



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0806

Henfield Lodge, Brighton Road, Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9SU

DESCRIPTION:

Prior Notification for the Change of Use of an Agricultural Building to a single dwellinghouse.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

WK/3/02	Retention of garden building for storage of garden machinery and processing of grapes for wine Site: Henfield Lodge Brighton Road Henfield	Application 07.06.2002	Permitted	on
DC/09/0995	Variation of Condition 3 on WK/3/02 to allow the storage of finished wine in bottles in barn in connection with vineyard and commercial use to allow applicant to sell and deliver bottles locally.	Application 17.03.2010	Permitted	on
DC/21/0810	Erection of first floor extension, alterations to create enclosed courtyard and replacement of conservatory with loggia.	Application 08.09.2021	Permitted	on

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site forms part of a former vineyard created in 1998. Henfield Lodge, formerly East Kentwyns, comprises 8.5 acres lying directly south of Brighton Road, including a vineyard and barn at the south-western end, gatehouse and substantial main house. The nearest property is South Kentwyns. there is a bank boundary to the lane on the barn side which is characterised by mature, native trees and hedge screening. The existing access to the barn continues from the main entrance drive to Henfield Lodge, from Brighton Road.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION:

This notification seeks prior approval under Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 to form 1no dwellinghouse.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework

Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF 2015):

Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development

Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection

Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection

Policy 33 - Development Principles

Policy 38 - Strategic Policy: Flooding

Policy 41 - Parking

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 Environmental Health: Comment

Commercial or agricultural buildings can be subject to significant contamination risks arising from their use, construction and storage of machinery, equipment, fuels or other chemicals. Potentially hazardous materials may also be incorporated in made ground, yards and hard standings.

In accordance with the recommendations of the Planning Practice Guidance, information is required on these matters and a preliminary risk assessment including a site walkover should be provided to ensure the site can be made safe and suitable for the development.

WSCC Highways: Comment

The site is located off Brighton Road, an A-classified road subject to 50mph speed limit restrictions. Generally, the change of use from agricultural to residential dwelling would generate a reduction in material use at the site. The existing use would create a certain number of movements throughout the day, whereas the movements associated with residential use would be anticipated within network peaks. Therefore, although the nature of trips would change, the frequency would likely not exceed that of the current permitted use.

The WSCC Car Parking Demand Calculator indicated that a development of this size in this location would require three car parking spaces. From inspection of the plans, three adequate spaces have been provided. Secure and covered cycle parking has not been included within the design, however due to the nature of the adjoining highway, may not be a desirable means of travel for all users. The LPA may wish to secure the parking and a cycle parking provision to be provided, via planning condition, if they deem appropriate.

In summary, the movements associated with agriculture have done so safely with no known safety highways concerns, and C3 residential uses are considered less intensive. West Sussex County Council in its role as LHA has therefore considered the proposal on that basis. In principle, the current GPDO gives limited ability to consider wider highway and transport impacts beyond those set out. The prior approval is therefore considered acceptable in highway terms.

Southern Water: Comment

Insufficient information provided.

Parish Comments:

None received

Representations:

1 representation letter received from 1 household objected to the proposal for the following reason:

- New house not needed in this location – no explanation, create noise/disturbance for neighbours and a precedent for further houses in grounds of Henfield Lodge.
- Ancillary to Henfield Lodge – previous planning applications have required buildings to be ancillary to the main dwellinghouse
- Increased vehicle traffic – increased traffic in the lane a concern due to being narrow with a dangerous exit onto Brighton Road
- Adverse impact on South Kentwyns – directly opposite, additional windows, intensity of use compared to existing, increased vehicle noise
- Precedent of previous conditions – similar conditions to those imposed on previous planning application should be attached

1 representation letter received from 1 household neither supported nor objected to the proposal:

- Access to the property should be limited to access to Henfield Lodge via the main access on A281.

