



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0924

Lock House, Lock, Partridge Green, West Sussex, RH13 8EG

DESCRIPTION:

Erection of holiday cottage (Full Planning)

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/24/0608	Conversion of existing dwelling into 5No. dwellings, replacement of existing garage and flat with 1No. dwelling, and erection of 7No. dwellings as enabling development (Full Application)	Withdrawn 02.10.2024	Application	on
DC/24/0609	Conversion of existing dwelling into 5No. dwellings, replacement of existing garage and flat with 1No. dwelling, and erection of 7No. dwellings as enabling development (Listed Building Consent)	Withdrawn 02.10.2024	Application	on
DC/24/1667	Conversion of a single dwelling to 5no. dwellings and conversion of the existing garage block with flat to single dwelling. (Full Application).	Application 17.01.2025	Refused	on
DC/24/1668	Conversion of a single dwelling to 5no. dwellings and conversion of the existing garage block with flat to single dwelling. (Listed Building Consent).	Application 17.01.2025	Refused	on
DC/25/0037	Conversion of a single dwelling into 3no. dwellings and conversion of the existing garage block with flat into single dwelling. (Full Application).	Application 07.03.2025	Permitted	on
DC/25/0038	Conversion of a single dwelling into 3no. dwellings and conversion of the existing garage block with flat into single dwelling. (Listed Building Consent).	Application 07.03.2025	Permitted	on
DC/25/0359	Conversion of 2no. existing buildings to holiday let use. (Full Application).	Application 16.06.2025	Permitted	on
DC/25/0360	Conversion of 2no. existing buildings to holiday let use. (Listed Building Consent).	Application 16.06.2025	Permitted	on
DISC/25/0084	Approval of details reserved by conditions 2a(i), 2b, 2c and 2d to approved application DC/25/0038.	Application 18.07.2025	Permitted	on
DISC/25/0085	Approval of details reserved by conditions 3, 5, 6 and 8 to approved application DC/25/0037.	Application 01.08.2025	Permitted	on
DC/25/1539	Prior notification for the erection of an agricultural barn.	Prior Approval Required and PERMITTED on 14.11.2025		
DC/25/1881	Erection of a new build coach house building to be used as a holiday cottage. (Full Application).	Application 15.09.2026	Refused	on
DC/25/1882	Erection of a new build coach house building to be used as a holiday cottage. (Listed Building Consent).	Pending consideration		
DISC/25/0404	Approval of details reserved by condition(s) 3 to approved application DC/25/0359.	Application 10.02.2026	Permitted	on
DC/26/0026	Erection of a pitched roof extension to the east wing flat roof and erection of a single storey extension to the existing outbuilding. (Householder Application).	Application 23.03.2026	Permitted	on
DC/26/0027	Erection of a pitched roof extension to the east wing flat roof and erection of a single storey extension to the existing outbuilding. (Listed Building Consent).	Application 23.03.2026	Permitted	on
DC/26/0577	Conversion of central unit (unit 2) into 2no. residential	Pending consideration		

DC/26/0578	units (Full Application). Conversion of central unit (unit 2) into 2no. residential units, with the erection of an orangery extension. (Listed Building Consent).	Pending consideration
DISC/26/0129	Application for Approval of Details Reserved by Condition 2 and 3 to approved application DC/26/0027 (Listed Building Consent)	Application Permitted on 16.06.2026
DC/26/0927	Erection of a car port, leisure suite and padel court. Conversion of the tank room into a holiday let. (Full Application).	Pending consideration
DC/26/0928	Erection of a car port, leisure suite and padel court. Conversion of the tank room into a holiday let. (Listed Building Consent).	Pending consideration

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The application site consists of a Grade II Listed Building positioned to the north-west of the access road within a rural countryside location. The site includes a number of detached buildings, swimming pool, and tennis court set within extensive grounds of circa 10.3 hectares that slope to the south-east.

Nearby residential properties are located at a distance of between 100m and 350m to the south-west and south-east respectively, with an area of woodland bounding the site to the north.

