



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0006

Land South Of The Bowling Green , The Daisycroft, Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9RN

DESCRIPTION:

Erection of 9no. detached dwellings with associated parking, landscaping, hardstanding, access and associated works.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

No relevant planning history

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The application site is located to the south-east of Furners Mead, within the built-up area boundary of Henfield.

The site comprises an enclosed agricultural field located immediately to the east of Furners Mead and The Daisycroft, and immediately to the north of the dwellings along Henfield Common North. The land level descends to the south, with the rear elevations of a number of the dwellings along Henfield Common North are located along the boundary of the site. The site is bound by a mix of post and wire fencing, post and rail fencing, and closeboard fencing, with 2no. oaks subject of Tree Preservation Orders located along the eastern boundary.

The wider surroundings are characterised by medium density residential and commercial development to the south and west, with agricultural fields and woodland located to the east. A sports pavilion and allotments are located immediately to the north, with agricultural fields located further beyond.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of 9no. dwellings along with access and landscaping.

The proposed dwellings would comprise 3no. 2-bed single storey bungalows, 3no. 4-bed bungalows with accommodation in the roof, and 3no. 4-bed two storey dwellings.

The proposed dwellings would be sited to face an internal access road which would extend along the northern boundary before extending south into the centre of the site. Each dwelling would benefit from at least 2no. allocated parking spaces provided to the front of the property and in some instances, within an integral garage, with 3no. visitor parking spaces also provided. Cycle and bin storage would be provided within the rear amenity space of each property.

An area of open space would be maintained to the south-western corner of the site, accessed between Plots 5 and 6, with additional tree planting provided throughout the site.

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 7 - Strategic Policy: Economic Growth
Policy 15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision
Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
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 38 - Strategic Policy: Flooding
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking

Henfield Neighbourhood Plan (2017-2031):

Policy 1 – A Spatial Plan
Policy 2 – Housing Site Allocations
Policy 4 – Transport, Access and Car Parking
Policy 10 – Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 12 – Design Standards for New Development

Henfield Parish Design Statement

Paragraph 33 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 year. 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 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
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
Strategic Policy 37: Housing Provision
Strategic Policy 38: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Policy 40: Improving Housing Standards in the District

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

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

Planning Advice Notes:

Shaping Development in Horsham District
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:

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

HDC Arboricultural Officer: Objection: -

The principal arboricultural features on the site are 2no. Category A grade, open-grown oak trees located along the eastern boundary. Both of these trees are subject to statutory protection under TPO/1468 (T1 and T2). The evidence available suggests that these trees previously formed a line of five trees, where it is considered that these are the last surviving members of this historic line, being of significant age, and historical and landscape importance. The trees are considered to be high-quality specimens with significant amenity value. Due to their size and form, they are readily visible from numerous public viewpoints, particularly when viewed from Henfield Common to the south-east, where the trees can be seen in their entirety.

While the layout is generally acceptable, there are concerns with the impacts Plots 6, 7, and 8 would have on the protected trees. Specifically, the Root Protection Areas of the protected trees are located entirely within the proposed garden areas, where this arrangement is likely to result in clear and foreseeable post-development conflicts, where the introduction of domestic paraphernalia would likely negatively impact the trees through changes in ground levels, soil compaction, and root severance.

The natural, broad-spreading form of the oaks in their current form is considered to be a primary feature of the trees, where the proposed development, particularly in the layout as identified, has the potential to place future pressure on pruning and tree management. The current layout would cast shade across the rear gardens of Plots 6, 7, and 8 during the morning, where the proposed dwellings would restrict the extent of natural light reaching the rear gardens in the late afternoon. Consequently, the rear gardens of Plots 6, 7, and 8 would be affected by shading for a substantial proportion of the day. This would likely result in pressure to significantly prune the trees to improve sunlight penetration. Furthermore, the properties would likely be affected by tree-related detritus, where this would likely be perceived as a nuisance for future occupiers and would foreseeably generate demands for pruning where no comparable pressure currently exists. Given the significant amenity value of these trees, any major tree works would notably erode the existing visual amenity value that the trees provided to the immediate and wider area. Continued tree management would also compromise the health of the trees and diminish the physiological condition and long-term prospects of them.

For these reasons, the current layout could not be supported on arboricultural grounds, and it is considered that the site layout would need to be re-designed to achieve a more harmonious and sustainable relationship with the mature TPO trees at the site. A reduction in the dwelling size of the units

would enable a layout that could retain a landscape buffer, protecting the trees while aligning with housing needs. This would ensure the long-term health and amenity of the protected trees.

HDC Conservation: No Objection

Although there will be some glimpses of the proposed properties when looking through the Conservation Area, this will not result in harm. Background activity, light and noise associated with dwellings is not unexpected in this location. There will be little intervisibility with the Listed Building.

Question the inclusion of crown flat roofs for all the properties. This introduces a number of unnecessarily complicated roof junctions with a risk of being poorly detailed and executed. These points of the roof are the most likely to be visible when looking through the Conservation Area. The roof design also introduces potential weak points in terms of maintenance and repair, all for very little benefit in terms of trying to reduce the perception of height. From a design perspective, the preference would be to show the roofs finished with a ridge.

HDC Drainage Engineer: More Information Required

The information submitted relies upon previously submitted information, however it is expected that a new BRE 365 test is conducted. It is not considered suitable to rely on the results of previous tests from previous applications, particularly as drainage strategy relies on point infiltration.