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.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

The main issue is whether prior approval is required for the proposed change of use and conversion of the existing agricultural building to provide a single dwelling under Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

Permitted development

Permitted development:

Q. Development consisting of—

(a) a change of use –

- (i) a building that is part of an established agricultural unit and any land within that building's curtilage, or**
- (ii) a former agricultural building that was (but no longer) part of an established agricultural unit and any land within that building's curtilage**

to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of Schedule 1 to the Use Classes Order,

- (b) development referred to in sub-paragraph (a) together with the extension of the building referred to in sub-paragraph (a), or**
- (c) development referred to in sub-paragraph (a) together with building operations reasonably necessary to convert the building referred to in sub-paragraph (a) to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule or to extend that building.**

Prior approval consent is sought to convert and extend the existing agricultural building into 1 dwellinghouse under Q(a-c) as above.

Development not permitted:

Q.1 Development is not permitted by Class Q if—

- (a) in the case of a site that is part of an established agricultural unit, the site was not part of the established agricultural unit—**
 - (i) on 24th July 2023**
 - (ii) where the site became part of an established agricultural unit after 24th July 2023, for a period of at least 10 years before the date development under Class Q begins,**

Paragraph X of Part 3, Class Q of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 ('interpretation of Part 3') states that 'agricultural building' means a building used

for agriculture and which is so used for the purposes of a trade or business, and excludes any dwellinghouses, and 'agriculture use' refers to such uses.'

Section 336(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states that 'agriculture' includes horticulture, fruit growing, seed growing, dairy farming, the breeding and keeping of livestock (including any creature kept for the production of food, wool, skins or fur, or for the purpose of its use in the farming of land), the use of land as grazing land, meadow land, osier land, market gardens and nursery grounds, and the use of land for woodlands where the use is ancillary to the farming of land for other agricultural purposes, and 'agricultural' shall be construed accordingly.

The site was part of an agricultural unit, but this use has ceased. Therefore, the prior approval application falls under sub paragraphs (i) and (ii).

- (b) in the case of a building that was (but is no longer) part of an agricultural unit —**
- (i) the site was part of an established agricultural unit on 24th July 2023,**
 - (ii) where the site ceased to be part of an established agricultural unit after 24th July 2023, the site has not been part of the established agricultural unit for a period of at least 10 years before the date development under Class Q begins, or**
 - (iii) since ceasing to be part of an established agricultural unit, the site has been used for any non-agricultural purpose.**

The site was part of an established vineyard use from 1998 until 2016/2017 when the commercial vineyard operations ceased. The planning statement states that the building has not been used for any non-agricultural purposes since.

It is however noted that the building was previously a glasshouse used in connection with the vineyard. In 2002, an application for the retention of garden building for the storage of garden machinery and processing of grapes for wine (WK/3/02) was approved. This application sought to change the dimensions and materials of the building for the purpose of storing garden machinery and processing grapes for the vineyard. Condition 5 was attached to the permission:

Condition 5: The building shall be used as a private domestic building in connection with the maintenance and enjoyment of the private domestic dwellinghouse Henfield Lodge and its grounds only. It shall not be used for any residential purpose (whether this be independent or ancillary or otherwise) or for any other purpose.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of nearby neighbours.

This condition states that the building was not an agricultural building, through the wording 'private domestic building' and as such shall not be used for any residential purposes (whether this be independent or ancillary or otherwise) or for any other purpose. Therefore, due to the building not being an agricultural building and the attachment of a condition restricting residential use, the building would not benefit from permitted development rights under Class Q conversion from agricultural to residential.

It is also noted that in 2010, planning permission was approved for the variation of Condition 3 on WK/3/02 to allow the storage of finished wine in bottles in barn in connection with vineyard and commercial use to allow applicant to sell and deliver bottles locally (DC/09/0995). This permission also attached the following condition:

Condition 2: The building shall be used for the storage of finished wine bottles in connection with the vineyard at Henfield Lodge and for no other purpose.