The northern part of the site includes an access track that runs through 'Grants Copse', classified as Ancient Woodland. The application site is bound by this area of Ancient Woodland.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The application proposes to erect an 8-bedroom holiday cottage in a coach house style. The proposed building would be 1.5 storeys high, 26m length, width of 8.88m and ridge height of 7.27m. The design of the building would take inspiration from the nearby Lock House, with a central glazed carriageway, clock tower element, an ordered and coherent design of openings, stable-style doors and appropriate fenestration. Four car parking spaces are proposed on an area of grasscrete, and the cars will be hidden by a yew hedge surrounding.

The application has a previously consented scheme for the erection of a stable block (ref: DC/14/2134) in the same location.

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 4 - Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion
Policy 7 - Strategic Policy: Economic Growth
Policy 9 - Employment Development
Policy 10 - Rural Economic Development
Policy 11 - Tourism and Cultural Facilities
Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
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 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 39 - Strategic Policy: Infrastructure Provision
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking

West Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan (2021):

Policy 4: Green Infrastructure: Existing Trees, Hedgerows, Habitats and Wildlife
Policy 5: Community Facilities
Policy 9: Car Parking

Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19):

Strategic Policy 1: Sustainable Development
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 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Strategic Policy 14: Countryside Protection
Strategic Policy 16: protected Landscapes
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
Policy 28: Community Facilities, Leisure and Recreation
Strategic Policy 29: New Employment
Strategic Policy 30: Enhancing Existing Employment
Policy 31: Rural Economic Development
Strategic Policy 34: Tourism Facilities and Visitor Accommodation

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

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

Parish Design Statement

Planning Advice Notes:

Facilitating Appropriate Development
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:

HDC Arboriculture: Objection [Summary]

The existing site usage/dwelling proximity has led to a relatively recent rapid decline in adjacent Ancient Woodland (AW) condition.

Increased habitable build at the site in relatively close proximity to the AW will incur a foreseeable additional future pressure to maintain the denuded woodland without understorey or replacement of felled/removed trees.

If acceptable in other planning terms, I recommend that the applicant re-sites the building further away from the woodland and fully complies with the buffer requirements proposed by Natural England (NE).

If the current/similar siting is to be pursued, I recommend the applicant seeks to provide a Forestry Commission approved woodland management plan for the adjacent Grants Wood AW to support their application for development. The plan should include a 25 year scheme for the replacement of trees and associated understorey at the site, to avoid deforestation and conserve the site, recognised as being an irreplaceable habitat, having been continually wooded since at least 1600AD.

Otherwise, in my view the development would foreseeably lead to further/increased pressure to denude a recognised irreplaceable landscape habitat contrary to the ethos of the NPPF.

HDC Conservation: Objection [Summary]

The proposed building is reflective of a country house stable block and is similar in scale and position to a building granted permission in 2016. This building would have provided ancillary facility to a large single dwelling. The keeping of horses in this location is not unexpected and reflects the lifestyle of the occupants of a house this size and in this rural location.

The current proposal follows the granting of permission to subdivide the house into smaller dwellings. It is reasonable to assume that future residents may still wish to keep horses and so I am satisfied an ancillary building of this nature may still respect and respond to the principal building in its rural setting. However, the current proposal to place a large residential building in a similar location will result in a different experience within the setting of the listed building. Despite the intention that the residential building appears as a historic stable block, the consequences of its intended use will clearly advertise it as a residence. The additional need for car parking, outdoor recreation areas with hardstanding, artificial lighting and domestic detritus will exacerbate the experience that this is a large residential building within the grounds of the listed building. I am satisfied a residential building of this size will dilute an appreciation of the primacy of the country house and harm its special interest. There are no public benefits that may arise from this proposal.

Ecology Consultant: Further information required / temporary holding objection [Summary]

We are not satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination of this application and recommend that details of survey results, mitigation & enhancement measures are required to make this proposal acceptable,

To fully assess the impacts of the proposal the LPA needs ecological information for the site, particularly for bats, which are European Protected Species. These surveys are required prior to determination because Government Standing Advice indicates that you should “*Survey for bats if the area includes buildings or other structures that bats tend to use or there are trees with features that bats tend to use nearby*”.

This information is therefore required to provide the LPA with certainty of likely 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.

We also understand that Trees T4 (Scot's pine) and T14 (Oak) will be removed for safety reasons. For these trees, we highlight that due diligence with regard to impact on bats should be exercised when they are felled

Southern Water: Comment [Summary]

Our investigations indicate that Southern Water can facilitate water supply to service the proposed development. Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the water supply to be made by the applicant or developer.