Opportunities to explore SuDS has been missed and it is advised that the drainage strategy consider the use of additional SuDS.

The results of winter groundwater monitoring must be provided to support the application. The Applicant must demonstrate that appropriate measures have been taken to protect groundwater from pollution. The Applicant must demonstrate that appropriate measures have been taken to protect groundwater from pollution.

HDC Environmental Health: Comment

No Preliminary Environmental Risk Assessment for the site has been provided, but a review of historic mapping and aerial photography shows that the site has remained undeveloped.

If the application is approved, it is recommended that conditions relating to demolition and construction hours and the submission of a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) be imposed.

HDC Environmental Waste Management: Comments

The wheeled drag distance is too far for plots 4 through to 9. With trucks not being able to access the site, this will require the trucks to reverse from The Diasy Croft, up the road, round the corner, and up to the bin store, which is far from ideal.

Would strongly advise that the developer allow access for waste service vehicles, use of the designated turning head, and use the HDC supplied refuse strategy.

HDC Landscape Architect: Objection

The site is relatively flat and comprises an existing outbuilding and predominantly neutral grassland, with sections of non-native hedgerow along part of the northern boundary, and scattered trees within the site. The eastern site boundary and associated vegetation are shown on historic maps. There are two trees (T2 & T3) along this boundary protected by Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

Henfield Conservation Area lies immediately south of the site, and a Grade II Listed building is located to the south-west. Deciduous woodlands are present within the surrounding landscape.

The Horsham District Landscape Character Assessment (2003) identifies the site within the Landscape Character Area (LCA) D2: Hendfield and Small Dole Farmlands. Relevant key characteristics include small to large size regular and irregular fields with a variable hedgerow pattern. The overall sensitivity to change is assessed as high due to the area's visibility, some ridgelines and moderate to high intrinsic landscape qualities. Key sensitivities relate to large scale housing or industrial development and the cumulative impact of small scale incremental change, e.g. suburbanisation. Planning and Land Management Guidelines include: ensure any development does not intrude onto visible ridgelines; ensure any appropriate new development responds to traditional local design and materials, including

flint/brick and sandstone; conserve and manage existing hedgerows, especially where they surround small scale irregular field patterns.

Increased building heights have required the introduction of flat roof elements, which are out of character, to reduce visual prominence. This indicates that the scale exceeds what is appropriate for the locality and in relation to the site's proximity to the listed building. The predominantly single-storey character along The Daisycroft (with the exception of Little Orchard property) provides a clear precedent.

The site's proximity to the listed building requires the development to be low rise and low density with the additional requirement for a buffer zone in the southwestern area of the site. Whilst the open space proposed to the south-west corner is positive in theory, the orientation of dwellings backing onto it and the narrow linking path between plots are not appropriate in terms of amenity, passive surveillance or good design. There is an opportunity to extend the open space across the southern boundary to form a cohesive open space buffer.

In addition, the proposed layout creates a narrow corridor between rear garden fences of existing southern properties and the new scheme. This raises concerns regarding safety, passive surveillance and maintenance responsibilities. Such leftover spaces should be avoided and the removal of fencing and use of new planting along the existing southern boundary is preferable.

The proposed parking arrangements appear to be 'shoe-horned' into the layout, resulting in several locations that raise concerns about safety and practicality. In particular, the placement of parking spaces on or immediately adjacent to road corners creates potential hazards for both vehicles and pedestrians.

The eastern boundary has historic landscape value. The mature oak trees T2 and T3, both protected by TPO, exhibit some features towards potential candidate to veteran tree status. The Preliminary Ecological Assessment notes that these trees meet all six condition criteria, but the table incorrectly states only five under 'Number of criteria pass.' If all 6 criteria are met, the tree achieves the highest possible condition score for this habitat type.

The proposed layout places rear gardens and fencing within the Root Protection Area (RPA) of the TPO trees, and in the case of the northern of the two trees, directly through the trunk. This risks long-term harm through root pressure and potential future requests for crown reduction by residents. An active frontage development would better respect the sensitive landscape features and improve the scheme's response to character.

The new hedgerow and hedgerow tree planting along the northern boundary is welcomed. Proposed planting along the eastern boundary should be carefully reviewed to ensure adequate distance from existing trees for long-term canopy development.

Overall, consider the proposals to be in conflict with allocation Policy 2.4 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Development Plan and Policies 25, 26, 31, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework

HDC Landscape Architect (Subsequent Response): Not Supported

The proposed layout places rear gardens and fencing within the Root Protection Area (RPA) of the TPO trees, and in the case of the northern of the two trees, directly through the trunk. This risks long-term harm through root pressure and potential future requests for crown reduction by residents.

Proposed open space in the south-west corner provides inadequate levels of amenity, passive surveillance and overall design quality, due to the orientation of dwellings backing onto this space and the narrow linking path between plots.

Proposed layout creates a narrow corridor between rear garden fences of existing southern properties and the new scheme. This raises concerns regarding safety, passive surveillance and maintenance responsibilities. Such leftover spaces should be avoided and the removal of fencing and use of new planting along the existing southern boundary is preferable.

The proposed parking arrangements appear to be 'shoe-horned' into the layout, resulting in several locations that raise concerns about safety and practicality. In particular, the placement of parking spaces on or immediately adjacent to road corners.

