Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DC/23/1918
Woolvens Farm, Billingshurst Road, Ashington, RH20 3BB

DESCRIPTION:
Demolition of existing barn and outbuildings and erection of replacement 4-bed dwelling.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/19/1445	Demolition of existing building and erection of 4-bed dwelling.	Refused on 13.09.2019
DC/20/0310	Demolition of existing building and erection of 4-bed dwelling.	Withdrawn on 06.04.2020

SITE AND SURROUNDS
The application site is located to the north of Billingshurst Road (B2113), outside of any defined built-up area. The site is therefore within the countryside in policy terms. The site is positioned to the north of a residential dwelling known as Thornbank, with access shared between the two premises. A number of rural buildings are located to the west of the application site, with the wider surroundings comprising agricultural land. The site bound by a mix of post and rail fencing and hedging. The site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3, with Lancing Brook running along the edge of the eastern boundary of the application site. The building is currently used to store a range of materials.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION
The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing barn and the erection of a 4-bed dwelling.

The proposed dwelling would seek to reflect a traditional Sussex barn, and would measure to a length of 42m and a maximum depth of 18m. The proposal would comprise the main barn structure to the south, with a single storey hipped roof outshut positioned to the north. The proposed development would involve the infill of the ground level by approximately 0.95m, with the main barn building incorporating a half-hipped roof measuring to an overall height of 6.6m above this, and the outshut measuring to an overall height of 4.5m above the built-up ground level. The proposed dwelling would incorporate roof lights within the east and west elevations, with cart door openings to these elevations. The proposal would be finished in timber cladding and tile roof.

The proposed development would utilise a private access track, which would run parallel along the north of Thornbank's private access road off B2133. A new access would also be created in the south western corner of the application site, as opposed to the established entrance to the south-east of the site, which would be removed. Parking and private amenity space would be provided within the application site, to the east of the proposed building.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES
The National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

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 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection

Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles
Policy 38 - Strategic Policy: Flooding
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking

Ashington Neighbourhood Development Plan (2021)
Policy Ash1: Overall Spatial Plan for Ashington
Policy Ash3: Parking Provision
Policy Ash5: Landscaping and Countryside Access

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 2.9 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 limited 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.

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 Arboriculture: Objection.
Insufficient information provided on existing trees and how they will be managed during the development in accordance with the relevant design standard (BS 5837:2012 - Trees in relation to design demolition and construction – Recommendations).

HDC Environmental Health: Objection.
Insufficient information provided on proposed water supply in relation to Water Neutrality, land contamination, and construction environmental impacts.

HDC Drainage: No views received.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES
Natural England: Objection
Insufficient information provided.

WSCC Highways: No objection, subject to conditions and informatives.
The proposal would not have a severe impact on the operation of the highway authority and therefore is not contrary to Paragraph 115 of the NPPF.

Southern Water: Comment

Advise that there are no public foul sewers in the area to serve the proposed development and advice the applicant to examine alternative means of foul disposal are examined. Southern Water note that it is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.

Environment Agency: Objection.
The submitted Flood Risk Assessment does not comply with the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments, as set out in paragraphs 20 to 21 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance and its site-specific flood risk assessment checklist. The FRA does not therefore adequately assess the flood risks posed by the development.

Ecology Consultant: Objection.
Insufficient ecological information has been provided, in particular with regards to bats and aquatic species.

NatureSpace: No objection, subject to an informative.

Parish Comments:
Ashington Parish Council objects to this planning application on the grounds that:

- The location is outside the defined built-up area boundary, in a countryside location, and its use is not essential to this location.
- The site is not identified for development in the Ashington Neighbourhood Plan (site was rejected) nor the Horsham District Planning Framework / emerging Local Plan.
- The site is located some distance from village services, has poor pedestrian links and would therefore require the use of a private car. This is not considered sustainable.

Representations:
No letters of representation have been received.

Member Comments:
None received.

