



PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

TO: Planning Committee

BY: Head of Development and Building Control

DATE: 22nd September 2026

DEVELOPMENT: Erection of a new front driveway, replacement fence and gate.

SITE: Chewton, The Street, Slinfold, West Sussex, RH13 0RR

WARD: Itchingfield, Slinfold and Warnham

APPLICATION: DC/26/0106

APPLICANT: **Name:** Mr Tony Nadaline **Address:** Chewton, The Street, Slinfold, West Sussex, RH13 0RR

REASON FOR INCLUSION ON THE AGENDA: More than eight persons in different households have made written representations within the consultation period raising material planning considerations that are inconsistent with the recommendation of the Head of Development and Building Control.

RECOMMENDATION: To approve planning permission subject to appropriate conditions

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

- 1.1 To consider the planning application.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

- 1.2 This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a new front driveway, replacement fence and gate. During the course of this application amendments were negotiated to reduce the extent of the front driveway. The application form states that the driveway will comprise pea shingle with a brick surround, with the new fence to comprise post and rail. It is noted that the elevation plans refer to alterations to the front elevation of the dwelling however these have already been granted planning permission and listed building consent under previous applications.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

- 1.3 The application site is located on the southern side of The Street in Slinfold. The main property is a Grade II listed two-storey dwelling, with the listing details as follows:

'C16 timber-framed house with modern red brick infilling. First floor hung with fishscale tiles. Tiled roof. Casement windows. Two storeys. Four windows.'

- 1.4 The application site falls within the defined built-up area of Slinfold and also within the Slinfold Conservation Area. The site is surrounded by a cluster of grade II listed buildings, namely St Peters Church situated to the north of the site, no. 4 Church View located to the east and Starr Inn House which adjoins the west elevation of the main dwelling. Further listed buildings are located along The Street to the east and west.

2. INTRODUCTION

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The following Policies are considered to be relevant to the assessment of this application:

National Planning Policy Framework (2026)

Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF 2015):

Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development

Policy 33 - Development Principles

Policy 34 - Cultural and Heritage Assets

Policy 41 - Parking

Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan 2014 - 2031

Policy 1 – Conservation Area

Policy 5 – Development Principles

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

Policy 19: Development Quality

Policy 20: Development Principles

Policy 21: Heritage Assets and Managing Change within the Historic Environment

Policy 25: Parking

Parish Design Statement:

Slinfold Parish Design Statement

PLANNING HISTORY AND RELEVANT APPLICATIONS

DC/22/1413	Construction of new driveway and associated landscaping and alterations (Householder Application).	Application Refused on 06.10.2022
DC/22/1414	Construction of new driveway and associated landscaping and alterations (Listed Building Consent).	Application Refused on 07.10.2022
DC/22/1461	Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of a two-storey rear and side extension with internal alterations (Householder Application).	Application Refused on 27.09.2022
DC/22/1462	Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of a two-storey rear and side extension with internal alterations (Listed Building Consent).	Application Refused on 27.09.2022
DC/23/1697	Demolition of single storey rear extension and erection of a single and two storey rear extension (Householder)	Application Permitted on 07.11.2023
DC/23/1698	Demolition of single storey rear extension and erection of a single and two storey rear extension (Listed Building application)	Application Permitted on 07.11.2023
DC/24/1977	Non Material Amendment to previously approved application DC/23/1697 (Demolition of single storey rear extension and erection of a single and two	Application Permitted on 28.01.2025

DC/25/0012	storey rear extension) for internal alterations to approved layout and changes to windows. Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of a single and two storey rear extension with internal alterations (Listed Building Consent).	Application Permitted on 16.05.2025
DC/25/0955	Removal of Condition 3 of previously approved application DC/23/1698 (Demolition of single storey rear extension and erection of a single and two storey rear extension (Listed Building application)) Relating to the rooflights.	Application Permitted on 04.08.2025
DC/25/1897	Variation of Condition 1 of previously approved application DC/23/1697 (Demolition of single storey rear extension and erection of a single and two storey rear extension (Householder)) relating to changes to windows.	Application Permitted on 23.01.2026

3. OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1 Where consultation responses and representations 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 horsham.gov.uk/planning/planning-applications/view-and-comment-on-planning-applications.

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

3.2 HDC Conservation: Objection

Following amendments to reduce the extent of the parking area (17/07/2026)

My objection remains as before. I appreciate the parking area has been reduced but the harm resulting from the parking of vehicles in front of the listed cottage will not be overcome. The level of harm to the setting of the listed building and the conservation area remains the same in my view.