Proposed planting along the eastern boundary should be carefully reviewed to ensure adequate distance from existing trees for long-term canopy development.

Consider the proposals to be in conflict with allocation Policy 2.4 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Development Plan and Policies 25, 26, 31, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework. Recommend that the scheme is reviewed to align with policy requirements, deliver connected, safe and well-designed open spaces, and protect and enhance valued landscape features that contribute positively to the local character. Proposals should also consider the Planning and Land Management Guidelines for the Landscape Character Area D2: Henfield and Small Dole Farmlands.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

Ecology Consultant: No Objection

There are no buildings on site, the two mature Oak trees will be retained, and the Willow and Beech tree have negligible bat roost potential. Agree that no further surveys for bats are required.

Support the Precautionary Method Statement for Reptiles and Mobile Protected and Priority Species. This should be secured by condition of any consent and implemented in full. The mitigation measures identified should be secured by condition of any consent and implemented in full. Support the recommendation that a Wildlife Friendly Lighting Strategy is implemented for this application to avoid impacts from light disturbance. This should also be secured by condition and technical specification should be submitted prior to occupation. Also support the proposed reasonable biodiversity enhancement for protected, priority and threatened species.

Satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available to support determination of this application. This provides certainty for the LPA of the likely impacts on designated sites, protected and priority species and habitats, and with appropriate mitigation measures secured, the development can be made acceptable.

Southern Water: Comment

Inadequate capacity in the foul network. Network Capacity refers to the available capacity in our underground assets that carry wastewater to Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTWs). This includes a range of pipe sizes and material types, Wastewater Pumping Stations (WPS) and supporting infrastructure. Some capacity issues may be addressed with operational changes; others may require physical works on Southern Water assets. Part of the evaluation looks at the risk of flooding incidents arising from the additional flow of material in terms of 'hydraulic overload'. This means we consider whether there is enough room in the pipes for the likely maximum flow from the connection itself. This assessment does not include random events such as ingress of water from broken pipes, changes in flow arising from blockages or unidentified additional flows from misconnections, these are dealt with through other processes outside of Southern Water asset growth planning team as they are operational incidents.

WSCC Highways: More Information Required

The Daisycroft is a private access road that does not form part of the adopted highway network, although it does form part of the public rights of way network, with footpath number HEN/2547/6 running along the access road and past the site.

The LHA are aware that the private road spur serves the bowling green, sports pavilion, allotments, plus access to three properties on The Daisycroft. It consists of a narrow road and a footway that leads to the gate of the bowling green/sports pavilion/allotments. The roadway varies in width from around 3.2m to 3.5m wide. There is also a wider section, but it is not clear if this is a parking bay approved under the previous development here or was implemented as a passing bay to allow the passing of vehicles to ease two-way vehicle movement to/from the bowling green/sports pavilion and allotments, secured as part of The Daisycroft development.

A plan detailing the access work has not been provided, nor have visibility splays from the proposed access in both directions, nor intervisibility splays for vehicles entering or leaving the bowling green/sports pavilion/allotments. Tracking also showing how two opposing vehicles will access the site/the site and the bowling green/sports pavilion/allotments needs to be provided. Some tracking has been provided, but this does not show the initial access from the existing roadway and into the site via the proposed access route.

WSCC Highways (Re-consultation): No response received

WSCC Public Right of Ways: Comment

Having reviewed the online documentation, it is noted that the entrance to the development crosses Public Right of Way (PROW) 2547. It is also noted that the existing hedge next to the point where Footpath 2547 enters the grounds of Henfield Bowls Club is proposed to be removed. The documents further indicate that new hedging will be planted around the site perimeter, which, based on the plans provided, would run alongside Footpath 2547.

Further information is required to clarify how Public Footpath 2547 will be accommodated, protected, and maintained during the construction phase and following the completion of the proposed development.

NatureSpace: Further Information Required

The development falls within the red impact risk zone for Great Crested Newts. There are 7 ponds within 500m of the development proposal, the closest of which is located 74m south-east. There are recent Great Crested Newt records within 100m. There is connectivity between the development and surrounding features in the landscape.

In agreement with the Ecological Report that eDNA surveys should be undertaken on any ponds with ecological connectivity to the site to further inform any mitigation requirements, which could include the requirement to secure a licence. As stated within the report, this information is required prior to determination.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:

Representations:

80 letters of Objection have been received from 65 separate addresses, and these can be summarised as follows:

- Impact on flood risk of nearby properties
- Does not reflect identified local housing need
- Design and scale of development out of keeping with the surroundings
- Impact on Conservation Area
- Insufficient separation distance from existing dwellings
- Impact on trees
- Loss of natural light to neighbouring properties
- Impact on privacy of neighbouring properties
- Introduction of fence and hedge would impact amenity of neighbouring properties
- Differing ground levels with adjacent dwellings along Henfield Common North
- Restricted access
- Additional traffic
- Impact on public footpath
- Does not conform with Neighbourhood Plan policy
- Damage caused by construction traffic
- Impact on services
- Impact of parking on neighbouring roads
- Overdevelopment
- Site too small for quantum of development proposed
- Insufficient parking
- Refuse collection unacceptable
- Access for emergency vehicles
- Height and roof form of the proposed dwellings
- Siting of proposed bin collection area
- Noise
- Unsafe pedestrian access
- Impact on enjoyment of the Henfield Bowling Club
- Visible from Henfield Common North
- Impact on key views
- Inadequate information of Great Crested Newts

Parish Comments:

Henfield Parish Council: Objection

- Does not accord with Policy 2.4 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan
- Contrary to Policies 1, 10, 16, 23, 32, 33 and 35 of the Horsham District Planning Framework

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 (HDPF) states that development will be permitted within towns and villages which have defined built-up areas. 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 in accordance with the settlement hierarchy.