No Soakaways should be connected to the public surface water sewer.

WSCC Highways: Comment [Summary]

The LHA previously provided consultation advice for several application at the site including recently for application DC/26/0927, raising no highway safety concerns.

The primary access is via Lock Lane which adjoins the public highway at an existing access onto Bines Road. The site is prone to flooding few times a year due to the river Adur. During these times, site access is via a private road that adjoins the public highway at an existing access onto the A24.

An inspection of collision data provided to WSCC by Sussex Police from a period of the last five years reveals one recorded collision within the vicinity of the site. However, this was not attributed to the use of the site access or site operation. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest the site access has been operating unsafely, or that its continued use would exacerbate an existing safety concern.

The Transport Statement includes data from the TRICS database that shows the holiday cottage will increase the total daily trips to the site by 4 movements a day with no change in AM or PM peak. Therefore, the LHA are satisfied that the proposed use will not cause a significant material intensification of movements to or from the site.

The applicant proposes four vehicle parking spaces and four bicycle parking spaces which would be sufficient for the proposed use. Whilst there does appear to be suitable space on site, I would advise that parking be secured by condition for details to be provided.

In summary, the LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in ‘severe’ cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Forestry Commission: Comment [Summary]

We are concerned about the deterioration that the ancient woodland has already suffered and may experience further because of this proposed development.

We fully support the Arboricultural Officer's statement dated 26 August 2026. Increasing the size of the ancient woodland buffer by moving the proposed building further away would provide greater protection to the woodland. Whether the buffer is 15m or greater, for the buffer to provide adequate protection to the woodland it needs to be:

- A high-quality semi-natural buffer, comprising native woodland planting, scattered trees, scrub and species-rich grassland to form a graded woodland edge; and
- An area free from built development, hard surfacing and recreational infrastructure.

We would also recommend the implementation of measures to discourage informal access (including by domestic pets) to the woodland and buffer area, including thorny native shrub planting and appropriate signage.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:

Representations:

6 letters of Objection have been received from 4 addresses, objecting to the application on the following grounds:

[Summarised]

- Traffic and safety – dangerous to have more traffic on unlit lane
- Noise generated from applications would disturb neighbouring properties and wildlife
- Overdevelopment
- Loss of general amenity
- Road prone to flooding and maintenance is an issue
- Concerns about light and noise pollution close to established ancient woodland
- Commercialisation of the site
- Inappropriate scale and form of development in the countryside
- Insufficient evidence that the stated trip generation figures accurately reflect the actual operational activity associated with an 8-bedroom commercially managed holiday-let property
- Change over days are particularly concerning as there is only one lawful vehicular means of access and egress to the site – all guests, departures, deliveries, service vehicles associated with the proposed development would be required to use the same single-track route.
- Increased overall level of activity within the countryside
- Limited weight should be attached to the trip-generation conclusions contained within the Transport Statement

Parish Comments:

West Grinstead Parish Council: Objection [Summary]

- It is an unsustainable new build in remote countryside, adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
- It is a substantial building, with no historical link to the listed house and is intended as a holiday let for 16 people.
- Only 4 parking spaces have been provided with no plan for overspill parking. The remote location, with no public transport, is likely to increase the need for car use, for visitors and all others involved in servicing the property.
- The adjacent irreplaceable Ancient Woodland and associated wildlife will be adversely affected. The Arboricultural Officer for HDC has already highlighted the recent denuded nature of the AW and potential for more damage to its biodiversity.
- The application does not comply with the Government recommendation for a minimum 15m buffer to the woodland or address how replanting of trees and understorey can be achieved with over 200 deer roaming unmanaged across the site.
- The position of this new building will change the landscape character of Grants Copse Ancient Woodland and the surrounding area.

The WGPC regard this application as over-development in the open countryside and strongly object to this proposal.

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.¹

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

Principle of Development:

Policy 11 of the HDPF outlines that measures which promote tourism and enhance local cultural facilities, including recreation based rural diversification, will be encouraged. Any development should be of a scale and type appropriate to the location and should increase the range or improve the quality of accommodation, attraction or experiences for tourists, day visitors, business visitors, and residents in the District.