Initial comments (06/03/2026)

This proposal is little different in substance to that refused in 2022 (DC/22/1413). The alteration of the garden to create off street parking in front of Chewton will have a harmful impact to its setting. Chewton is one of few historic dwellings that retain a front garden as might be expected in this historic village. This is important in preserving an appreciation of its special interest as a dwelling built well before the advent of motorised traffic. Although the alteration will have little visual impact on its own the problem will arise when vehicles are parked immediately in front of the cottage, concealing it from view and interfering with an opportunity to appreciate it in the streetscape. The proposal will also harm the character of the conservation area. The Slinfold Conservation Area Management Plan mentions the importance of avoiding the loss of front gardens to parking.

For this reason I am satisfied less than substantial harm will result. This will be in the middle of the scale with regard to the impact to the listed building and towards the lower end of the scale with regard to the impact to the character of the conservation area. Although some public benefit might be forthcoming with the freeing up of on street parking spaces this is not sufficient to outweigh the harm in my opinion.

3.3 WSCC Highway: No objection

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

3.4 Representations:

9 letters of Objection have been received from 9 addresses, objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Design - park cars immediately in front of it would severely and detrimentally affect the street scene.
- The existing garden and picket fence contribute significantly to the aesthetic of this part of the street and removing them would result in a loss of amenity.
- Highway Access and Parking - it would be awkward and potentially dangerous to manoeuvre a vehicle here and I strongly object to this application.
- A driveway would be out of place.
- Car going in and out of the proposed access would be hazardous.
- The danger of entering the site on a notorious bad bend in the road unpassable by 2 cars due to parking .
- Complete spoiling of an old house.
- It is inappropriate to create parking spaces in front of a 16th century house in the centre of the village which is in a Conservation Area.
- Would spoil the general ambience of the area and if two cars are parked with that access to the road it would cause a hazard.
- No other property in this row of houses has parking on the frontage and it would totally detract from the streetscape.
- The addition of cars turning out of a drive with limited visibility in either direction would be an accident waiting to happen in an area where children and families are walking to the village school.
- Visibility is already limited for those turning East from Clapgate Lane and this would increase the risk.
- Vehicles to be parked immediately in front of the cottage would be hugely detrimental to the integrity of the conservation area.
- Introduce potential danger to all road users, bearing in mind the lack of adequate sight-lines.

Re-consultation 05/07/2026

- The proposed new driveway/access would be almost immediately opposite the junction with Clapgate Lane, where traffic and pedestrian movement are already high.
- Quite simply, this is not a safe location for an additional access point due to passing traffic, and the presence of children and other pedestrians,
- The road being on a bend here it would be very difficult for vehicles to safely reverse into or out of the driveway - an accident waiting to happen.
- Objecting to this re-jigged application on safety grounds.

3.5 5 letters for Support have been received from 5 addresses, supporting the application on the following grounds:

- Important to have as many cars off this street as possible.
- Improvements made by the applicant have improved the appearance of this part of the village.
- The position of the parking area appears very discreet.
- Among many owners of a listed house in the conservation area who have off street parking and to add Chewton to our number will hardly make a significant difference to the appearance of the village.
- Experienced firsthand the challenges associated with traffic and parking on The Street - particularly during peak periods linked to Slinfold CE Primary School regular drop-off and pick-up times resulted in extremely limited parking availability.
- Lack of consistent parking made it impractical to consider owning an electric vehicle, as there was no reliable opportunity to charge a car near home.
- Proposed driveway would provide the residents with the assurance of safe, reliable parking at all times, relieving daily stress and contributing to improved traffic flow and reduced congestion on the Street.

- Support this improvement and believe it will have a positive impact on both the property and the surrounding area.
- Fully support this proposal as it frees up space across the road where Parking is already a problem.
- Cannot see that it is detrimental to the property or the street scene in any way and appears in keeping with other neighbouring properties.
- It will be sympathetically completed, and will not detract from the property.
- It will be a positive thing to aid the congestion, and parking problems that the village currently has.
- The area could benefit greatly from any off road parking.
- With the school runs and any events happening in the church or village hall, the road can be quite chaotic.
- Any opportunity to get as many parked vehicles off the road should be utilised.