Policy 1 of the Henfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan defines the built-up area boundary of Henfield. Development proposals located inside the boundary will be supported provided that they accord with the other provisions of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan and the HDPF.

Policy 2 of the Henfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan states that residential development on the site as identified will be supported subject to the criteria identified against each site.

The application site is identified under Policy 2.4 of the Henfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan as "Land South of the Bowls Club (Off Furners Mead)". This allocates the site for approximately 10 single storey dwellings, subject to the following criteria:

- a. The design for the proposal demonstrates an understanding of the elements which contribute to the character of the landscape and these inform the design and layout of the site. Any proposal should be of an appropriate scale and massing in keeping with the character of the surroundings.
- b. The proposal preserves or enhances the historic significance of the setting of the Henfield Conservation Area, in particular the proposal must preserve the nearby Listed Building and its setting. This will include a green buffer zone in the south west part of the site.
- c. The proposal comprises single storey dwellings suitable for older and downsizing households to meet local need.
- d. The proposal takes account of the amenities of adjoining residential properties.
- e. The proposal takes full account of visibility and key views, in particular provides mitigation against its visibility from the south.
- f. The proposal maintains and enhances the site's rural character, retaining existing field boundaries where appropriate and enhancing with native species.
- g. A full ecological and biodiversity assessment should be submitted as part of the application. Any reasonable mitigation proposed by the assessments must be implemented in full.

- h. Vehicular access into the site is provided from Furners Mead and in a way which does not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the occupiers of adjacent residential properties.
- i. All roads, cycle ways and footpaths should conform to West Sussex Highway Standards.
- j. Any external lighting should be designed to minimise light pollution and supports the dark skies policy of the South Downs National Park.
- k. The proposal includes an adequate number and positions electric vehicle charging points to enable residents to choose to use electric vehicles.
- l. The development of the site takes place on the basis of a comprehensive drainage strategy. The strategy should address how seasonal groundwater would be satisfactorily accommodated within the development of the site.

The application site is located within the built-up area of Henfield, which is defined as a “Small Town and Larger Village” within the settlement hierarchy. These are described as settlements with a good range of services and facilities, strong community networks and local employment provision, together with reasonable rail and/or bus services. The settlements act as hubs for smaller villages to meet their daily needs, but also have some reliance on large settlements/each other to meet some of their requirements.

The application site comprises an allocated parcel of land within the adopted Neighbourhood Plan, where the principle of residential development of approximately 10 dwellings has been considered appropriate. The principle of development is therefore considered appropriate, subject to conformance with a number of criteria being met, as discussed in the following sections.

Housing Mix:

Policy 16 of the HDPF states that development should provide a mix of housing sizes, types and tenures to meet the needs of the district’s communities as evidenced in the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment in order to create sustainable and balanced communities. The appropriate mix of different housing types and sizes for each site will depend upon the established character and density of the neighbourhood and the viability of the scheme.

Policy 2.4 of the Henfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan states that development on the site should comprise single storey dwellings suitable for older and downsizing households to meet local need.

The Northern West Sussex Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) dated 2019 indicates that there is a need for primarily 2-bed and 3-bed dwellings within the District (30% and 40% respectively). It is noted that the SHMA indicates a 25% need for 4+ bed dwellings in the district.

The Henfield Housing Needs Assessment (HHNA) outlines that the current housing stock exhibits a strong bias towards larger dwellings and relatively few flats. Smaller dwellings of 2 and 3 rooms (1-bed and 2-bed dwellings) are needed to address the increase in the number of solo households, the growth in numbers of the elderly, and the need to provide affordable homes for newly forming households. While the number of larger family homes forms an important part of the housing mix and should continue to do so, they do not represent a priority moving forward; where the evidence suggests an over-supply of medium sized homes of 5 rooms (3-bed houses).

Policy 2.4 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan seeks to provide single storey dwellings suitable for older and downsizing households to meet local need. The intention of this policy is to accommodate local need, where the SHMA identifies a majority of need for 2-bed and 3-bed dwellings, with the HHNA indicating the majority of local need within the Parish for 1-bed and 2-bed dwellings.

The proposed development would comprise 3no. 2-bed single storey bungalows, 3no. 4-bed bungalows with accommodation in the roof, and 3no. 4-bed two storey dwellings. While it is noted that the proposal incorporates a small number of 2-bed single storey dwellings, the majority of the housing mix comprises 4-bed dwellings, contrary to the recommendations of both the SHMA and the HHNA. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy 16 of the HDPF and Policy 2.4 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan.

The weight to be given to this conflict, and whether there are any material considerations that would outweigh this conflict, will be assessed in the Conclusion section below.

Design and Appearance:

Policies 25, 32, and 33 of the HDPF promote development that protects, conserves and enhances the landscape and townscape character from inappropriate development. Proposal should take into account

townscape characteristics, with development seeking to provide an attractive, functional and accessible environment that complements the locally distinctive character of the district. Buildings should contribute to a sense of place, and should be of a scale, massing, and appearance that is of a high standard or design and layout which relates sympathetically to the landscape and built surroundings.