Reason: To accord with the terms of the application and in the interests of the amenities of adjoining residents in accordance with policy DC9 of the Horsham District Local Development Framework: General Development Control Policies (2007).

Article 3(4) of the Order states:

- (4) *Nothing in this Order permits development contrary to any condition imposed by any planning permission granted or deemed to be granted under Part 3 or Part 13 of the Act otherwise than by this Order.*

With these conditions in place, the application site would not benefit from Class Q permitted development rights due to two distinct legal barriers highlighted in its planning history. First, the building fails the foundational criteria of Class Q because it does not possess a solely agricultural status, having instead held a planning history tied to private domestic garden storage (under permission WK/3/02) and commercial wine distribution (under DC/09/0995). Second, even if agricultural status could be argued, Article 3(4) of the GPDO strictly bars the use of permitted development here. In accordance with the 'Dunnett principle' (Dunnett Investments Ltd v SSCLG [2017]), a planning condition can exclude permitted development rights without naming the GPDO explicitly, provided its wording is clear and unambiguous. The historic planning permissions on this site contain explicitly restrictive, absolute exclusions stating that the building "shall not be used for any residential purpose" and shall be used only for its approved terms "and for no other purpose." This clear wording satisfies the Dunnett threshold, creating a direct legal conflict that completely suspends Class Q rights on the property. The proposal therefore does not comply with the provisions of Paragraph Q.1(b)(iii) of the Order.

- (c) **the floor space of any dwellinghouse under Class Q having a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of Schedule 1 to the Use Classes Order exceeds 150 square metres,**

The floor space of the proposed dwellinghouse measures at 148 sqm. This would not exceed the 150 sqm allowed under Class Q.1(c).

- (d) **the development under Class Q, together with any previous development under Class Q, within the original limits of an established agricultural unit (see Paragraph Q.3(2) of this Part) would result in –**

- (i) **the cumulative number of separate dwellinghouses having a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of Schedule 1 to the Use Classes Order exceeding 10, or**
- (ii) **the cumulative floor space of dwellinghouses having a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of Schedule 1 to the Use Classes Order exceeding 1,000 square metres.**

The proposal is for 1no dwellinghouse, therefore the total number of dwellings is under 10. The overall cumulative floor space would be 148 sqm which is within the requirement of Class Q.1(d).

- (e) **the site is occupied under an agricultural tenancy, unless the express consent of both the landlord and the tenant has been obtained;**

The proposal is considered to meet the requirements of (e).

- (f) **less than 1 year before the date development begins—**

- (i) **an agricultural tenancy over the site has been terminated, and**
- (ii) **the termination was for the purpose of carrying out development under Class Q,**

unless both the landlord and the tenant have agreed in writing that the site is no longer required for agricultural use;

The proposal is considered to meet the requirements of (f).

- (g) **development under Class A(a) or Class B(a) of Part 6 of this Schedule (agricultural buildings and operations) has been carried out on the established agricultural unit during the period which is 10 years before the date development under Class Q begins,**

There is no evidence to indicate that development under Class A(a) or Class B(a) of Part 6 has taken place.

- (h) the development would result in the external dimensions of the building extending beyond the external dimensions of the existing building at any given point, other than—**
 - (i) extension of the building allowed by paragraph Q.1(i);**
 - (ii) protrusions of up to 0.2 metres to accommodate building operations allowed by paragraph Q.1(j)(i),**

The proposals would not result in the external dimensions of any part of the barn extending beyond the external dimensions of the existing barn by more than 0.2 metres other than the proposed rear extension.