HUMAN RIGHTS
Article 8 (right to respect of a private and family life) and Article 1 of The First Protocol (protection of property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to the application. Consideration of human rights is an integral part of the planning assessment set out below.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT
The main considerations material to this application relate to:
- Principle of Development
- Design and Appearance
- Amenity Impacts
- Highways Impacts
- Flood Risk
- Ecology
- Water Neutrality

Principle of Development:

The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing building, and the erection of a 4-bed dwelling. The site comprises a timber clad building and lean-to open-sided extension, which is currently used for the storage of materials. These materials comprise primarily building materials and are seemingly not agricultural in nature.

Policy 2 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) sets out the main growth strategy, focusing development in the main settlements. Policy 3 of the HDPF directs development within existing settlements which have defined built-up area boundaries (BUAB) and Policy 4 states that development will be permitted outside BUAB expansion of settlements where, amongst other criteria, a

site has been allocated in a local plan or neighbourhood plan. As the application site is located outside of a BUAB and is not allocated within either the HDPF or the Ashington Neighbourhood Plan (ANP), the proposed development does not accord with Policies 3 and 4 in this regard. Therefore, the principle of the proposed development outside of any defined built-up area boundary is contrary to the overarching spatial strategy and principles of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Development Plan.

As the site lies outside of any BUAB, it is therefore considered to be within a countryside location in policy terms. Policy 26 protects the countryside against inappropriate development unless it is considered essential and appropriate in scale; whilst also meeting one of four criteria. These criteria include: supporting the needs of agriculture or forestry; enabling the extraction of minerals or the disposal of waste; providing for quiet informal recreational use; or enabling the sustainable development of rural areas. The erection of a dwelling is not considered to be essential to its countryside location, nor does it meet any of the criteria set out in Policy 26, therefore this proposal does not accord with Policy 26.

In recognition of the HDPF housing policies being out-of-date, the Council published interim guidance on Facilitating Appropriate Development (FAD). The FAD recognises that the Council is likely to receive applications outside of defined BUAB and on unallocated sites (such as this proposal) as it is unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. Given this position and the principles behind HDPF Policy 4, the FAD confirms that applications which meet all the following criteria will be positively considered:

- The site adjoins the existing settlement edge as defined by the BUAB;
- The level of expansion is appropriate to the scale and function of the settlement the proposal relates to;
- The proposal demonstrates that it meets local housing needs or will assist the retention and enhancement of community facilities and services;
- The impact of the development individually or cumulatively does not prejudice comprehensive long-term development; and
- The development is contained within an existing defensible boundary and the landscape character features are maintained and enhanced.

While the proposed development could be considered to meet some of the required above, the application site is located approximately 1.3km north of Ashington and does not adjoin an identified settlement, therefore fails at the first criteria and does not accord with the FAD.

Paragraph 83 of the NPPF promotes development in rural areas where housing would enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities by virtue of it’s location. Paragraph 84 of the NPPF continues that "planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one of the listed circumstances apply. The term "isolated" is not defined within the National Planning Policy Framework, but case law has confirmed that it should be given its ordinary objective meaning of remote and far away from other places, buildings and people, and separate or remote from a settlement, services, and facilities. It was concluded in the Braintree Judgement that a settlement would not necessarily exclude a cluster of dwellings. The application site is located within proximity to a number of residential dwellings and other buildings, and given this spatial context is not considered to be "isolated" in its truest sense and does not therefore engage the considerations of paragraph 84.

Policy Ash1 of the Ashington Neighbourhood Development Plan outlines that new development in Ashington shall be focused within the built-up area boundary. Development proposal outside the built-up area boundary and the site allocations will not be permitted unless: they represent appropriate uses in the countryside; they are on previously developed land and accord with local and national policy for such development; or they relate to the retention of existing and appropriate provision of new commercial businesses. While it is recognised that the site could be considered previously developed land, the spatial strategy and directive from the NPPF guides development to previously developed land within settlements, where it is considered to be more sustainable, and as set about above, the proposal does not accord with the relevant development plan policies.

It is therefore considered that the principle of the proposed development within the countryside is contrary to the overarching spatial strategy and principles of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Development Plan.