Policy 12 of the Henfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan states that as appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals will be supported where their design and detailing meet the relevant requirements in the Henfield Parish Design Statement. In addition, as appropriate to the site concerned, development proposals should be of a scale, density, massing, height, landscape design, layout and materials that are of a high quality and reflect the architectural and historic character and the scale of the surrounding buildings and street scene/landscape.

The site comprises an enclosed agricultural field located immediately to the east of Furners Mead and The Daisycroft, and immediately to the north of the dwellings along Henfield Common North. The application site is located within Landscape Character Area D2: Henfield and Small Dole Farmlands, where the overall sensitivity to change is assessed as high due to the area's visibility. Planning and Land Management Guidelines include ensuring that any development does not intrude onto visible ridgelines, ensure any appropriate new development responds to traditional local design and materials, and conserve and manage existing hedgerows, especially where they surround small scale irregular field patterns.

It is recognised that the site is located in close proximity to the medium density residential development comprising Furners Mead and The Daisycroft, whereby the proposal has the potential to appear as an extension to this residential locality. However, the site is located to the edge of the settlement and surrounded by countryside, where the land level of the site sits above both Furners Mead and Henfield Common North. Development of the site would be visible from along Henfield Common North, where any proposal would need to be sensitively designed to address this. This is highlighted in Policy 2.4€ of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Following consultation with the Council's Landscape Architect, the application site is located within the D2: Henfield and Small Dole Farmlands Landscape Character Area. Relevant key characteristics include small to large size regular and irregular fields with a variable hedgerow pattern. The overall sensitivity to change is assessed as high due to the area's visibility, some ridgelines, and moderate to high intrinsic landscape qualities. Key sensitivities relate to large scale housing or industrial development and the cumulative impact of small scale incremental change. Planning and Land Management Guidelines include ensuring any development does not intrude onto visible ridgelines; ensuring any appropriate new development responds to traditional local design and materials, including flint/brick and sandstone; and conserving and managing existing hedgerows, especially where they surround small scale irregular field patterns. Concerns were initially raised with the design and layout of the development, which was considered to result in a poor quality design where development would be shoe-horned into the site and would fail to reflect the respect and respond to the landscape character features.

The application has been amended to address these concerns, with the redesign of the roofs of each dwelling to omit the crown roof element and additional soft landscaping. Following re-consultation with the Landscape Architect, concern remains in respect of the layout of the proposal, where the proposal is considered to adversely impact the protected trees, the proposed parking arrangements are considered to be shoe-horned into the site, and the narrow corridor between rear garden fences and proposed planting considered to be inappropriate. The layout and accessibility to the open space is also considered to result in poor safety and surveillance and design quality.

While the comments of the Landscape Architect are noted, it is recognised that Policy 2.4 allocates the site for approximately 10 dwellings, including open space provision to the south-west. This allocation does not in itself make any development acceptable, where any proposal needs to take account of the constraints and sensitivities of the site, including its relationship to nearby built form and open spaces, and its proximity to protected trees and natural features.

The proposed dwellings would utilise form and features found within the locality, with the design of the dwellings considered to relate sympathetically with the built character of the wider surroundings. The proposal is considered to be of a scale and massing that would sit comfortably within the context, and while the proposal would be somewhat visible from wider vantage points along Henfield Common North, it is considered that in totality, the proposal would sit comfortably within the context. It is therefore considered that the overall design, scale and massing of the proposed dwellings would respect the

character of the locality and would not result in significant adverse harm to the visual amenities of the area.

However, when considered alongside the overall layout of the development and the manner in which the proposed dwellings relate to each other and the retained open spaces, there are some concerns that the proposal appears somewhat cramped, and particularly when considering the layout and orientation of the dwellings to the open space and the protected trees. It is considered that improvements in the layout and arrangement of the dwellings, including a reduction in their footprint, would enable an improved spacing and relationship with the open space to the south-west, while also reducing the potential impact on the root protection areas of the protected trees, with this impact considered further below.

Trees and Landscaping:

Policy 25 of the HDPF states that the natural environment and landscape character of the District, including the landscape, landform and development pattern, together with protected landscapes and habitats will be protected against inappropriate development. The Council will support development proposals which: protects, conserves and enhances the landscape character, taking into account areas identified as being of landscape importance, the individual settlement characteristics, and maintains settlement separation. Policy 33 of the HDPF outlines that in order to conserve and enhance the natural and built environment development should presume in favour of the retention of existing important landscape and natural features, for example trees, hedges, banks, and watercourses. Development must relate sympathetically to the local landscape and justify and mitigate against any losses that may occur through the development.

Policy 2.4(f) of the Henfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan states that the proposal should maintain and enhance the site's rural character, retaining existing field boundaries where appropriate and enhancing with native species. Policy 10 of the Henfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan continues that development proposals will be supported provided their layout and landscape schemes comply with the following principles as appropriate: the amenity value of the existing landscape including hedgerows, scrub trees and ponds is maintained, and the proposals result in positive visual and landscape impact; the amenity value of trees is maintained, including those trees without Tree Preservation Orders and trees outside the Henfield Conservation Area; and landscape schemes enhance the site and its surroundings, and positively contribute to the landscape character of the area, including providing for their ongoing maintenance and utilise native plants especially in public areas and on boundaries.