- (i) the development under Class Q(b) would result in an extension that—**
 - (i) has more than one storey,**
 - (ii) is sited anywhere other than to the rear of the existing building,**
 - (iii) extends beyond the rear wall of the existing building by more than 4 metres,**
 - (iv) has eaves the height of which exceed the height of the eaves of the existing building,**
 - (v) is higher than whichever is the lower of—**
 - (aa) the highest part of the roof of the existing building, or**
 - (bb) a height of 4 metres above the ground,**
 - (vi) extends beyond a wall that forms a side or principal elevation of the existing building, or**
 - (vii) would be sited on land that, before the development under Class Q(b), is not covered by a hard surface that was provided on the land by virtue of any development, and—**
 - (aa) the hard surface was not provided on the land on or before 24th July 2023, or**
 - (bb) where the hard surface was provided on the land after 24th July 2023, the hard surface has not been situated on the land for a period of at least 10 years before the date development under Class Q(b) begins,**

It is noted that the Applicant has proposed two different extensions, one with a hipped roof and one with a gable roof. The Applicant seeks prior approval for both approaches and will be decided by the applicant later.

However, while the proposed extensions would be in accordance with the majority of the above criteria, it does not meet Class i (iii) which states that the extension must not *extend beyond the rear wall of the existing building by more than 4 metres*. The extension would extend beyond the rear wall by approximately 5 metres for both the gable roof and hip roof extensions. This would also extend past the existing hard surfacing on site. Therefore, the proposed extensions would extend further than 4m from the rear wall and would therefore exceed the limitations under Q.1(i)(iii).

- (j) the development under Class Q(b) would consist of building operations other than—**
 - (i) the installation or replacement of—**
 - (aa) windows, doors, roofs, or exterior walls, or**
 - (bb) water, drainage, electricity, gas, or other services, to the extent reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse; and**
 - (ii) partial demolition to the extent reasonably necessary to carry out building operations allowed by paragraph Q.1(i)(i);**

Paragraph 105 of the Planning Practice Guidance in relation to building operations states the following:

'Building works are allowed under the change to residential use. The permitted development right under Class Q assumes that the agricultural building is capable of functioning as a dwelling. However, it recognises that for the building to function as a dwelling some building operations which would affect the external appearance of the building, which would otherwise require planning permission, should be permitted. The right allows for the installation or replacement of windows, doors, roofs, exterior walls, water, drainage, electricity, gas, or other services to the extent reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwelling house; and partial demolition to the extent reasonably necessary to carry out these building operations. It is not the intention of the permitted development right to include the construction of new structural elements for the building. Therefore, it is only where the existing building is structurally strong enough to take the loading which comes with the external works to provide for residential use that the building would be considered to have the permitted development right.'

The notification has been supported with a structural report for the barn. The barn is a single storey barn with a higher ground level on the north side and a lower ground level on the south side. The north wall is a 340mm thick solid brick wall, and the south wall is formed by a low solid brick plinth wall. The east and west gables are oak framed with horizontal timber boarding/framing as external cladding. The floor is part compacted hardstanding and part concrete. The roof structure is formed by primary oak truss members connected to the oak posts. The report notes that all proposed conversion works are capable of being carried out without introducing any structural loads that will have an adverse impact on the existing structures of the building or require any significant modification or changes to the existing structure. The structural report concludes that the structural condition of the barn is considered to be sound, and the structural elements have the capacity to accept that standard structural loads that are applicable to dwellings and the introduction of a rear extension without any significant alteration or upgrading.

The proposed works will involve installation and replacement of windows, doors and insulation of roofs and exterior walls that are reasonably necessary for the barn to function as a dwellinghouse. No demolition or partial demolition is proposed. The development is therefore considered to meet the requirements of (j).

While it is recognised that the proposed conversion would involve some alterations to the structural fabric of the building, the subject building would appear capable of conversion in their own right. Any works to the building are considered reasonably necessary to support a residential use as permitted under Q.1(j). The measures are not considered to be of such a degree to amount to a rebuild, and the required works are therefore considered to be reasonably necessary to convert the building.

(k) the site is on article 2(3) land;

The site is not on article 2(3) land.

(l) the site is, or forms part of—

- (i) a site of special scientific interest;**
- (ii) a safety hazard area;**
- (iii) a military explosives storage area;**

The site is not within any of these areas.