3.6 Parish Comments:

Slinfold Parish Council: Objection

Following amendments to reduce the extent of the parking area (02/07/2026):

The Parish Council objects to the proposed new driveway/access on highway safety grounds. The site is opposite a school and close to a junction, where traffic and pedestrian movement are already high, particularly at school start and finish times. This is not a safe location for an additional access point. It would be difficult for vehicles to reverse into or out of the driveway safely because of passing traffic. Furthermore, the presence of children, and other pedestrians, would increase the risk of accidents. The proposal would therefore have an unacceptable impact on highway and pedestrian safety and should be refused.

Initial comments (03/03/2026)

The Parish Council objects to this application. It cannot see it is materially different to applications DC/22/1413 & DC/22/1414 and refers to the senior conversation officer's comments to application DC/22/1414 as reasons for objection.

3.7 Member Comments:

None received

4. HOW THE PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION WILL PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS

- 4.1 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.
- 4.2 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.

5. HOW THE PROPOSAL WILL HELP TO REDUCE CRIME AND DISORDER

- 5.1 It is not considered that the development would be likely to have any significant impact on crime and disorder.

6. PLANNING ASSESSMENTS

Design and Appearance:

- 6.1 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.
- 6.2 Furthermore, Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) aims to maintain that the development should reinforce the special character of the district's historic environment through appropriate siting, scale, form, and design, and should make a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of the area. In addition, development should preserve and ensure clear legibility of locally distinctive vernacular building forms and their setting, features, fabric and materials, and should seek to secure the viable and sustainable use of heritage assets through continued preservation by uses that are consistent with the significance of the heritage asset.
- 6.3 Policy 1 of the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan states that "Development proposals within or affecting the setting of the Slinfold Conservation Area must pay special regard to preserving and/or enhancing its character or appearance. Special regard must also be paid to the setting of the Conservation Area".
- 6.4 Additionally, Slinfold Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan states that the loss of front gardens to parking detracts from their historic setting and should be avoided.
- 6.5 This application is a resubmission of a previously refused planning permission under application reference DC/22/1413. The previous 2022 proposal sought permission a larger parking area to the site frontage with a turning area. This current application initially sought a reduced parking area with turning area, however the latest amendments have removed the turning area altogether such that the proposed parking space accommodates only one parked vehicle, and is therefore significantly reduced in scale when compared to the previously refused scheme.
- 6.6 As set out in the Conservation Officer's comments Chewton is one of the few historic dwellings that retain a full front garden in this historic village. The Conservation Officer is therefore of the view that preserving this special interest as a dwelling built before the motorised traffic is important. The Conservation Officer goes on to recognise that the proposed parking area would have minimal visual impact on its own however and parked vehicle on the site would conceal the cottage from view and interfering with an opportunity to appreciate it in the streetscape. It is further noted that the Slinfold Conservation Area Management Plan states the importance of avoiding the loss of front gardens to parking. As a result, the Conservation Officer identifies that less than substantial harm will result, with this harm being at the middle of the scale with regard to the impact to the listed building and towards the lower end of the scale with regard to the impact to the character of the conservation area.
- 6.7 Whilst these comments were made in respect of the original scheme which included the smaller turning head, the Conservation Officer has commented that his conclusions remain the same with the amended scheme which omits the turning head.
- 6.8 It should be noted that since these comments were made Policy HE6(4) of the revised NPPF 2026 has removed reference to 'less than substantial harm', replacing it with reference instead to general harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset. Specifically, national Policy HE6(4) now states that

'where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal. Important public benefits can include securing the long-term

reuse of a vacant or underused listed building, and enabling energy efficiency and low carbon heating measures to be employed.'

- 6.9 Whilst the wording to national policy has changed, Officers do not consider this to alter how the Conservation Officer's comments should be assessed. Nevertheless, Officers disagree with the level of harm identified by the Conservation Officer. It is not uncommon for there to be discrete and sympathetic parking areas in front of listed buildings and indeed there are some examples of this locally within the village. Further, the amended plans show the parking area to now be a single bay set to one side of the property's frontage, with well over half the frontage remaining as a soft landscaped garden, thereby ensuring the parking of a single vehicle would not be dominant to the property or wider streetscape given the advanced position of both neighbouring properties in their plots. As such, Officers consider that the parking area now proposed would result in only very minimal harm to the listed building and conservation area. The proposed post and rail fence replaces a previous low timber post fence fronting the site and is considered to have a neutral impact on the site and surrounds.
- 6.10 In terms of public benefits, these are not significant, being limited to the removal of parking from the street outside the property (noting that parked cars on the street also impact on views of listed buildings as much as those parked on plot) and also the opportunity afforded by on plot parking to provide for EV charging facilities. This would have some synergy with the public benefits cited in national Policy HE6(4) above.
- 6.11 Taken overall, Officers are of the view that the landscaping and parking area now proposed is sufficiently reduced such that it appropriately balances the preservation of the listed building and conservation area with public benefit, in accordance with Policies 32, 33 and 34 of the HDPF, Policy 1 of the SNP, and Policy HE6(4) of the NPPF 2026.