Following consultation with the Arboricultural Officer, it is noted that the principal arboricultural features on the site are 2no. Category A grade, open-grown oak trees located along the eastern boundary. Both of these trees are subject to statutory protection under TPO/1468 (T1 and T2). The evidence available suggests that these trees previously formed a line of five trees, where it is considered that these are the last surviving members of this historic line, being of significant age, and historical and landscape importance. The trees are considered to be high-quality specimens with significant amenity value. Due to their size and form, they are readily visible from numerous public viewpoints, particularly when viewed from Henfield Common to the south-east, where the trees can be seen in their entirety.

While the layout is generally acceptable, there are concerns with the impacts Plots 6, 7, and 8 would have on the protected trees. Specifically, the Root Protection Areas of the protected trees are located entirely within the proposed garden areas, where this arrangement is likely to result in clear and foreseeable post-development conflicts, where the introduction of domestic paraphernalia would likely negatively impact the trees through changes in ground levels, soil compaction, and root severance. The current layout would cast shade across the rear gardens of Plots 6, 7, and 8 during the morning, where the proposed dwellings would restrict the extent of natural light reaching the rear gardens in the late afternoon. Consequently, the rear gardens of Plots 6, 7, and 8 would be affected by shading for a substantial proportion of the day. This would likely result in pressure to significantly prune the trees to improve sunlight penetration. Furthermore, the properties would likely be affected by tree-related detritus, where this would likely be perceived as a nuisance for future occupiers and would foreseeably generate demands for pruning where no comparable pressure currently exists. Given the significant amenity value of these trees, any major tree works would notably erode the existing visual amenity value that the trees provided to the immediate and wider area. Continued tree management would also compromise the health of the trees and diminish the physiological condition and long-term prospects of them.

While recognised that proposed dwellings 6, 7 and 8 would be located outside the Root Protection Areas of the protected trees, the limited size of the residential curtilages to these plots, when coupled with the

overall size of each of the protected trees, would impact the level of natural light entering the residential curtilages of these properties. This would consequently place future pressure on the protected trees, where any potential works would reduce the visual amenity value of the trees.

While additional planting is proposed within the site, which would offer some landscape enhancement, there are concerns that the proposed layout of the development, facilitated by the scale and footprint of the proposed dwellings, would result in adverse harm to the existing trees, and particularly protected T1 and T2. The proposed development would not therefore protect and conserve the landscape character features, contrary to Policies 25 and 33 of the HDPF and Policies 2.4 and 10 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan.

The weight to be given to this conflict, and whether there are any material considerations that would outweigh this conflict, will be assessed in the Conclusion section below.

Heritage:

Policy 34 of the HDPF states that applications for development affecting heritage assets will be required to, among other things, reinforce the special character of the district's historic environment through appropriate siting, scale, form and design, including the use of traditional materials and techniques; make a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of the area, and ensuring that development in Conservation Areas is consistent with the special character of those areas; preserve and ensure clear legibility of locally distinctive vernacular building forms and their settings, features, fabric and materials; and retain and improve the setting of heritage assets, including views, public rights of way, trees and landscape features.

Policy 2.4 of the Henfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan states that development on the site should preserve or enhance the historic significant of the setting of the Henfield Conservation Area, in particular the proposal must preserve the nearby Listed Building and its setting. This will include a green buffer zone in the south west part of the site.

Policy 12 of the Henfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan states that the design of new development should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Henfield Conservation Area and/or preserve any adjacent Listed Buildings and their settings.

Following consultation with the Council's Design and Conservation Officer, no concerns were raised with regard to the principle of residential development to the rear of the Henfield Conservation Area and the designated Listed Building. Glimpses of built form within this context is generally expected, where there would be limited intervisibility with the Listed Building. Concerns were however raised regarding the proposed roof forms, and particularly the scale and massing resulting from the crown-pitched design.

The proposal has been amended to reduce the roof form and remove the crown-pitched roof elements to the dwellings. This amendment has improved the overall quality of the design in a manner that would better reflect the proportions and visual quality of the development. Consequently, the proposal is considered to sit more comfortably within the context of the designated Conservation Area. The development is not therefore considered to result in harm to the special qualities and significance of the designated Conservation Area and nearby heritage asset, in accordance with Policy 34 of the HDPF and Policies 2.4 and 12 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan.

Residential Amenity:

Policy 32 of the HDPF states that development will be expected to provide an attractive, functional, accessible, safe, and adaptable environment that contribute a sense of place both in the buildings and spaces themselves. Policy 33 continues that development shall be required to ensure that it is designed to avoid unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupiers/users of nearby property and land.

Policy 12 of the Henfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan states that the design of development should respect the amenities of occupiers/users of nearby property and land.

The proposed layout would facilitate appropriate spacing between each of the dwellings, with the orientation and openings of the development considered to ensure that each dwelling would benefit from appropriate amenity space and would not be adversely impacted through overlooking or loss of privacy.

Concerns were raised with regard to the distance between the proposed dwelling of Plot 9 and the nearby residential properties along Henfield Common North. The scale of this dwelling has been reduced, where on ground floor side windows are proposed. Additional landscaping is proposed along the southern

boundary, and while this cannot be relied upon to mitigate harm, it would aid in the reduction of perceived overlooking from the development site.

In considering the development in totality, it is not considered that the proposal would result in harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties and users of land through overlooking, overbearing impact, loss of light and loss of privacy. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with the above policies.