(m) the site is, or contains, a scheduled monument; or

The site is not and does not contain a scheduled monument.

(n) the building is a listed building

The building is not a listed building.

- (o) the existing building, excluding any proposed extension under Class Q(b) but including any proposed building operations under Class Q(c), would not be capable of complying with the nationally described space standard issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government on 27th March 2015 as read with the notes dated 19th May 2016 which apply to it, or**

The floor plans demonstrate the GIA of the proposed dwelling would be approximately 148 sqm, complying with nationally described space standards. The above criteria is therefore met.

- (p) the building does not have suitable existing access to a public highway.**

The barn has a hard surface access, directly leading to and connected to the similar hard surface access to Henfield Lodge and the Gatehouse from Brighton Road, a public highway. An existing alternative access gate directly from the public highway lane leading to Hole Farm is permanently locked shut and screened and not proposed to be used as access to the barn or the garaging at the Gatehouse.

Conditions

Q.2— (1) Where the development proposed is development under Class Q(a) together with development under Class Q(b), development is permitted subject to the condition that before beginning the development, the developer must apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority will be required as to—

- (a) transport and highways impact of the development**

The site is located off Brighton Road, with the existing access to the barn having an existing hardstanding area at the front capable of providing three parking spaces. The existing, 2003, approved set back gated access to Henfield Lodge is also the public highway access to the barn. Vehicle trips to and from a single-family dwelling would not introduce an intensification when compared to the previous use as a commercial vineyard.

West Sussex County Council as the Local Highway Authority have advised that the suitable space is provided surrounding the site which would meet the dwelling's parking needs, and that there are no apparent concerns regarding the visibility and access into the site. Furthermore, the increased trip generation from the proposed change of use would not be considered to exceed potential current use. As such, no objections are raised on highway grounds.

- (b) noise impacts of the development**

Paragraph 187 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should prevent new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution. Paragraph 198 continues that decisions should ensure that all new development is appropriate for its location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so, they should mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impact resulting from noise from new development and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life.

The proposed development is well located in relation to adjacent residential dwellings and other buildings nearby. There would be no increase in vehicle movements to and from the barn and its location 75 metres from the main house separated by high brick wall, with no noise impact envisioned as a result of the proposed conversion. The nearest dwelling would be 28 metres away, but there is mature tree and hedge screening to the bank to the sunken lane. The planning statement states that the proposed change of use to single family dwelling is unlikely to increase noise at the site and its surroundings over its previous use as a barn associated with commercial vineyard operations. It is

considered that the proposed residential use would not be anticipated to generate any harmful levels of noise over and above the existing arrangement, no objections are therefore raised on these grounds.

(c) Contamination risks on the site

Paragraph 187 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should prevent new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution. Paragraph 196 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that a site is suitable for its proposed use, taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination.

Commercial and agricultural buildings and land can be subject to significant contamination risks arising from their use, previous land uses, construction and storage of machinery, equipment, fuels, or other chemicals. Potentially hazardous materials may also be incorporated in made ground, yards, and hard standings. Risks arising from the use therefore require evaluation by the applicant.

No contamination assessment has been provided. The planning statement states that the O/S maps from 1875 to 1956 show the vineyard and barn areas as market garden with associated buildings. The market garden use later became the vineyard, planted with vines in 1998. No non-agricultural uses have been carried out either while an operational vineyard or since the removal of the vines around 2018/2019. It is considered very unlikely that there are any contamination risks associated with the previous use of the barn, the vineyard and orchard/market garden. Information, however, is required on these matters and therefore a preliminary risk assessment including a site walkover should be provided to ensure the site can be made safe and suitable for development. Nonetheless, in the event that consent were to be granted, Officers are satisfied that this matter could have been dealt with by way of condition.

(d) flooding risks on the site

The site lies outside any area subject to flood risk. No concerns in respect of flooding are therefore raised.

