectory High Street Rusper West Sussex RH12 4PX

SENDER DETAILS

Name	[redacted]
Address	Rusper Stores High Street RUSPER RH12 4PX

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- ☐ Appellant
- ☐ Agent
- ☑ Interested Party / Person
- ☐ Land Owner
- ☐ Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- ☐ Final Comments
- ☐ Proof of Evidence
- ☐ Statement
- ☐ Statement of Common Ground
- ☑ Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- ☐ Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

RPC Representation
Appeal Reference: APP/Z3825/W/25/3376429
[redacted],
The Planning Inspector has invited further comments in relation to The Glebe appeal. His letter called for representations that must relate only to Section 3 (pages 4–6) of the Appellant's Heritage Rebuttal Statement. Rusper Parish Council wish to submit the following, which is in addition to our previous responses to the initial planning application DC/24/1835 and our initial appeal response sent previously.
The "Appeal Rebuttal in connection with The Refusal Of DC/24/1835" by DGC Consultants, seems to concentrate primarily on the impact on the The Old Rectory (Non-Designated Heritage Asset – NDHA) and much of what they say is valid in the sense of the appreciation of this building as a grand Victorian building in its own right. They make light of the significance of the historic setting of the Grade 1 Listed St. Mary Magdalene Church, alongside the Old Rectory and the historic Glebe field as a group that clearly represent the fundamental character of the village as a Christian settlement.
Despite the later addition of a new Rectory on part of the Glebe field, the photograph shown as Figure 1 in their submission clearly shows the relational importance of these three areas when considered in the historical context of a Christian settlement.
This combination of sites forms the northern edge of the Rusper Conservation area and are a key element in the overall appreciation of the village setting. The urbanising effects of a development of this nature and the way it would impact this northern edge of the Conservation area seem to have been ignored as part of this document, as they were previously in the earlier HDC submissions. They dismiss this as "The significance of the relationship between these two
buildings is less tangible and relates to their function / former function which can be easily appreciated through the name of the buildings and also through documentary evidence.", which totally ignores the character impact on the Conservation area as a whole and the spacial relation as shown in their Figure 1.
Two of their conclusion responses also relate to this aspect of the rebuttal:
Their conclusion point 6.2:
6.2 A key assertion of the council since the refusal of the application is that the application site makes an important contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is noted within the CAAMP that the application site is one area where the rural character of the conservation area can be appreciated, but it is not the only area. Further, the proposed layout of the new housing has been given due consideration to retain a sense of openness and preserve mature trees on the site. This has ensured that the green and verdant character of the site will be preserved by the proposed development if the appeal is allowed.
Where it states "It is noted within the CAAMP that the application site is one area where the rural character of the conservation area can be appreciated, but it is not the only area." is misleading. Residents of the village will clearly know that this is a clear misrepresentation. It is the only rural, agricultural field within the Conservation area. The only other open areas are the Village Playground and the Church graveyard, which are an entirely different character.
As such the Glebe field adds an important aspect to the character of the village and the Conservation area.
Their conclusion point 6.3:
6.3 Third Party Representations have focused on the effect of the new development on the relationship between the church and The Old Rectory. While there may be change to views from within the application site the relationship between The Old Rectory and the church will be seen over the new built form, this will not eradicate an understanding of this relationship which will still be visible across the site, even if the built form is an incidental part of these views. Further views across the site are seen through the existing mature tree planting which offers partial screening, even in autumn and winter and more so in the spring and summer. There will also still be an understanding of the relationship between the two buildings from views outside of the application site.
Where it states " The Old Rectory and the church will be seen over the new built form, this will not eradicate an understanding of this relationship which will still be visible across the site" it underestimates the impact of the proposed development. Once completed the views of the Church and drive to the Old Rectory will be sandwiched between the terrace of cottages to the south and an estate

of 9 houses to the north. To say that this will not impact the character of the setting of these buildings and the Conservation area as a whole is a misrepresentation.
They also fail to note the slow erosion of the setting of these important buildings and their setting over recent years. Previous developments in Chalice Walk and The Old Forge have already impacted on the overall character of the Conservation area and whilst individually their impact was not significant, when considered alongside this new proposal we start to see a significant overall impact that cannot be ignored.