Highways Impacts:

Policies 40 and 41 of the HDPF promote development that provides safe and adequate access, suitable for all users.

Policy 2.4 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan states that vehicular access into the site is provided from Furners Mead and in a way which does not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the occupiers of adjacent residential properties and all roads, cycle ways and footpaths should conform to West Sussex Highway Standards.

Policy 4 of the Henfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan states that as appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals should demonstrate that safe pedestrian routes from residential to community facilities can be achieved, and demonstrate that cycle ways can be achieved, especially to provide links from residential to community infrastructure and the wider regional cycle routes. Adequate off-road car parking should be provided for all developments in accordance with West Sussex Parking Standards.

The Daisycroft is a private access road that does not form part of the adopted highway network, although it does form part of the public rights of way network, with footpath number HEN/2547/6 running along the access road and past the site.

Following consultation with the Local Highways Authority, further information was requested to confirm that two vehicles could pass each other along the access, along with proposed visibility splays. Additional information has been submitted to address these matters, including visibility and tracking plans.

A further consultation from the Local Highways Authority was requested but no response was received. Had the application be considered acceptable in all other regards, the outstanding matters would have been further addressed.

Ecology:

Policy 31 of the HDPF states that development will be supported where it demonstrates that it maintains or enhances the existing network of green infrastructure. Development proposals will be required to contribute to the enhancement of existing biodiversity and should create and manage new habitats where appropriate.

Paragraph 187 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should contribute to an enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are resilient to current and future pressures and incorporating features which support priority or threatened species. Paragraph 193 of the NPPF states that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

Circular 06/2005 identifies that the presence of protected species is a material consideration when considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat. Therefore, it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed application, is established before planning permission is granted. Information on biodiversity impacts and opportunities should inform all stages of development, and an ecological survey is usually necessary where the type and location of development are such that the impact on biodiversity may be significant and existing information is lacking or inadequate.

The application has been supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Arbtech dated 01.10.2025. which identifies the habitats and features within the site and the likely presence of protected and priority species.

Following consultation with the Council's Ecologist, the information provided is considered sufficient to support the application, with the proposed Precautionary Method Statement, mitigation measures, and enhancement measures considered acceptable. Subject to the inclusion of conditions to secure these matters, no ecology concerns are raised.

Water Neutrality:

A 2021 Position Statement from Natural England identified that it could not be concluded with the required degree of certainty that new development in the Sussex North Water Supply Zone would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites. As a consequence, and to comply with the legal duties set out in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (known as the Habitat Regulations), all new development since has been required to demonstrate water neutrality.

On 31st October 2025 Natural England formally withdrew the 2021 Position Statement, citing a package of measures that they were satisfied would safeguard the Arun Valley sites. Principal amongst these measures is a reduction in the Southern Water abstraction licence 'by March 2026'. However, given the licence change has not yet taken place Horsham District Council, as competent authority under the Habitats Regulations, cannot yet be certain that new development will not result in adverse impacts on the Arun Valley sites.

To ensure development can come forward as water neutral in the meantime, the Council has agreed with Natural England to use the significant water savings made by Southern Water in 2024/25 through their programme of leakage reduction (amongst other measures). This has generated some 3,240,000 litres per day of water savings that can now be attributed to new development without increasing water abstraction in the Arun Valley beyond baseline. These savings were previously to be used to launch the Sussex North Water Certification Scheme (SNWCS), however following the withdrawal statement SNWCS will no longer be launching. Natural England standing advice dated 10 November 2025 raises no objection to using these savings to enable development to come forward. The standing advice clarifies that it functions as Natural England's formal response pursuant to Regulation 63(3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 to all relevant planning applications which seek to achieve water neutrality using the above Southern Water savings.

Officers have undertaken an Appropriate Assessment which demonstrates that the anticipated increase in mains water consumption from this development, alongside all other development granted since the 31st October 2025, will not exceed 3,240,000 litres per day.

Accordingly, Officers consider that the proposed development will not have an Adverse Effect on the Integrity of the Arun Valley Site, either alone or in combination with other plan and projects, thereby complying with Regulations 63 and 70 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, HDPF Policy 31, and paragraph 193 of the NPPF.

Drainage and Flood Risk:

Policy 38 of the HDPF states that development proposals will follow a sequential approach to flood risk management, giving priority to development sites with the lowest risk of flooding and making required development safe without increasing flooding elsewhere. Development should utilise drainage techniques that mimic natural drainage patterns and manage surface water as close to its source as possible where technically feasible.

The Applicant has provided a SuDS and Foul Drainage Assessment which outlines that the proposed drainage solution for the proposed development. The Council's Drainage Engineer requested additional information. It is however considered that these matters could be addressed by condition should the development be considered acceptable.

Climate Change:

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.

Should the proposed development be considered acceptable, the following measures to build resilience to climate change and reduce carbon emissions would be secured by condition:

- Water consumption limited to 110litres per person per day
- 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 suitably 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 (on unregistered sites) and significant on-site enhancements will be secured over this period by way of a Legal Agreement.

The Applicant has submitted a Biodiversity Gain Assessment by Arbtech dated 15.10.2025 along with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric. This indicates that a minimum of 5.69 area-based habitat units and 0.01 linear-based habitat units are required. The Biodiversity Gain Assessment states that given the proposed vegetation clearance of the site to facilitate the provisioning of residential infrastructure, including large amounts of sealed surface and vegetated garden, it is unlikely that net gain will be achieved within the development site. The Assessment outlines that off-site compensation will be required, but it does not indicate the method in which this would be achieved. This matter would be addressed post-decision should the application be approved.

