

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 18 June 2026 19:24
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0766

Categories: Comments Received

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 18/06/2026 7:24 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Town Barn Dragons Green Road Shipley West Sussex
Proposal:	Erection of 1no. self-build dwelling and conversion of existing barn to form home office. Construction of associated driveway.
Case Officer:	Jacques Burrowes

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: Newbuildings Place Dragons Green Road, Shipley Horsham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I am the householder at Newbuildings Place, Dragons Green Road, RH13 8GQ and I oppose this planning application on grounds of planning policy, and not because of any likelihood that it might impact me or my home in any specific sense - though the likely noise of a construction project on the scale in question would be material and disagreeable. 1. the proposal is effectively for a new dwelling in open countryside. The current use of the site is permanent pasture for grazing and the building on a small part of the proposal site, at the east end near Dragons Green Road is a former agricultural barn (Town Barn) with what I believe is a materially commenced planning consent for conversion into a single residential unit. 2. This existing Town Barn consent was originally granted for the conversion of a modest agricultural barn under the then existing barn conversion policies. The material

commencement is believed to be in respect of the access for this development. This latest proposal is however, out of all scale and has no functional or spatial relationship at all with that earlier scheme.

3. The application form would lead one to suppose that only the current extant Town Barn of 89 sq m GIA is involved but this is not the case; the proposal is for a substantial new detached home an addition, as I understand it, of over 380 sq m or around 4,100 sq ft. The justification for a self/custom build home on this scale is something I would question.

4. Assuming a modest construction cost (excluding land purchase), of [REDACTED] (see BCIS housebuilding index) and ignoring any external works or upgrading of the Town Barn, this is an [REDACTED] project. Even allowing for the possibility that the applicant has sufficient local connections to be registered on the Planning Authority's register of those interested in self-build, the requirement for a scheme on this scale stretches credulity and principle beyond reasonable limits.

5. No established need for an exception involving a dwelling related to agriculture, forestry or the management of the land has been demonstrated (or even argued) nor any substantial argument advanced as to why general policies aimed at encouraging local planning authorities to make provision for self/custom build home should override specific policies of countryside protection.

6. The custom/self build national policy as I understand it, is intended to provide variation and opportunity where none exists at present and is often lumped in with more affordable routes to home ownership; it is not clear that HDC has failed to make adequate provision as part of its overall policy or that any such failure would overcome the hierarchy of other considerations nor does that appear to be argued. Custom and self build is thus a variant on existing development policies not a means of overriding countryside protection or creating a new class of exception.

7. The applicant refers to several planning precedents; none of these is on all fours with the creation in this case of a wholly new, large, residential property in open countryside. In all the cases cited they are development within an existing residential curtilage, and/or a one for one replacement of an existing residential building, or a conversion from an existing non agricultural building. None of these applies to the present application.

8. This application, if approved, would set a very significant precedent in which anyone with substantial means and wishing to build their own property might similarly come to some arrangement with a landowner for the construction of a large country property almost anywhere in open countryside.

9. Contrary to what has been claimed in the application, the site would be visible looking north from footpath no 1891-1 also designated the Sussex Diamond Trail and according to my calculations the proposed new dwelling would be 280-300m north of this public right of way at its nearest point and sited on the visible horizon at the crown of a low rise at around 46m AOD. The belt of trees at this point along the north side of the public path has limited understorey development (due to shading by oak trees) allowing views to the north and the development would be plainly visible at various points along this path. The proposed dwelling site would also be visible to passers by on the public Dragons Green Road at the access point by Town Barn itself, near the apex of a bend in the highway where one can see over the hedge and again at a gateway off the highway to the northwest of this. I am assuming the proposed new dwelling would have a height to the ridge of just under 9m above adjacent existing ground level and thus would on present proposals, be plainly visible in the landscape.

10. The proposed site is not currently particularly visible from the mansion complex at Newbuildings Place (a listed building and former home of Arabist, poet and traveller, Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, so of some local historical relevance) though is likely to be visible near the northern exit door of the mansion, from the adjacent spare bedroom window and the gardens and grounds close by, more so in winter than now and particularly if ash dieback continues to decimate certain trees in the wooded strip north of the footpath 1891-1, though the impact is small. The landscape has to my knowledge, remained largely unchanged in terms of its field patterns and woodland since the 1830s though there has been some loss of wooded rews.

11. The applicant makes the suggestion that the proposal would add to the available housing stock. In strict terms it may indeed do so but by a negligibly small percentage only; furthermore, the national need is not for large executive homes worth millions such as in the present proposal but for smaller, affordable dwellings for home makers of modest means where multimodal travel is an option and services such as shops, doctors, schools, employment and so on are in sufficiently close proximity to avoid total private car dependence.

12. Neither the proposed site nor the design of the property proposed in this application, have any exceptional merit. Not that they are objectively poor, just not in any way outstanding. I am aware of policies in the past that in certain circumstances could permit a new dwelling of exceptional architectural merit in an exceptional setting. This is clearly not one of them.

13. to summarise, there is no overriding need or exceptional circumstances justifying this proposal; in any event, several substantial properties are for sale in the area including at Shaw's Lane, Southwater, Hooklands Lane, Shipley, Brooks Green, Maplehurst and West Chiltington. Self build plots are advertised with existing planning consent locally in Shipley parish. I would therefore question what assessed need has been established in this case to justify the proposal at Town Barn in particular as opposed to mere fancy at the notion of building one's own home. Clearly the siting of this proposal is totally outside any existing settlement boundary, unrelated to any other group of buildings. The proposals infringe in particular existing policies 25, 26 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework and should be rejected.

13. If notwithstanding the above, the District Council is minded to grant consent, I would suggest conditions be imposed in relation to the following:

- a. To ensure external finishes and design are of the highest quality, local provenance and complimentary to the character of other buildings in the locality;
- b. The dwelling be recessed into the landscape to reduce visual impact, given that it would otherwise be many years before a planting scheme would effectively screen the proposed new dwelling, with the creation of a landscaped mound and buffer strip to permanently prevent the proposed development being seen from any publicly accessible viewpoint;
- c. Measures to ensure no reflected sunlight or artificial light emanates from any part of the proposed development such as to impinge on nearby amenity;
- d. Measures to prevent excessive or unusual noise including music and entertainment emanating from the development during construction and subsequent use and occupation such as to detract from the rural tranquillity of the location;
- e. The revocation of the extant consent for the conversion of the Town Barn former agricultural building to residential use to prevent proliferation of dwellings in this area.

Further I submit that these must be secured by legal agreement under s.106 and not simply by a condition in the planning consent.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**



Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB

Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton