



D&M PLANNING ^{Ltd}
Chartered Town Planners

1A High Street, Godalming Surrey GU7 1AZ | 01483425705 | info@dm-planning.co.uk
www.dm-planning.co.uk

FINAL COMMENTS CONCERNING

APPEAL AGAINST THE NON-DETERMINATION OF APPLICATION DC/25/2126

FOR

**ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY DETACHED GRANNY ANNEXE TOGETHER
WITH A DETACHED SINGLE STOREY MULTIPURPOSE WORKSHOP AND GYM**

5 KINGSFOLD CLOSE, BILLINGSHURST, WEST SUSSEX, RH14 9HG

**D&M REF: 009/26/MS
PINS Ref: 6009032
June 2026**

DIRECTOR - ANDREW BANDOSZ BA (Hons) MSc Dip UPI MRTPI | **ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR - MATT SMITH** BA (Hons) MA MRTPI
ASSOCIATE - CHRIS FRENCH BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI
PLANNER - PAUL HARDWICK BSc (Hons) MRTPI

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction**
- 2.0 Discussion of Suggested Reasons for Refusal**
- 3.0 Response to Council's Full Statement of Case**
- 4.0 Commentary on Suggested Conditions**

Appendices:

- 1. Officer's Report for 8 Kingsfold Close

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This statement provides final comments in direct response to those submitted by Horsham District Council ('the Council') in relation to the Appeal Against Non-Determination (PINs reference 6009032).
- 1.2 The application concerned the proposed erection of two outbuildings, one to provide ancillary residential accommodation in the form of an annex, the other to provide a gym/workshop space. Both buildings would be within the rear garden of the property they would serve, namely, 5 Kingsfold Close.
- 1.3 This response will cover the main response to the Council's comments and the suggested conditions.
- 1.4 The Council's Statement sets out a number of points including a description of the proposal, site description, main considerations and conclusion. The focus of this statement will be on the main parts of the planning considerations.

2.0 SUGGESTED REASONS FOR REFUSAL

- 2.1 The suggested reason for refusal is referenced at paragraph 4.1 of the Council's statement. It reads:

The annexe outbuilding, by reason of its scale, form and design, would represent an unsympathetic form of development which would be harmfully out of keeping with the character and appearance of the application site and wider locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy Bill 2 of the Billingshurst Parish Neighbourhood Plan.

- 2.2 Evidently, the suggested reason for refusal is solely related to the proposed annexe and not to the gym/workshop building. The concerns raised are evidently about its scale, form and design with the Council considering that this would result in a harmful impact on the character of both the application site and wider locality.

- 2.3 The Council has given reference to three policies of the Development Plan within the suggested reason for refusal being:

Policy 32: Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development

Policy 33: Development Principles

Bill 2: Housing Design and Character

- 2.4 We highlight at this juncture that none of these policies specifically require development to give regard to the character of the application site with the policies worded to consider the wider environment in which they sit.

- 2.5 We also highlight that not every aspect of these policies is relevant to the consideration of the proposal.

- 2.6 It is therefore understood that the general position of the suggested reason for refusal, as articulate within the Council's statement, is with regard to the impact of the proposal on the character of the area with it being found harmful by reason of its scale, form and design.
- 2.7 The Council have not, despite comments in the report, made any suggestion regarding the impact of the proposal in terms of use. That being said we have given specific regard to Paragraph 3.22 of the Council's statement below.

3.0 RESPONSE TO COUNCIL'S FULL STATEMENT OF CASE

3.1 Within this section of the statement we will seek to make reference to the main planning matters as they relate to the Council's Full Statement of Case. We acknowledge that the Council has not raised concern regarding the impact of the proposal in terms of impact on neighbours, highways, water neutrality, trees, climate change and therefore any comments on these matters would be limited.

3.2 In addressing the Council's comments we will give regard to the following main considerations:

- Principle of Development
- Impact on the Character of the Area

Principle of Development

3.3 In considering the principle of development it has been highlighted between paragraphs 4.4 – 4.8 of the appeal statement, and within the originally submitted Planning Statement, that the proposed development would be ancillary to the host dwelling.

3.4 The Council have also not suggested a reason for refusal contrary to this perspective. Whilst this is the case the comments of the Council at paragraphs 3.22 and 3.23 are noted. This stating:

The proposed layout within the annexe outbuilding would provide all the facilities required for independent day to day living and there would be no apparent functional dependency between the annexe and existing main dwelling. A self-contained dwelling (not associated with 5 Kingsfold Close) would appear characteristically cramped and could not be supported under Policies 32 or 33 of the HDPF.

If, as a matter of fact and degree, the Inspector is satisfied that the outbuilding would represent ancillary accommodation, and if the appeal is allowed, a condition would be recommended to prevent use other than as ancillary to the main dwelling.

- 3.5 Whilst acknowledging that the Council has effectively reserved that assessment for the Inspector's discretion, we do raise some concern with the Council's position on this matter.
- 3.6 We highlight that the Council's view at 3.22 seems to imply that the Council view the proposal as being tantamount to an independent dwelling and not an ancillary outbuilding. The basis for this being an assessment of the facilities it provides for *independent day-to-day living* and the absence of an apparent *functional dependency between the annexe and existing main dwelling*.
- 3.7 It is our position that this would be an example of substantive unreasonable behaviour to the determination of the case as it would constitute the decision maker *acting contrary to, or not following, well-established case law*. In this instance the case law being *Uttlesford DC v SSE & White* [1992]. This is a well-established example of case law concerned with ancillary outbuildings. Specifically, the case law considers a circumstance in whether a converted garage, which provided all the facilities for independent day-to-day living, constituted an independent dwelling or an annex. In the case law it was determined that the consideration of whether the operation constituted development by reason of a material change of use, required regard, on fact and degree, to be given to how the space was utilised and not what provisions it provided.
- 3.8 In this instance it is highlighted that the annex would share a distinct functional relationship between the main house and the building. Firstly, it is highlighted that the intended use of the building is to provide ancillary accommodation for friends and family as well, as to future proof the appellants occupation of the building who are becoming progressively infirm and therefore may require a live-in-carer. The nature of the occupation would therefore be inherently tied to the occupation of the main house with neither being sold or let separately and the actual occupant themselves being dependent on the connection to the occupier of the main dwelling.
- 3.9 It is secondly highlighted that there would be a physical functional connection between the two. The property at large would retain one access to the highway, hard surfacing

between the main house and the outbuilding, a single garden, and single utility connection. It is also highlighted that as a single storey building the proposed building would have a degree of subordination to the much larger main dwelling, the result of such being that the building is legible as an annex as opposed to an independent dwelling.

- 3.10 It is also highlighted that the Council recognised the application as being one that is described, on the appeal and planning application, as *Erection of a single storey detached granny annexe*...Had the Council considered the proposal to be different then it was within their gift to suggest a revised description of development. It is also highlighted that should the building be built as, or subsequently change in use, to no longer being ancillary this in its own right would constitute a breach of development for which the Council could look to enforce against.
- 3.11 While the Council have not sought to suggest a reason for refusal based on the principle of development, we do consider that the approach at paragraphs 3.22 and 3.23 to make such a suggestion fails to acknowledge relevant case law. Other than the fact that the annex would have necessary facilities the Council have not provided any justification for the reasoning as to why it should not be regarded as ancillary clearly acting contrary to the established case law.
- 3.12 As is clearly established, in line with the relevant case law, neither outbuildings would be tantamount to a material change of use of the land, this is to say that they would be ancillary to the host dwelling. Given such, we contend, as previously submitted, that the principle of development should be solely concerned with the impact on the character and amenity of the area reflecting the locality of the site within the defined built-up area.

Design and Impact on the Character of the Area

- 3.13 Within paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 of the Council's statement they set out the relevant policy framework for consideration of the proposal. We do not dispute that these are the most relevant to the determination, however, they are not the sole policies focused on ensuring

high quality design – these are referenced in the originally submitted planning statement (paragraphs 4.10 and 4.27).

- 3.14 It is also set out that the policies include a variety of sub-points not all of which are relevant to the appeal proposal. The originally submitted Appeal Statement (paragraphs 4.11 – 4.13) provide a more detailed exploration of the relevant policies. We do, however, understand that the overall aim of these policies is to ensure design which does not result in harm to the character of the area.
- 3.15 In this instance Kingsfold Close consists of a residential road within the built-up-area. Properties consist of generous detached two storey dwellings with parking and amenity to the front. To the rear the properties have good sized gardens and include a number of amenities to the respective host dwelling including outbuildings, swimming pools etc. As shown on the aerial image below number of these should be apparent to the Inspector during the course of their site visit.
- 3.16 Evidently this pattern of large, detached dwelling house with such amenities is typical of the urban built-up area. This is particularly the case when regard is given to the generous plot size of the buildings and the relative low density of the road which affords occupiers more space than may typically be the case. It is also highlighted, as is the case for no.8 Kingsfold Close that these amenities have also been granted consent to be to the front of the property again reflecting the generous spacing of this residential area.



Source: Google Maps. Outbuildings, swimming pools and amenity areas circled for clarity

- 3.17 As set out the Council's concern, as per the suggested reason for refusal, are limited to the annexe, not the proposed gym/workshop. On this basis we have focused on this building rather than the other.
- 3.18 In paragraph 3.4 the Council's statement seems to suggest that the concerns are based on the building's footprint, the height exceeding 3m, and the functional design with *limited articulation* which the Council consider to be at odds with the host building *and the prevailing nature of surrounding development*.
- 3.19 At paragraph 3.5 and 3.6 this is expanded to state that the Council consider that good design should take into account the pattern and scale of the surrounding context and built form, but that has not been undertaken as part of the proposal.

- 3.20 The Council argue that very little detail or justification has been provided for the rationale and how this has evolved has been presented. It goes on to state that

The proposed footprint and form would create a visible and incongruous contrast with both the host building and the pattern of surrounding development. This contrast would create a jarring relationship which would be harmful to the prevailing character and appearance of the site and wider surrounding area.

It is acknowledged that the site currently benefits from boundary planting which provides a level of screening. The presence of planting could not though be relied upon in perpetuity and should not be accepted as a substitute for good design.

- 3.21 In response we make a number of comments; these are split into various sub-headers below for ease of reference

Justification and Evolution of Design

- 3.22 Firstly it is highlighted that this is an application essentially for outbuildings. We would not anticipate there to be a need for such a modest scheme to provide justification about how a scheme has evolved. This as alluded to in the Council's statement is similar to that one would expect in a Design and Access Statement for major development. Notwithstanding that, the appellant through all submissions to date has routinely set out the context of the area and provided justification for the building.
- 3.23 To reiterate this, however, the annex is proposed in such a form to provide the necessary functions for the intended use, namely, to provide ancillary accommodation for friends and family and also to future proof the appellant in the event of furthering declines in health. The building is therefore designed to provide sufficient space for such including providing space for reduced mobility as evidenced by the ramp into the building and the general circulation arrangements. Further, the building has been designed to meet the Passivhaus standards including the proposed insulation properties, floor to ceiling heights, provision of solar panels, window arrangements etc.

- 3.24 In addition to the internal ceiling heights seeking to achieve the highest standards, the design of the proposal as a flat roof structure is to enable the installation of adjustable solar panels allowing them to maximise solar returns throughout the year. The proposed parapet arrangement is intended to reduce the visual impact of the Solar PVs. The inclusion of these Solar PVs will enhance the sustainability and energy efficiency of the proposal allowing it to function in a manner which helps to address the challenges of a changing climate. We highlight at this juncture that the policies of the Council as set out in both the Planning Statement and previously submitted Appeal Statement also seek to ensure that development addresses such challenges. This too also explains the form of the building though little regard is given to such in the Council's statement.

Materials

- 3.25 In terms of the external appearance the raised at paragraph 3.4 of the Council's statement it is acknowledged that the plans are relatively simple in the degree of detail shown, however, regard must be given to the submission as a whole. As is stated within the application form on multiple occasions it is proposed that the building be clad in timber, specifically Siberian Pine. It is highlighted that the existing property benefits from similar cladding on its elevations including those which front the highway and this would inherently link the outbuilding to the outbuildings. This articulation is clearly in keeping with the host dwelling and would provide a direct link between the two.
- 3.26 Notwithstanding this, it would be open to the Inspector to condition details of the external materials to be provided should this be deemed necessary. In the advent of such this would ensure the relationship in materiality was secured.
- 3.27 It is also highlighted that such timber cladding is clearly visible within the context of the area. There are a number of outbuildings serving the various properties within Kingsfold Close which are afforded similar finishes, as shown in the image below for example. It is also notable that these buildings benefit from a flat roof as is proposed on the annexe building. In this sense we therefore disagree with the position of the Council that the

building would not reflect the prevailing character of the area as it is this sort of design which is prevalent within the Close.



Source: Google Street View, overlooking no.1 Kingsfold Close

Visibility of building

- 3.28 Within the Council's statement it is said that the harm would be because it is visible from the street scene and that the screening of the existing boundary treatment cannot be relied upon.
- 3.29 Firstly it is highlighted that in the consideration of other applications within the Close the Council has, contrary to the comments within the Appeal Statement, given weight to the existing boundary vegetation. We attach at Appendix 1 the officer's report for the outbuilding erected to the front of the property which states, as highlighted:

It is however recognised that the boundary treatment comprises of an established hedgerow which screens the side garden from the wider streetscape. Whilst this cannot be relied upon to make the development acceptable, it would reduce the visual prominence of the building and would sufficiently screen the proposed outbuilding from the wider streetscape.

- 3.30 In this instance the boundary treatment between the site and the highway is materially different to that at no. 8. The hedgerow separates the boundary of no. 5 with the neighbour to the north, no. 4, in contrast no. 8 was simply to the highway and therefore much more integral given its forward position to the screening. We therefore suggest that the likelihood of the screening being removed is much more reduced than at no. 8 as this constitutes a communal boundary between two properties and is effectively two hedgerows deep.
- 3.31 Additionally, even if the hedging is not taken into account, it remains our opinion that the building would remain well screened. As is evidenced on the site plan and would be apparent to the Inspector during the course of their site visit the proposed building would be positioned to the rear of the host dwelling and behind an existing shed. In these circumstances the building would effectively be screened by the existing built form notable the host dwelling. Further, the proposed building would be orientated in such a fashion that its smaller flank wall would be the facing elevation further limiting its visibility within the context of the area.
- 3.32 We also highlight, as per the submission above, that the area itself is characterised by the detached dwellings benefiting from similar flat roof buildings within their gardens. Being positioned to the rear of the property is entirely within the context of the area and reflects the established pattern that is clearly visible within the Close.
- 3.33 In light of such it is our contention that the proposal would not be jarring nor would it be in conflict with the established pattern in the street scene particularly as that pattern includes clear examples of outbuildings positioned in similar location and finished in similar materials to that proposed. This contention is emphasised by the fact that the building, as a single storey structure, would clearly be set lower than the host dwelling and orientated in such a manner to show a clear dependency on it.

Fallback Position

- 3.34 At paragraph 3.8 of the Council's statement the Council seeks to diminish any consideration of those rights afforded under Class E of the General Permitted Development Order which grants permission for the erection of outbuildings, swimming pools etc. subject to a number of conditions.
- 3.35 The Council's statement correctly acknowledges that as an ancillary outbuilding the proposed annex could not be constructed under such rights, but this misses the point raised in the submitted Appeal Statement.
- 3.36 As is clearly set out in paragraphs 4.17 and 4.18 it is our point that the scale and size of the building is only marginally larger than that which could be constructed under permitted development. We are not stating that there is a fallback position for the application as proposed.
- 3.37 The point being made, however, is that under those rights afforded under Class E an outbuilding could be constructed in this locality of near identical appearance, footprint and (subject to modest reductions in height) scale. Under such rights buildings up to 50% of the curtilage can be constructed with no real design consideration for materials, finish or form. The proposal, by contrast offers and opportunity for controls to be conditioned on such.
- 3.38 Indeed it is highlighted that given the absence of planning applications within the wider Close that the majority of the outbuildings which are evident from the highway were constructed under such rights. The provisions under Class E of the General Permitted Development Order, have significantly contributed to the context of the area which has resulted in the examples of single storey, flat roofed buildings of various footprints, with timber cladding etc.
- 3.39 Whilst the proposed annexe would be ancillary, as opposed to incidental, and marginally taller than that permitted under the GPDO, the footprint, finish, design etc. of the

proposed building would be consistent with that afforded under such. This we contend reflects the assertion that the building would not be harmful to the character of the area and that it would in fact strongly reflect the pattern of development in the area.

