

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 September 2026 10:32
To: Bethan.Tinning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: DC/26/1147 - Morlands Farm

Hi Bethan,

I took your email of the 28th below where you say "We are minded to recommend approval" to mean that was also the view of your Team Leader also.

However, thank you for bringing the change of position to my attention. Please treat this email as our NPPF comments and add it to the application file.

You refer to policy S5(1)(j) of the NPPF. S5(1)(j) of the NPPF is I believe aimed at new build urban extensions which should of course be well related to settlements. The application was not however submitted specifically to address the lack of housing land supply/delivery. Although these are significant factors which weigh positively in the planning balance given the provision in housing with policy HO7 stating that **"substantial weight should be given to the benefits of providing homes"**.

The application falls squarely within the provisions at S5(1)(c) for **"The reuse... of an existing building, provided that the existing building is of permanent and substantial construction, is lawful in planning terms..."**. The application concerns a lawful building which the structural appraisal confirms is of permanent and substantial construction. No extension of the floorspace is proposed.

It also arguably meets the requirements of S5(1)(d) for **"The redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed-use including residential)"**

The application is therefore wholly compatible with policy S5 and the specified **"development outside settlements"** which **"should be approved, unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects"** the bar for which is very high.

You also refer to Policy CC2(1)(a) which states that where relevant to the proposal, development should **"Accord with policies TR3 and TR4 so that sustainable patterns of movement are prioritised, opportunities are taken to improve walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport, and infrastructure is provided to support the transition to zero-emission vehicles"**. Policy TR3(1)(e) states that **"In rural areas, opportunities to improve walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport and enhance the connectivity of an area should be taken where they exist and can be supported by the development proposed."** This policy is not a requirement for development to be served by walking routes and public transport etc and simply requires that opportunities are taken to make development more sustainable in the interest of the "Mitigation of climate change". In this regard you will appreciate that the cafe use could attract multiple vehicular movements to and from the site, the proposed use as a single dwelling would be far less, thereby representing a significant improvement. The lane is part of the public right of way network which links directly into the Town of Henfield. Furthermore, Henfield is within cycling distance (about 2km) and includes

public transport options. Any car journeys to Henfield would be relatively short. The dwelling would be required to provide EV charging in line with Building Regs and highways policy supporting the transition to zero emission vehicles. There are currently PVs on the roof which provide electricity which will be required by the development. Part 2 of the same policy states that **"Substantial weight should be given to the benefits of improving the energy efficiency of existing buildings and ... solar panels"**. I cannot see any conflict with this policy or "missed opportunities".

You should also recognise that part (d) of the same policy (CC2(1)) specifically requires development proposals **"Take advantage of opportunities to reuse existing structures"**. The application makes sustainable re-use of an existing building which should be supported.

Policy L3 also requires that **"Substantial weight should be given to the benefits where a development proposal would achieve one or more of the following: ... b. Making better use of vacant and underutilised land and buildings (such as: by bringing back into residential use empty homes and other suitable buildings"**.

Policy HO11 concerns isolated homes in the countryside. Having regard to the proximity to the dwellings to the northwest, northeast and south and other structures on the property I would not consider the site to be isolated and you similarly haven't raised a concern in relation to this policy. Even still, this policy carries forward the previous NPPF provisions for the "reuse a redundant or disused building and enhance its immediate setting" which your previous recommendation would have taken into account.

Policy DM3: Determining development proposals requires local planning authorities to "b. Take a proportionate approach to the consideration of the planning matters raised by the proposals, in a way that reflects their scale, complexity and potential impact;"

Policy S3 is clear that "development proposals that accord with both an up-to-date development plan and the decision-making policies in this Framework should be approved without delay"

There is a lot of new policy in the NPPF which we are all getting to grips with. I trust that you will reconsider the recommendation in light of the above.

Kind regards

Julian Sharpe
07941 083518