Residential Amenity:

- 6.12 Policy 33 of the HDPF states that permission will be granted for development that does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of the occupiers/users of nearby properties and land.
- 6.13 It is not considered that the proposal would directly impact upon neighbouring amenity. The Street is a busy road where cars are already parked in close proximity to residential properties. As such, it is not anticipated that the parking of a single vehicle at the front of the property would result in marked difference in this regard.

Highways Impacts:

- 6.14 Policy 40 and 41 of the HDPF promote development that provides safe and adequate access, suitable for all users. In addition, Policy 41 states that adequate parking and facilities must be provided within development to meet the needs to anticipated users. It is considered that the proposal does not raise concerns with regards to parking capacity or capacity impacts on the highway network. Therefore, the proposal would accord with the above policies in this regard.
- 6.15 Following consultation with the Local Highway Authority (LHA), it is acknowledged that the visibility at the proposed point of access appears restricted, however, due to the road layout in this location it is anticipated that traffic speeds would be low. The absence of wide visibility plays at the minor accesses onto The Street, along with parked vehicles, encourages drivers to approach more cautiously. Considering this context, and that the access is not anticipated to generate a significant number of movements, the LHA raised no concerns to the proposed access point.

- 6.16 The replacement fence does not appear to obstruct visibility for vehicles or pedestrians. In addition, the existing vegetation is to be kept cut to no higher than 600mm which will help to maintain visibility on entry and exit.
- 6.17 The parking area is suitable sized for one car, however on-site turning would not be achievable, so a parked car may have to exit the site in reverse gear if it has not reversed into the site. However, this would not be anticipated to give rise to a highway safety concern, owing to sufficient visibility and anticipated low traffic speeds, noting that this part of The Street is already narrow and single lane due to the presence of parked vehicles on the road. Both pedestrians and other road users would therefore be already travelling at a slow speed and would have good visibility of any vehicle reversing out of the site, or driving forward out of the site.
- 6.18 For the above reasons, the LHA does not consider the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal. Officers have no reason to disagree with this conclusion.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG):

- 6.19 In accordance with the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024 as amended, this application is exempted from the statutory requirement to demonstrate a 10% net gain in biodiversity as the development is householder development.

6.20 Conclusions and Planning Balance:

Taken overall, Officers are of the view that the landscaping and parking area as amended is sufficiently reduced such that it appropriately balances the preservation of the listed building and conservation area with public benefit, in accordance with Policies 32, 33 and 34 of the HDPF, Policy 1 of the SNP, and Policy HE6(4) of the NPPF 2026, and would not result in amenity issues of highway safety or capacity issues. The revised proposal is therefore considered to comply with relevant local and national planning policies and is recommended for approval.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 To approve planning permission subject to the following conditions:

Conditions:

- 1 Plans list
- 2 **Standard Time Condition:** The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 3 **Regulatory Condition:** The materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall strictly accord with those indicated on the application form and approved plans.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail in the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with Policies 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
- 4 **Regulatory Condition:** The hard surface hereby approved shall be made of porous materials or provision shall be made and retained thereafter to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the property. The hard surface shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding and pollution and increase the level of sustainability of the development and to comply with Policy 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Note to Applicant:

The applicant is advised that in addition to obtaining planning permission that they must also obtain formal approval from the highway authority to carry out the site access works on the public highway. The granting of planning permission does not guarantee that a vehicle crossover licence shall be granted because the highway license process considers wider factors than are considered by the Highway Authority at planning stage.

Additional information about the licence application process can be found at the following web page:

<https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/highway-network-permits-and-licences/highway-licences/west-sussex-county-council-licences/dropped-kerbs-or-vehicle-crossovers-for-driveways/>

8. USE OF AI

8.1 This report has not been prepared with the support of artificial intelligence tools.