- 3.40 We consider that this further advances our position that the building would be suitable to the context of the area and would accord with the relevant policies of the Development Plan.

Other Matters

- 3.41 The Council's statement gives reference to the proposal in terms of its impact on neighbouring amenity, trees and water neutrality. We do not disagree with these conclusions and given the nature of the proposal alongside consultee responses can see no justification for divergence from such conclusions.
- 3.42 It is, however, highlighted that the Council's statement gives no regard to the sustainability credentials of the property. As is set out the proposal has been specifically designed to maximise the energy efficiency of the build both from use of renewables, insulation and heating. This is a fundamental design approach to the building which is neglected in the Council's consideration of the proposal.

Conclusion

- 3.43 For the reasons set out above we respectfully request that the Inspector allow the appeal and grant planning permission for the proposed development. As set out the Council's concerns are limited to the design and visual impact annexed, despite this we consider that the proposal would contrary to this, respect the character of the area reinforcing the residential character of the Close.

D&M PLANNING LIMITED
Chartered Town Planners

4.0 COMMENTS ON CONDITIONS

- 4.1 Within this section we have provided commentary on the suggested conditions as presented by the Council. These are addressed in the order as presented by the Council.

Condition 1

- 4.2 Agreed.

Condition 2

- 4.3 Agreed.

Condition 3

- 4.4 Agreed

Condition 4

- 4.5 Agreed

Condition 5

- 4.6 We agree with this condition, however, as per the above we also invite the Inspector to require the appellant to submit more detailed information about the proposed finishes. We suggest that this could be worded as prior to above slab level works.

Condition 6

- 4.7 Although we do not disagree with the purpose of this condition, we do question whether it is necessary. Should the buildings be constructed for any alternative use other than being ancillary to the host dwelling, or if they are subsequently changed in use, this would in itself constitute an unlawful material change of use. In such circumstances it would be

open to the Council to take enforcement action which could be used to remedy the breach. We highlight that the period of time for immunity is now 10 years providing ample time in such an event for the Council to take action if deemed appropriate.



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/23/0350
8 Kingsfold Close, Billingshurst, West Sussex, RH14 9HG

DESCRIPTION:

Erection of a shed/workshop for storing garden maintenance equipment, garden furniture and domestic tools.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None relevant

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):

Policy 31- Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32- Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33- Development Principles

Neighbourhood Plan:

The Billingshurst Neighbourhood Plan was formally made on 23 June 2021.

Policy 1: Billingshurst Built-Up Area Boundary

Policy 2: Housing Design and Character

Parish Design Statement:

Billingshurst Parish Design Statement

Planning Advice Notes:

Facilitating Appropriate Development
Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS RESPONSES

Consultations:

Natural England: Standing Advice:-

It cannot be concluded that existing abstraction within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone is not having an adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley SAC/SPA/Ramsar sites. Developments within Sussex North must therefore not add to this impact and one way of achieving this is to demonstrate water neutrality. The definition of water neutrality is the use of water in the supply area before the development is the same or lower after the development is in place.

To achieve this Natural England is working in partnership with all the relevant authorities to secure water neutrality collectively through a water neutrality strategy. Whilst the strategy is evolving, Natural England advises that decisions on planning applications should await its completion. However, if there are applications which a planning authority deems critical to proceed in the absence of the strategy, then Natural England advises that any application needs to demonstrate water neutrality.

Parish Comments:

The Parish Council does not object to this application.

Members noted that the location has been carefully chosen to be in a discrete corner of the garden and that the shed has been designed to fit the space available. In order to ensure that the screening provided by the existing hedge is maintained, it is suggested that an appropriate condition might be attached to permission, should it be given.