In addition, Policy 10 of the HDPF supports sustainable rural economic development and enterprise within the District which maintain the quality and character of the area, whilst sustaining its varied and productive social and economic activity.

Policy 34 of the emerging Horsham District Local Plan states that outside settlement boundaries, proposals for tourist accommodation should seek to re-use existing buildings in the first instance, and demonstrate rural diversification and support rural development initiatives, particularly where they assist farm diversification projects, benefit the local economy, or enable the retention of buildings contributing to the character of the countryside.

The NPPF continues to support sustainable economic growth and tourism development through Policies E1-E4. The Framework recognises the role of rural tourism and visitor accommodation in supporting the rural economy, whilst also requiring development to be sustainable, appropriately located and compatible with environmental, infrastructure and landscape constraints. Policy S4 of the NPPF states that development outside settlement boundaries should only be approved where such a location is necessary for rural businesses and services, including tourism.

The application site represents previously developed land associated with Lock House, which comprises a substantial principle listed building surrounding by landscaped grounds which contains a series of outbuildings and domestic paraphernalia. The site is not particularly well related to neighbouring settlements and related services, with access requiring use of private vehicles for day-to-day activities. It is though considered that the development has potential to contribute toward the rural economy. While likely access to a private car would be necessary this would not be uncommon for a holiday-let, and the site is well located for access onto the Public Right of Way network which would provide opportunities for informal recreation.

Policy 26 of the HDPF requires development outside built-up area boundaries to be essential to its countryside location and to meet one of the following criteria: -

1. Support the needs of agriculture or forestry;
2. Enable the extraction of minerals or the disposal of waste;
3. Provide for quiet informal recreational use; or
4. Enable the sustainable development of rural areas.

The scale of the development, although appreciable in terms of the built form, would not amount to a significant increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside, with the proposed use contributing toward the sustainable development of this rural area. The proposal does not therefore raise any fundamental conflict with the above policy.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed holiday accommodation would potentially provide a modest contribution towards the local visitor economy and accords with the objectives of Policies 10 and 11 which seek to support tourism and rural enterprise.

Design and Appearance:

Policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF seek to ensure that development promotes a high standard and quality of design in order to enhance and protect locally distinctive characters. The policies also seek to ensure that the scale, massing and appearance of development relates sympathetically with the built surroundings, landscape, open spaces and routes within and adjoining the site, including any impact on the skyline and important views.

Policy 34 of the HDPF requires development affecting heritage assets, including listed buildings and their settings, to conserve and, where appropriate, enhance their significance. Proposals should be of a high standard of design which responds positively to the historic environment and its contribution to local character.

Section HE5 of the NPPF (2026) states that *'When considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance'* (1). *'Development proposals which would have a positive effect on a designated heritage asset should be supported'* (2) and *'Any harm to a designated heritage asset will be a matter of considerable importance and weight'*, which should be considered in accordance with paragraphs 4 to 6 of policy HE5 (3).

The application proposes a substantial new-build 'coach house' to provide 8-bedroom holiday accommodation. The building would be sited approximately 230 metres to the north-east of Lock House, in a location which benefited from an expired planning permission for the erection of a stable block (ref: DC/14/2134). In principle, the siting of a building in this location could be acceptable. The site is not experienced in association with Lock House, with significant levels of intervening screening and the presence of built form within substantial grounds which form the setting of a listed building would not necessarily be unexpected.

The application site lies within the curtilage and wider setting of Lock House, a Grade II listed building, and forms part of the experienced approach to the principal dwelling. It is also in proximity to Grants Farmhouse, further increasing the sensitivity of the site. The setting of the heritage asset is therefore highly sensitive, particularly in views experienced along the main access route, which is also a public right of way from where the proposed development would be highly visible.

It is acknowledged that the site benefits from a now expired planning permission DC/14/2134 approved in January 2015. This granted a stable block in a similar location to the proposed development. The approved stable block had a 25m frontage, 14m depth and ridge height of 7.2m.

