From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 12 June 2025 15:45:09 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/0818
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 12/06/2025 3:45 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	The Haven House Sedgwick Lane Horsham West Sussex RH13 6QE
Proposal:	Prior Notification for Change of Use of Agricultural Building to 1no. dwellinghouse.
Case Officer:	Bethan Tinning

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	Garstan Sedgwick Lane Horsham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Other - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	I am one of the residents of the dwellings in front of the agricultural stretch of land applying for change of use for as a dwelling house. I have numerous objections as follows: Objection : Ecological

The Ecological Appraisal Report section 6.6 Further Surveys, states that 2 surveys should be carried out between May and September to determine the presence and roosting of bats therefore no change of use should be considered until the full findings of these surveys is available. There is evidence of the presence of dormice (also protected) and I believe a full survey should be carried out on the presence of dormice. There is also at least 1, possibly 2 owls living in the structures on the site. There is strong material evidence of this, as well as aural evidence pre-dawn and post-dusk to the local residents.

As yet, we have not been able to see either of the 2 new ecological reports, rather the original ecological report from the refused change of use application (DC/25/0211) has been re-used, therefore 6.6 still applies and permission should be deferred until such time as 2 surveys have been completed between May and September.

Objection: Access

The WSCC Highways submission, states traffic will not increase. This is not accurate as conversion of a barn to a house, with independent access from the property "The Haven House", whilst retaining agricultural use, will increase traffic movements as there would be agricultural and residential access along the bridle path know as Buckley Lane.

Objection: Utilities

The electricity and water are currently supplied via "The Haven House". If this proposed property is to be a separate, independent dwelling then, whilst there is electricity supply readily available, there isn't anywhere to connect to the water main on Sedgwick Lane because it is not possible to close off or dig up the bridle path due to Southern Water and their contractors requiring 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, unhindered, and emergency access to the sewage works at the end of the bridle path (known as Magpie Lane Waste Water Treatment Works). If access is hindered due to temporary works, the sewage works will overflow very quickly into the adjoining stream and/or back up to the houses connected to the sewage works.

If the proposed barn conversion utilities are to continue to be supplied from "The Haven House", then this should be treated as an annexe and not have separate residential access along the bridle path.

Objection: Removal and relocation of Stables
The current submitted drawings state that "Existing timber stables

to be dismantled and
relocated towards separate paddock". I understand, from advice given by numerous agricultural development advisors, this requires planning permission as stables are not generally considered agricultural (the building marked as Barn 1, has always been used as stables (American Barn Style, as pictured on page 9 of the preliminary ecological report) otherwise a new stable can pop up in a field and in a short time period, planning/change of use is submitted by a property developer, for a new residential property, leading to creeping urbanisation - "stables require planning permission in the UK, even if they are for personal use. This is because stables are not typically considered agricultural buildings and therefore don't qualify for the same permitted development rights as other agricultural structures".

Objection: Location
Given it's location behind existing, well-established dwellings, going back over 100 years, the proposal should be considered as Back Land Development which the Government Inspector for NPs removed a back land development from the NP.
Objection: Structural
The structure of the building - high asbestos content in cladding and pre-cast frame, along with steel clamps holding the 2 parts of the barn together would be too weak to support a traditional barn roof, plus condition and mix of block, timber, brick on the bottom quarter of the barn mean the structure would need complete demolition which would invalidate change of use.

HDC advice;
Buildings suitable for conversion
In considering whether a building is suitable for residential conversion, we will consider whether its form, bulk and general design is in keeping with its surroundings. Generally larger, more modern agricultural buildings would not be considered appropriate for residential conversion because they are often of a size and design that is not in keeping with their surroundings.
Generally, modern agricultural buildings are of portal frame construction with blockwork walls. Often the pitch of the roof is too low to use traditional plain tiles, which are the local vernacular building material.
More modern agricultural buildings are not domestic in scale and the alterations necessary to insert windows and doors into buildings constructed of blockwork and portal frame, together with the raising of the roof to accommodate clay or concrete tiles would constitute extensive alteration, which would have a harmful effect on the character of the countryside.

There are, however, a range of more traditional buildings (including some modern structures) which would be considered more suitable for residential conversions. These include brick and tile buildings such as former stable buildings, bothys and

traditional timber-framed buildings.
We are committed to maintaining or enhancing the character of the countryside and therefore any residential conversion of an agricultural or other rural building will normally only be permitted where it retains the rural character of the building and its setting.
Alterations and repair
Planning permission will normally be refused for any conversion that results in extensive alteration or substantial reconstruction in order to bring them into residential use. Where we are in any doubt as to whether a building can be suitably converted, the applicant will be required to submit a structural survey and/or a method statement setting out how it is intended to convert the building without significant extension and/or rebuilding.
In determining whether the amount of rebuilding is acceptable, a distinction will be made between structure and/or cladding or infill. While it is essential to retain or re-use as much as possible of the original, the renewal of cladding such as weatherboarding or tiles will not normally be counted as rebuilding provided the traditional materials, details and finishes similar to the original are used as replacements. In the same way, there will be a distinction between principal and secondary timbers on timber-framed barns with the retention of important principal rafters, wallplates and main posts being more important than the latter common rafters and studs.
In considering what element of re-building is acceptable, we will consider each case on its merits. However, as a general rule any proposal which involves a new roof structure of re-building of any significant section of walling (ie a gable end) would normally be regarded as unacceptable.

Objection: Design

The current proposed look of the building is very residential, in conflict with the guidance, as there are 3 proposed large windows whereas there is only one barn entrance, plus numerous other windows, uniform in shape and character. These windows would also look directly onto inhabited rooms of existing dwellings in front of the property.

Exterior walls
The most effective way of providing light to the main barn is to utilise the cart entrances.
Barn doors can be retained as shutters since they will normally fold flat against flank walls. Glazing can be inserted to provide light to flanking areas as well as direct into the building. This also helps to 'hide' the glazing. The insertion of windows can greatly change the character of the building. Generally, windows should be small, vertical in emphasis and inserted in a random fashion to avoid a domestic appearance. Existing features such as ventilation slits, patterned brick and flintwork should be preserved unaltered in any conversion scheme. Existing features such as ventilation slits, patterned brick and flintwork should be preserved unaltered in any conversion scheme.

Objection: Light and Noise
A residential unit, particularly one with 3 large windows, exterior lighting and extra vehicles would result in exponential, permanent increase in light pollution in addition to the current usage. Noise resulting from extra vehicle movements and an inhabited dwelling would result in permanent, exponential increase in noise for much of the day and evening in addition to the current usage.

Objection: Water Neutrality

To date, there hasn't been a water neutrality assessment posted to the planning portal.

Objection: General Points
Sedgwick Lane has no need for further housing as additional housing until 2031 has already been designated under the Nuthurst Parish Neighbourhood Plan which confines development to the built-up area boundaries of Mannings Heath, Monks Gate and Nuthurst with Sedgwick Lane being excluded.

Proposed access is via a popular, well-used bridleway, frequented by ramblers, dog walkers, horse riders and cyclists. Any entrance off the bridleway would encounter low-visibility for those users. Residential use, necessitated by rural location having no local transport, would be a significant increase in daily vehicle movements, compared with the current light farm traffic and Southern Water treatment vehicles.

Noise and light pollution, under the current, longstanding usage has been low and confined to daytime. Should change of use be allowed, both light and noise pollution will increase both during the daytime and in the evenings, from the back land into the houses in front.

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 E aton