Representations:

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.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of an outbuilding situated in the front/side garden used as a shed/workshop for storing garden maintenance equipment, garden furniture and domestic tools. The application has been assessed on the basis of the submitted details, together with the planning history of the site and adjoining properties, available images and photographs supplied by the agent. These details were considered sufficient to allow the application to be properly considered and determined.

Character and Appearance

Policy 32 and 33 of the HDPF seeks 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 2 of the BNP states that development proposals should be guided by the Billingshurst Parish Design Statement and, where practicable, should incorporate the following features as appropriate to their scale and nature into the overall design of development:

- i. Soft landscaping and other boundary treatments to provide active frontages

The existing site hosts a detached two storey dwelling situated on a large plot within the built-up area of Billingshurst. The site features a medium sized front drive and large rear and side garden. There is an existing shed situated to the northeast of the dwelling house. The boundary treatment predominantly comprises well-established hedgerows and vegetation in keeping with the wider streetscape at an

approximate height of 2.7m. The existing shed would be demolished, and the proposed outbuilding would be sited further forward to the north corner of the front boundary. The proposed outbuilding would measure approximately 4.9m x 7.4m with a flat roof measuring 2.5m in height.

The proposed outbuilding would be situated in the side garden forward of the principal elevation and would represent a much larger structure on site than the existing shed. The proposed outbuilding would feature a roller shutter garage door on the front with a window and pedestrian door on the side. The materials would comprise of oiled cedar cladding, Brown hardie plank/ concrete fibre cladding to the elevations with a dark grey GRP flat roof situated on a brick base foundation. The proposed outbuilding would be used for the storage of the occupier's garden machinery and tools.

It is recognised that the principle of a building in this general location has been established, albeit that the proposal would sit forward of the principal elevation. It is recognised that the proposed building would incorporate a flat roof which would contrast the built form and character of buildings within the locality. It is however recognised that the boundary treatment comprises of an established hedgerow which screens the side garden from the wider streetscape. Whilst this cannot be relied upon to make the development acceptable, it would reduce the visual prominence of the building and would sufficiently screen the proposed outbuilding from the wider streetscape.

The proposed building would be of a scale, design and form that would be subservient to the main dwelling, and is not considered to result in significant harm to the visual amenity and character of the wider surroundings to justify a reason for refusal. It is noted that the Parish Council have suggested the imposition of a condition to retain the hedging, however this is not considered to be enforceable or necessary to make the development acceptable. On the balance of these considerations, it is therefore considered that the visual impact of the proposal is acceptable and would accord with the above policies.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

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.

It is considered that the siting and layout of the proposed outbuilding and the resulting relationship with adjoining properties would be sufficient to prevent any unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity. No letters of representation were received for the application.

Water Neutrality

There is no clear or compelling evidence to suggest the nature and scale of the proposed development would result in a more intensive occupation of the dwelling necessitating an increased consumption of water that would result in a significant impact on the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. The grant of planning permission would not therefore adversely affect the integrity of these sites or otherwise conflict with policy 31 of the HDPF, NPPF paragraph 180 and the Council's obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered to comply with relevant local and national planning policies and is therefore recommended for approval.

Recommendation: Application Permitted

Conditions:

- 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 Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 4 **Regulatory Condition:** The shed/workshop hereby permitted shall be occupied solely for purposes incidental to the occupation and enjoyment of 8 Kingsfold Close, Billingshurst (as identified on the approved plans), and shall not be used as a separate unit of accommodation, as habitable living accommodation, for any commercial purposes or for any other purpose(s)/use(s).

Reason: The establishment of an additional independent unit of accommodation, additional living accommodation, commercial use or any other use(s) would give rise to an over-intensive use of the site and lead to an unsatisfactory relationship between independent units of living accommodation contrary to Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

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/23/0350

(The approved plans will form Condition 1 on the Decision Notice of all Permitted applications)

Schedule of plans/documents approved:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location plan		TQRQM2305517382 1603	27.02.2023
Layout plan	Existing Layout	A007 REV 2	20.03.2023
Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed Shed Details	A008 REV 2	20.03.2023
Layout plan	Proposed Shed Layout	A009 REV 2	20.03.2023

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial William Omoma Date: 11.05.2023

Authorising Officer sign/initial Tamara Dale Date: 15.05.2023