Design and Appearance:

Policies 25, 32 and 33 of the HDPF promote development that is of a high-quality design, which is sympathetic to the character and distinctiveness of the site and surroundings. The landscape character of the area should be protected, conserved and enhanced, with proposals contributing to a sense of place through appropriate scale, massing and appearance.

Policy Ash5 of the Ashington Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan states that development which abuts open countryside must not create a hard edge and should provide an appropriate landscape buffer. Proposals must demonstrate how the visual impact of buildings on the site has been minimised through their layout, heights and landscaping. In particular, the retention and planting of trees, hedges and vegetation is encouraged to soften the impact to development, retain and improve the street scene and keep the rural village feel of Ashington.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting; establish a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit; optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development; and create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible.

The proposed development would involve the infilling of land by approximately 0.95m to the west to provide level ground infill, resulting in the main barn building incorporating a half-hipped roof measuring to an overall height of 6.6m above this, and the outshut measuring to an overall height of 4.5m above the built-up ground level. It is recognised that the height of the proposal would be further exaggerated by the infill, which would emphasise the verticality of the structure, particularly when considered within the site. However, the proposed Sussex barn form would be anticipated within the rural context and would not appear substantially out of keeping. It is also recognised that the site is relatively well screened, not visible from public vantage points, and with limited permeability through or into the site.

The HDC Arboriculturist has been unable to make a fair assessment of the impact of the proposed development on trees and landscape and the viability of retaining the mature trees around the site boundaries due to insufficient information. Therefore, without the certainty that the mature trees could viably be retained, it cannot be guarantee that the proposal could benefit from the existing screening or whether additional tree planting is required to ensure appropriate landscaping of the site.

As insufficient information has been submitted to determine that the proposed development would not result in an adverse impact to trees and landscape, a fair assessment of arboricultural impacts cannot be undertaken. Accordingly, the proposed development does not accord with Policies 25 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Amenity Impacts:

Policy 33 states that development should consider the scale, massing and orientation between buildings, respecting the amenities and sensitivities of neighbouring properties.

The site lies adjacent to a residential property to the south, which is separated from the site by the access drive, as well as a mature boundary hedge. While the proposal would introduce a residential receptor to the site, it is considered that such use would be reflective and commensurate to the neighbouring use. Furthermore, this use would likely result in the reduction of activity and disturbance from the site, especially with the proposed relocated access track and site access to the north. It is not therefore considered that the proposal would in harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties

through noise and disturbance. The proposed dwelling is considered to be at an acceptable distance from the neighbouring property to restrict potential overlooking and loss of privacy.

The proposed development is therefore not considered to result in harm to the amenities or sensitivities of neighbouring properties, in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Highways Impacts:

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

Policy Ash3 of the draft Ashington Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan states that development proposals that generate an increased need for vehicle parking must provide suitable offstreet parking in order to minimise obstruction of the local road network in the interests of safety of all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists. For all new residential developments, including redevelopments where there is an increase in the number of bedrooms in a property, the minimum number of car parking spaces to be provided will be in accordance with the West Sussex Residential Parking Demand Calculator, unless it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that an alternative approach to provision would be appropriate on a specific site.

The proposed development would utilise a new private access track, which would run parallel along the north of Thornbank's private access road off B2133. There are no proposed changes to the access onto the B2133, therefore the proposed development is not considered to have an adverse impact to highway safety. A new access would also be created in the south western corner of the application site and the established entrance to the south-east of the site would be removed. Visibility from the new access point is considered sufficient given that this would be a low traffic and low speed environment, not directly adjoining Billingshurst Road.

It is not anticipated that the proposal would generate a material increase in traffic movements over the existing permitted storage use. Parking and private amenity space would be provided within the application site, to the east of the proposed building. This would provide adequate space for vehicle turning and parking associated with the proposed development.

The proposal would provide a large area to accommodate the anticipated number of vehicles and a new separate access track and site access with appropriate visibility and space for anticipated capacity, without changing the access onto the B2133. It is not therefore considered that the proposed development would result in harm to the function or safety of the highway network, in accordance with Policy 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Paragraph 115 of the NPPF.