The design of the holiday cottage has been amended since the previous refusal (ref: DC/25/1881). The design statement states that the revised design seeks to reproduce an Edwardian coach house and stable courtyard, incorporating; a central glazed carriageway, a clock tower element, an ordered and coherent design of openings, stable-style doors and appropriate fenestration. The design has taken lead from elements of Lock House's vernacular, with materials including red imperial brickwork, clay tiled roofs with sprung eaves and subtle masonry detailing. Four car parking spaces are proposed on an area of grasscrete, and the cars will be hidden by a yew hedge surrounding, these are detailed within the submitted planning statement. The design statement concludes that compared to the consented stable block (DC/14/2134) and the previous refused holiday cottage (DC/25/1881), that the current scheme represents a sensitive and contextually appropriate development. The Council agree that the proposed design is a marked improvement over the previously refused scheme (DC/25/1881).

The applicant notes the significance of these two appeal decisions at Lock House (APP/Z3825/W/25/3359623 & APP/Z3825/Y/25/3359626), noting that the Planning Inspector allowed the conversion of Lock House into five dwellings and of the garage block into a further dwelling. On harm and benefits, the Inspector found that subdividing Lock House itself caused harm at the lower end of less than substantial harm, concluding that this was outweighed by public benefits. The applicant

notes that the proposed coach house is 230m away, with sufficient screening and lower ground level and there would be no private garden and residential paraphernalia.

However, while there may be levels of intervening screening, the proposed building would still be viewed in association with Lock House. Due to the path of the driveway, in order to reach the main Lock House, you would be required to pass the proposed holiday cottage. Therefore, while not appearing in views with Lock House, the building would still be viewed in conjunction with it due to its location on the approach. HDC Conservation objected to the proposal. While they accepted that the building appears as a historic stable block, the consequences of its intended use would clearly advertise it as a residence. Through the additional need for car parking, outdoor recreation areas with hardstanding, artificial lighting, and domestic detritus, the experience of the building will appear as a large residential building in the grounds of the listed building. A residential building of this size would dilute an appreciation of the primacy of the country house and harm its special interest. It is acknowledged that other planning permissions have been granted for the conversion of different buildings, for residential or holiday-let purposes, within the Lock House site. However, these buildings are dwarfed when compared to the main residential dwelling within the hierarchy of the buildings. It is also noted that none of these buildings are visible on the approach to the main dwelling due to the hierarchy on the site. While the traditional vernacular is appreciated, the proposed coach house for use as a holiday cottage, due to its scale and massing, would appear as a residential building forward of the listed building, appearing in views on the approach to the listed building.

It is acknowledged that the applicant provided a statement addressing these comments, stating that the appearance of the building would reflect a traditional country house stable block, there are four car parking spaces provided enclosed by a yew hedge so parked cars are screened, no outdoor recreation areas are proposed and refuse storage is within the communal bin store at Lock House and cycle storage is in the communal bike store at Lock House.

However, as above, while the traditional design and vernacular are appreciated, the scale and massing of the overall building would appear in views on the approach to the listed building. The hierarchy of buildings would be skewed with the sizeable coach house siting forward of the listed building, appearing as an additional residential building on site. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would be contrary to Policies 32, 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Landscape, Trees and Ancient Woodland:

Policy 25 of the HDPF requires development to protect, conserve and enhance landscape character, including the retention of important landscape features such as trees and hedgerows. Policy 33(6) of the HDPF also requires development to respect the landscape character of the area and maintain existing green infrastructure.

The NPPF also affords strong protection to irreplaceable habitats, including Ancient Woodland. Ancient Woodland is recognised as an irreplaceable habitat and development resulting in its loss or deterioration should be wholly exceptional and supported by clear justification. Policy N6 of the NPPF states: *'irrespective of site's status in nature*

The application site lies immediately adjacent to Grants Copse, an area of designated Ancient Woodland. Such habitats are irreplaceable and are highly sensitive not only to direct loss but also to indirect impacts arising from nearby development, including changes in hydrology, soil compaction, root disturbance, shading, and increased human activity.

The siting of the development has been amended since the previous refusal (DC/25/1881) to now sit outside of the 15m buffer from Grants Copse. While it is also acknowledged that an Ancient Woodland Buffer Management Plan has been submitted to support the application, it does not provide enough detail on the protection of the ancient woodland. Further details are required showing the exclusion zones, with a defined curtilage outlining which land is associated with the holiday-let outside of the buffer zone. Due to the sensitivity of the location, it is imperative that it is demonstrated with certainty that the proposal would not have an impact on the Ancient Woodland. Whilst the proposed woodland management measures are welcomed in principle, they do not address the fundamental issue which is

the siting of the development immediately adjacent to the buffer. Furthermore, the proposed low-key post-and-rail boundary is unlikely to provide any meaningful protection. Whilst it may define the buffer boundary, it is likely to do little in practice to restrict access due to the position of the building, abutting the buffer.