Other Matters:

It is noted that the Council's Waste Services team have raised concerns with the proposed refuse/bin collection, where access into the site by refuse vehicles would be preferred, in line with the Council's strategy. Had the application been considered acceptable, this matter would have been further addressed by amendment and/or condition.

Conclusions:

The application site is located within the built- up area boundary of Henfield where the principle of residential development is acceptable subject to all other material considerations. The site is identified under Policy 2.4 of the Henfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan as "Land South of the Bowls Club (Off Furners Mead). This allocates the site for approximately 10 single storey dwellings, subject to a number of criteria. As outlined in the preceding sections, the proposed housing mix, size, and type of dwellings are not considered to reflect local housing needs as identified within the North West Sussex Strategic Housing Market Assessment nor the Henfield Housing Needs Assessment, and would result in an unacceptable quantum on two storey dwellings, contrary to Policy 16 of the HDPF and Policy 2.4 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan.

The proposed layout of development and the resulting limited size of the residential curtilages to Plots 6, 7, and 8, when coupled with the overall size of each of the protected trees along the eastern boundary, would impact the level of natural light entering the residential curtilages of these properties. This would consequently place future pressure on the protected trees, where any potential works would reduce the visual amenity value of the trees. The proposed development would not therefore protect and conserve

the landscape character features, contrary to Policies 25 and 33 of the HDPF and Policies 2.4 and 10 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan.

It is acknowledged that the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a full 5-year housing land supply, and it is recognised that this forms a material consideration in decision making which triggers the application of the 'tilted balance' at Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF. In accordance with Paragraph 11(d), the Council is required to grant permission unless either (or both) of the following apply:

- (i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- (ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

It is acknowledged that the proposed development would contribute 9no. dwellings to the housing supply, where this would result in some benefits, including short-term economic benefits during construction and subsequent benefits to the local economy. The benefits of providing housing within the built-up area, in accordance with the spatial strategy, would be given significant weight in the planning balance.

Paragraph 14 of the NPPF outlines the continued relevance of Neighbourhood Plans in situations where the presumption of favour or 'tilted balance' applies. Paragraph 14 states:

"in situations where the presumption (at paragraph 11d) applies to applications involving the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, provided the following apply:

- (a) the neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan five years or less before the date on which the decision is made; and
- (b) the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement"

Henfield Neighbourhood Plan was made on 23 June 2021 and is therefore less than 5 years old. The Neighbourhood Plan allocates several sites for housing development to meet identified local needs up to 2030. It is therefore considered that both criteria (a) and (b) have been met.

The proposed development would conflict with Policy 2.4 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan, whereas outlined within paragraph 14 of the NPPF, this conflict would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits arising from the housing contribution. This policy is considered to be in date, where the conflict with the policy is given significant weight.

Taking all matters into account, the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework as a whole.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

- 1 The development would result in a mix, size, and type of dwellings that would fail to reflect local housing need as identified within the Northern West Sussex Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and the Henfield Housing Needs Assessment (HHNA). The development would not therefore be designed to meet local need, contrary to Policy 16 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy 2.4 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan. Notwithstanding the absence of a five-year land housing supply, and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) at paragraph 11(d), it is not considered that there are any material considerations in this instance which would outweigh harm arising from conflict with Local and Neighbourhood Plan policies in these regards.
- 2 The development, and specifically Plots 6, 7, and 8, would be sited in close proximity to a belt of mature protected trees on the eastern boundary of the site which form an important landscape

feature, contributing significantly to the character and visual amenity of the area. It has not been demonstrated that the development could be constructed and occupied without causing direct or indirect harm to these protected trees, including through root damage, changes to soil levels, or future pressure for pruning or removal arising from the close relationship between the trees and the proposed dwellings. The proposal would therefore place the long-term health, retention and public amenity value of these trees at unacceptable risk. The development is therefore contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy 2.4 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan (2017-2031).

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/26/0006

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

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location plan	Site Location Drawing	LP REVISION C	01.04.2026
Site plan	Proposed Site Plan	001 REVISION J	01.04.2026
Site plan	Proposed Site Plan (In Colour)	C001 REVISION C	01.04.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	Plot 01 Proposed Plans & Elevations	110 REVISION B	01.04.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	Plot 02 Proposed Plans & Elevations	111 REVISION B	01.04.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	Plot 03 Proposed Plans & Elevations	112 REVISION B	01.04.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	Plot 04 Proposed Plans & Elevations	113 REVISION B	01.04.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	Plot 05 Proposed Plans & Elevations	114 REVISION B	01.04.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	Plot 06 - Proposed Plans & Elevations	115 REVISION B	01.04.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	Plot 07 Proposed Plans & Elevations	116 REVISION B	01.04.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	Plot 08 Proposed Plans & Elevations	117 REVISION B	01.04.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	Plot 09 Proposed Plans & Elevations	118 REVISION B	01.04.2026
Supporting Statement	SUDs & Foul Drainage Assessment by GTA Civils & Transport Limited dated December 2025	13909	05.01.2026
Supporting Statement	Badger Survey by Arbtech dated 11th November 2025	NONE	05.01.2026
Supporting Statement	Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Arbtech dated 1st October 2025	NONE	05.01.2026

