**For official use only (date received): 27/02/2026 23:15:05**

# 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<br>Rusper<br>West Sussex<br>RH12 4PX |

### SENDER DETAILS

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | [redacted] |
| Address | The Rectory High Street<br>Rusper<br>HORSHAM<br>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**

The "Appeal Rebuttal in connection with The Refusal Of DC/24/1835" seems to 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 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 (in the 1980s), the photograph shown as Figure 1 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.

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.

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.

This combination of all these 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. In 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.
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 here, 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 of an entirely different character and as such the Glebe field adds an important aspect to the character of the village and the Conservation area.

The proposed development underestimates the impact it will have - 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.
My concerns about the environmental issues concerning wildlife and additional traffic and road safety in the village remain.