The Applicant seeks to enforce these issues via planning condition; however, it is not considered that these would be enforceable or reasonable conditions, providing a solution to the proximity to the Ancient Woodland. Given the proposed use as holiday accommodation, with succession of short-term occupation, it may be difficult to prevent or monitor activities within the buffer. It is reasonable to expect paying guests to make use of the land surrounding the accommodation. The purpose of the buffer is to provide effective protection from indirect impacts on the adjacent irreplaceable habitat, not remain undeveloped. Therefore, due to the above, it has not been demonstrated that the development would avoid direct or indirect harm to this habitat contrary to Policies 25 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and National Planning Policy Framework (2026).

Residential Amenity:

Policy 33 of the HDPF requires development to protect the amenity of existing and future occupiers, ensuring that proposals do not result in unacceptable impacts in terms of overlooking, loss of privacy, overbearing effects, or noise and disturbance.

The objections to the proposal are acknowledged. In this instance, the proposed development would be located within a spacious curtilage, with a clear degree of physical separation from the host dwelling at Lock House and from neighbouring residential properties, which are situated some distance from the application site. Given these separation distances, it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to material harm in terms of overlooking, loss of privacy, overbearing impact, or loss of light.

Furthermore, whilst the use of the building as holiday accommodation may introduce a degree of activity, the scale of separation and the rural context of the site are such that any associated noise or disturbance would not be of a level that would result in demonstrable harm to neighbouring residential amenity.

Accordingly, no objection is raised in respect of residential amenity, and the proposal is considered to comply with Policy 33 of the HDPF in this regard.

Highways Impacts:

Policy 40 of the HDPF seeks to ensure that development provides safe access for all users and does not result in unacceptable impacts on highway safety or the operation of the highway network. The NPPF similarly states that development should only be refused on transport grounds where there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or where the residual cumulative impacts on the transport network would be severe.

The objections made by representations regarding the access lane are acknowledged. The site is accessed via a network of privately maintained roads connecting to the adopted highway at Bines Road. The Highway Authority has confirmed that there are no apparent visibility concerns at the point of access onto Bines Road and that the proposed development would not be expected to result in a significant material intensification in the use of this access.

In respect of parking provision, the proposal includes four on-site parking spaces to serve the 8-bedroom holiday accommodation. Whilst this falls below the standards typically expected (one space per bedroom), it is acknowledged that there is scope within the site to accommodate additional parking if required. Furthermore, the Highways Authority advised that any potential overspill parking would be unlikely to adversely affect the operation or safety of the adopted highway network.

Overall, the Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposal and has confirmed that it would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety or give rise to severe cumulative impacts on the road network.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to comply with Policy 40 of the HDPF and the NPPF and no refusal reason is warranted on highways grounds.

Ecology:

Policy 25 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) requires development to protect and enhance biodiversity, ensure no net loss of habitats, and provide measurable net gains where appropriate. In addition, Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) requires most developments to deliver a minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), to be demonstrated through the statutory biodiversity metric.

In this instance, no ecological surveys have been submitted to establish the baseline conditions of the site. In the absence of a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) or equivalent ecological walkover survey, the Local Planning Authority cannot verify the habitat type present, their condition, or the potential presence of protected or priority species. This is particularly important given the site's proximity to Grants Copse, which represents a sensitive ecological receptor.

The Applicant provided a statement in response to the Ecology consultation response, stating that the arboricultural proposals for trees T9 and T11 have been revised and reduced, and neither tree will be felled. Furthermore, as neither tree is now proposed for felling, and the works are limited to the pruning of small-diameter branches showing no visible potential roost features, the Applicant requested that Ecology and the Council consider whether the revised scope of works removes the basis for the holding objection. However, even with these trees not being removed, there is no certainty as to whether there are bats present within the site due to the lack of bat surveys and the absence of a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. Without this information, there is insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed development would have no adverse impact on protected species and its habitat contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and National Planning Policy Framework (2026).