(e) whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the building to change from agricultural use to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order

The building is accessible via an existing hardstanding track. The proposal would not introduce openings that would face directly into existing neighbouring dwellings, and as such, it is not considered that the proposal would detrimentally influence the privacy of adjacent occupiers. The barn's location and siting is well-hidden in terms of the local landscape and in views from public rights of way. It is noted that a number of representation letters were received from neighbouring amenity, and it is considered that there is mature screening and boundary treatment along the road to screen in view from neighbouring amenity. The site is also located 2 miles away from Henfield, a local centre with good facilities, and where a regular bus service runs every 30 minutes. The bus service also runs to Brighton and the barn's location is within comfortable cycling distance of many local services. Overall, therefore, the proposed works would not be considered impractical or undesirable as termed at paragraph Q.2(1)(e).

(f) the design or external appearance of the building, and the provisions of paragraph W (prior approval) of this Part apply in relation to that application

The overall form and footprint of the existing building would be retained with the addition of a rear extension. The proposed elevations illustrate that the external appearance of the building would be retained with regards to the existing materials, and the rear extension would have a similar external appearance. Whilst new openings would be introduced within the structure, it is considered that these would not give the building an overtly domestic appearance beyond that which could be expected as a result of the conversion of a rural building to a residential use. The proposed windows and doors would be full height set at the centre of the oak frame. The matt, dark grey photovoltaic roof panels proposed will appear similar to the existing slated roof slopes but will also be hidden in the local landscape. The

proposed design and external appearance of the building is therefore considered to be acceptable within this rural setting.

(g) the provision of adequate natural light in all habitable rooms of the dwellinghouses.

Each habitable room serving each of the dwellings would benefit from access to natural light from the proposed new door and window apertures to be installed on the elevations of the building. As such, no objections raised on these grounds.

Conclusion

The proposal has been considered in relation to all relevant conditions, limitations, and restrictions of Class Q in Part 3. As reasoned in detail above, it is considered that the proposal would not comply with all relevant limitations of Class Q and therefore it is recommended that the prior approval is required and refused.

Recommendation: Prior Approval Required and REFUSED

Reasons for Refusal:

- 1 The building is the subject of Condition 5 of planning permission WK/3/02 and Condition 2 of DC/09/0995, which restrict its use to private domestic storage and commercial wine storage respectively; the conversion would therefore be contrary to these conditions and barred by Article 3(4) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended. Furthermore, because these historic permissions established a non-agricultural use on the site since it ceased to be part of an agricultural unit, the proposal fails to meet the foundational criteria of Paragraph Q.1(b)(iii) of Class Q of Part 3, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended.
- 2 The proposed development would include an extension that would extend from the rear elevation by more than 4m. The proposal would not accord with Q.1(i)(iii) of Class Q of Part 3, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended.

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/26/0806

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

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location plan	Proposed	0283_01	18.05.2026
Block plan	Existing	0283_02	30.06.2026
Floor plan	Existing Ground	0283_03	30.06.2026
Roof plan	Existing	0283_04	30.06.2026
Elevation plan	Existing	0283_05	30.06.2026
Block plan	Proposed	0283_06	30.06.2026

Floor plan	Proposed Ground	0283_07	30.06.2026
Roof plan	Proposed Roof Plan	0283_08	30.06.2026
Elevation plan	Proposed	0283_09	30.06.2026
Roof plan	Proposed	0283_10	30.06.2026
Elevation plan	Proposed Gable Roof to Extension	0283_11	30.06.2026
Supporting Statement	Planning	NONE	18.05.2026
Supporting Statement	Structural Inspection Report	NONE	18.05.2026
Photos	Planning Photographs 1/2	NONE	18.05.2026
Photos	Planning Photographs 2/2	NONE	18.05.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Bethan Tinning Date: 01.07.2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial RHERMITAGE Date: 07.07.2026