Flood Risk:

Policy 38 of the HDPF states that development should 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 flood risk elsewhere. Development proposals will: take a sequential approach to ensure most vulnerable uses are placed in the lowest risk areas; avoid the functional floodplain except for water-compatible uses and essential infrastructure; only be acceptable in Flood Zone 2 and 3 following completion of a sequential test and exceptions test if necessary; and require a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment for all developments over 1 hectare in Flood Zone 1 and all proposals in Flood Zone 2 and 3.

The application site lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3, which is land defined by the Planning Practice Guidance for the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for Flood Risk and Coastal Change as having a high and medium probability of flooding. Paragraph 165 of the NPPF discourages inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding by directing development away from areas at highest risk. As discussed above, the principle of the proposed development is at conflict with the relevant development plan policy and therefore is a departure within an area at the highest risk of flooding, contrary to NPPF Paragraph 165.

Paragraph 168 of the NPPF is clear that development should not be permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding and that the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Contrary to Policy 38, the applicant has not completed a sequential test as part of the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and therefore the proposal is also at conflict with the NPPF in this regard. When determining any planning applications, paragraph 173 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere and applications should be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment, including sequential tests. As advised by Environment Agency, the Flood Risk Assessment provided does not provide adequate information to fully assess the application and is therefore considered inadequate.

Insufficient information has been submitted to determine that the proposed development would not result in an increase in flood risk on or around the site, as required by paragraph 173 of the NPPF. Therefore, an adequate assessment of flood risk cannot be undertaken, and the proposal does not accord with Policy 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

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.

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.

The submitted Ecological Technical Note – Bat Preliminary Roost Assessment does not include an assessment of the potential presence of bat roosts in the trees or consideration of potential impacts or severance to flightlines. Furthermore, no information has been submitted to demonstrate an assessment has been undertaken on any impact of the proposed development on aquatic species, including Water Vole, which is a protected species in accordance with Government Standing Advice. This information is required to provide certainty of impacts on legally protected species and be able to secure appropriate mitigation either by a mitigation licence from Natural England or a condition of any consent.

As insufficient information has been submitted to determine that the proposed development would not result in an adverse impact to existing ecology, including protected species, habitats and flightlines, an adequate assessment of ecological impacts cannot be undertaken. Accordingly, the proposed development does not accord with Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Water Neutrality:

The application site falls within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone where mains-water is supplied by way of groundwater abstraction within the Arun Valley. The Local Planning Authority received a ‘Position Statement’ from Natural England in September 2021, advising that the effects of existing groundwater abstraction cannot be objectively demonstrated to be compatible with the conservation objectives of a number of habitat sites. The habitat sites named within the Natural England position statement include the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites.

Within its Position Statement of September 2021, Natural England advise that decisions on planning applications should await the development of a water-neutrality strategy on a strategic basis. In the current absence of a strategic solution to achieving water-neutrality, Natural England advise that individual plans and projects, where it is critical that these proceed, must demonstrate net-neutrality in respect of the use of mains-water such as to avoid contribution to the known adverse effect upon the integrity of Arun Valley habitat sites by reason of water-use.

The application site currently comprises material storage within a barn and lean-to structures, therefore the site baseline is expected to be negligible. The proposed development includes 1 bathroom, 2 en-suite bathrooms and a kitchen area alongside 4 bedrooms. All of these would give rise to a new water demand at the site over and above any of the existing uses. The submitted Water Neutrality Statement does not include any information on the existing site baseline, proposed mitigation measures, or indeed any water neutrality calculations. Specifications for various white goods and water metre readings have been submitted, but without any explanation of calculations as to how these may form a water neutrality assessment.

Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate the proposed baseline resulting from the proposed development, with no mitigation measures proposed and / or no offsetting measures to address a potential increased demand that may arise from the proposed dwelling. In assessing the submitted details, Natural England would require further information before a Water Neutral position could be established.

Therefore, officers conclude that insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the development is water neutral. It cannot therefore be concluded that the proposed development would not result in a likely adverse impact on the Arun Valley protected sites.

Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate with a sufficient degree of certainty that the proposed development would not contribute to an existing adverse effect upon the integrity of the internationally designated Arun Valley Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar sites by way of increased water abstraction, contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Paragraphs 185 and 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), thus the Local Planning Authority is unable to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority Habitats & Species).

Conclusions and Planning Balance:

The proposed dwellings would be remote from day-to-day services, where the provision of market housing in this location, not linked to a rural use, would be contrary to Policy 26 of the HDPF and would not be in accordance with the overarching spatial strategy for development as set out in Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF, or the criteria set out in the FAD.

As the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, the presumption in favour of development within Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF would apply in the consideration of this application, reducing the weight to be applied to Policies 4 and 26 of the HDPF. However, in this case the Paragraph 11(d) 'tilted balance' is disengaged as the absence of water neutrality and the location of the development in an area t risk of flooding both provide Footnote 7 clear reasons for refusal.

It is therefore considered that the issues identified in respect of the principle of the proposed development within the countryside, flood risk, ecological implications and water neutrality are all matters that are contrary to the overarching spatial strategy and principles of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Development Plan. The site does not benefit from fall-back, with the proposal seeking a private market house in the countryside. There are not considered to be any material considerations or public benefit that would outweigh the harm identified.

The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies 3, 4, 26, 31, and 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policies Ash1, Ash3 and Ash5 of the Ashington Neighbourhood Development Plan (2021).

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

Horsham District Council has adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule which took effect on 1st October 2017.

It is considered that this development constitutes CIL liable development.

Use Description	Proposed	Existing	Net Gain
District Wide Zone 1	168.00	218.00	0.00
		Total Gain	**0.00**
		Total Demolition	**0.00**

Please note that the above figures will be reviewed by the CIL Team prior to issuing a CIL Liability Notice and may therefore change.

Exemptions and/or reliefs may be applied for up until the commencement of a chargeable development.

In the event that planning permission is granted, a CIL Liability Notice will be issued thereafter. CIL payments are payable on commencement of development.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. The development would be located outside of a built-up area boundary, on a site not allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework or in the Ashington Neighbourhood Development Plan. The proposed development would not be essential to the countryside location and would therefore be inconsistent with the overarching strategy for development within the District. Notwithstanding the absence of a five-year land housing supply, and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) 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 Policies 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy Ash1 of the Ashington Neighbourhood Plan (2021).

2. It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, in the absence of a sufficient tree information, that the proposal would not result in an adverse impact to the natural environment and landscape, such that the proposal would be contrary to Policies 25 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

3. It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, in the absence of a sequential test and sufficient Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, that the proposal would not result in an increased flood risk, such that there is uncertainty with regards to flood management such that the proposal would be contrary to policy 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

4. It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, in the absence of a sufficient ecological information, that the proposal would not result in an adverse impact to legally protected bats and aquatic species, such that there is uncertainty with regards to maintaining and enhancing existing green infrastructure and biodiversity such that the proposal would be contrary to policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

5. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate with a sufficient degree of certainty that the proposed development would not contribute to an existing adverse effect upon the integrity of the internationally designated Arun Valley Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar sites by way of increased water abstraction, contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Paragraphs 185 and 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), thus the Local Planning Authority is unable to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority Habitats & Species).

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/23/1918
(The approved plans will form Condition 1 on the Decision Notice of all Permitted applications)

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

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Site Plan	Existing Site Plan	19/WF/100	18.10.2023
Floor Plan	Proposed Ground and First Floor Plan	20/WF/101	18.10.2023
Elevational Plan	Existing and Proposed East Elevation	20/WF/102 REV A	18.10.2023
Elevational Plan	Existing and Proposed North Elevation	20/WF/102	18.10.2023
Elevational Plan	Existing and Proposed South Elevation	20/WF/102	18.10.2023
Elevational Plan	Existing and Proposed West Elevation	20/WF/102A	18.10.2023

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Stephanie Bryant Date: 29/04/2024

Authorising Officer sign/initial Adrian Smith Date: 30/04/2024