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 N6 of the NPPF.

Drainage and Flood Risk:

Policy 38 of the HDPF requires development to incorporate appropriate surface water and foul drainage strategies, ensuring that proposals do not increase flood risk on or off site and are supported by suitable infrastructure.

In this instance, no information has been submitted in respect of either surface water or foul drainage. There are no details relating to the proposed means of disposal, drainage strategy, infiltration potential, or connection to any existing systems. There are however no apparent reasons, and none have been set out in the consultation responses received on the application, why a suitable drainage strategy could not be achieved in this location. It is considered that were planning permission to be granted a condition could require the submission and approval of a drainage strategy prior to any works commencing on the site. This approach would be sufficient to ensure development took place in accordance with the above policy.

Other Matters:

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. The proposed development includes the following measures to build resilience to climate change and reduce carbon emissions:

- Requirement to provide full fibre broadband site connectivity
- Refuse and recycling storage
- Biodiversity mitigation and enhancement
- Cycle parking facilities
- Electric vehicle charging points

Subject to these conditions the application could suitably reduce the impact of the development on climate change in accordance with local and national policy, in the event that permission were to be granted.

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 Metric which demonstrates a 76.23% net gain for habitat units is achievable by way of onsite biodiversity gains. However, this is not so significant as to warrant a legal agreement for monitoring.

Conclusions and Planning Balance:

The development would result in a modest contribution toward the supply of visitor accommodation within the District and this would provide further benefits toward the economy. These benefits are though considered to be outweighed by the identified harm, which would be longstanding and significant.

The development, by reason of its siting, scale, form and associated external works, has failed to demonstrate that it would preserve the significance, setting, and special architectural and historic interest of Lock House, a Grade II listed building. Due to the massing and location, on the approach to Lock House, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the site and immediate surrounds and to the setting of Lock House. There are no benefits that would outweigh the identified harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 32, 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and National Planning Policy Framework (2026).

The site lies immediately adjacent to Ancient Woodland, an irreplaceable habitat. While it is acknowledged that the applicant has submitted an Ancient Woodland Buffer Management statement, it has not been demonstrated that the development would avoid direct or indirect harm to this habitat, contrary to Policies 25 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2026).

Furthermore, no ecological surveys have been submitted. In the absence of a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) or equivalent survey, the LPA cannot verify the habitat type present, their condition or the potential presence of protected or priority species. While the applicant confirmed that two trees will not be removed, there is no certainty as to whether there are bats present within the site due to the absence of bat surveys and the absence of a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. The proposal therefore provides insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed development would have no adverse impact on protected species and its habitat, contrary to Policy 31 of the HDPF (2015) and NPPF (2026).

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The development, by reason of its siting, scale, form, and associated external works, has failed to demonstrate that it would preserve the significance, setting, and special architectural and historic interest of Lock House, a Grade II listed building. Insufficient information has been submitted in relation to the landscaping, boundary treatments, lighting, parking and servicing arrangements, and the integration of the development within the wider site. The proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the site and immediate surrounds and to the setting of Lock House. There are no benefits which would outweigh the identified harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 32, 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2026).
2. The site lies immediately adjacent to Ancient Woodland, an irreplaceable habitat. It has not been demonstrated that the development would avoid direct or indirect harm to this habitat, contrary to Policies 25 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2026).

3. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would have no adverse impact on protected species and its habitat, contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and National Planning Policy Framework (2026).

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/26/0924

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

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Block plan		NONE	09.06.2026
Location plan		NONE	08.07.2026
Tree plan	Tree Constraints	NONE REV A	09.06.2026
Tree plan	Tree Protection	NONE	09.06.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed	NONE	09.06.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed	NONE	09.06.2026
Design & Access Statement		NONE	09.06.2026
Supporting Statement	Flood Risk Assessment	NONE	09.06.2026
Supporting Statement	Arboricultural Impact Assessment - AIA-LH-28/4/26	NONE	09.06.2026
Supporting Statement	Transport Statement	NONE	09.06.2026
Supporting Statement	Ancient Woodland Buffer Management Statement	NONE	28.08.2026
Supporting Statement	Supporting Statement	NONE	28.09.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Bethan Tinning Date: 02.10.2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial RHERMITAGE Date: 05.10.2026