Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/24/1404
Merryhill , Storrington Road, Thakeham, West Sussex, RH20 3ED

DESCRIPTION:

Demolition of existing outbuildings and erection of a barn.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

T/47/97	Single-storey extensions Site: Merryhill Storrington Road Thakeham	Application Permitted on 22.10.1997
T/1/01	One single-storey dwelling (outline) Site: Merryhill Storrington Road Thakeham	Application Refused on 21.02.2001

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The application site is located on the west side of Storrington Road and includes two residential properties: Merryhill and Merryhill Cottage. Both share a large plot originally linked to Merryhill. Merryhill Cottage, the smaller, newer bungalow sits northeast of the main house. Merryhill itself is a large, two-storey detached house with white-painted brick walls and a hipped, tiled roof.

Merryhill has a connected garage on its eastern side with a curved extension. East of the garage are five single-storey timber sheds of various designs and sizes. The site is surrounded by thick vegetation and mature trees, limiting visibility from outside, except slightly in winter.

The site is about 0.2 miles north of Storrington, in an area of large, detached houses on spacious plots. The area has a rural, edge-of-village character, with properties arranged along the road and partly screened by vegetation. Located in designated countryside, the site has no specific landscape or heritage designations nearby.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The proposal seeks planning permission to demolish five outbuildings and replace them with a single barn to support the operation of Merryhill Mushrooms, which grows and sells mushrooms, as well as produces related products like growing kits, seasonings, and dried mushrooms.

The new barn would measure 20m in length, 5m in width, and have a maximum height of 4.9m on the west side. It features a mono-pitched roof that slopes to 5.9m on the east side, following the site's natural slope. The barn's footprint is 87.7m², which is 31.4m² larger than the total area of the buildings being demolished (56.3m²) and includes storage on the first floor.

The exterior will feature vertical timber cladding over a brick plinth, with a corrugated tin roof.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):

Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development
Policy 2 - Strategic Policy: Strategic Development
Policy 7 - Strategic Policy: Economic Growth
Policy 9 - Employment Development
Policy 10 - Rural Economic Development
Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection
Policy 28 - Replacement Dwellings and House Extensions in the Countryside
Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles
Policy 37 - Sustainable Construction
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking

Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19):
Strategic Policy 1: Sustainable Development
Strategic Policy 2: Development Hierarchy
Strategic Policy 8: Sustainable Design and Construction
Strategic Policy 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Strategic Policy 14: Countryside Protection
Strategic Policy 19: Development Quality
Strategic Policy 20: Development Principles
Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport
Policy 25: Parking
Policy 31: Rural Economic Development
Policy 32: Conversion of Agricultural and Rural Buildings to Commercial, Community and Residential Uses

Supplementary Planning Guidance:
Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD (2017)
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2017)

Parish Design Statement:
Thakeham Parish Neighbourhood Plan has been Made.
Thakeham6- Design
Thakeham9 – Development in the Countryside

Planning Advice Notes:
Facilitating Appropriate Development
Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

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 Arboricultural officer: No Objection

7 low merit trees T2, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9 and T16, are indicated for removal to facilitate the development proposals, the removal of these trees will not give rise to any significant landscape harm due to the retention of the mature tree belt to the east, therefore no significant concerns with the loss of these trees.

Some facilitation pruning is proposed for trees T12 T15, and the 12 Leyland cypress trees (G001). These works refer to overhanging branches that fall within the site, as such, there will be no impact on the wider landscape. Subject to the works being completed in accordance with the current industry

standard BS 3998 tree works recommendations 2010; do not have any significant concerns with the proposed surgery.

The development proposal shows a form of development that would require the new building, to be cited within the root protection area RPA of an off-site category B oak T11. The extent of the incursion is listed at 8.7% of the total RPA of T11, this falls below the maximum 20% as advised in BS5837 Trees in relation to design demolition and construction 2012. The area where the incursion will occur, currently consists of hard standing which will need to be removed, however, the proposed method of founding the new building to the ground upon a screw pile foundation system will minimise the impact on any potential tree roots that may be found in this area; this method of securing the building to the ground is satisfactory.

No information has been provided on any underground services for the new building. Such as electrical cables, or freshwater supplies. During the site visit, the applicant advised that they intended to make use of the existing power connections that currently service the existing buildings at the site. This is preferable, as it negates the need for any new excavations to connect services to the new building. However, this aspect of the proposal should be confirmed before a decision is issued.

Do not consider that the development proposed at the site will have a significant impact on the retained trees in the area and is therefore satisfactory from a tree perspective.

HDC Environmental Health: No Objection

Subject to condition in respect of construction hours

WSCC Highways: Comment

The site is located on Storrington Road, a B-classified road subject to a speed restriction of 40 mph in this location.

There are no proposed changes to the existing access or parking arrangements. The LHA does not anticipate that the proposals would give rise to a material intensification of movements to or from the site.

An inspection of data supplied to WSCC by Sussex Police over a period the past five years reveals that have been no recorded injury accidents within the vicinity of the site. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that the existing junction and access to the property is operating unsafely or that the proposal would exacerbate an existing safety concern.

From inspection of the plans, there is sufficient space for parking and to accommodate on-site turning allowing vehicles to exit in a forward gear.

In summary, the LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 115), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Agricultural Consultant: No Objection

RAC would accept that the applicant's proposal for the erection of a larger wooden building to be used as a replacement for five existing small separate wooden sheds, may be reasonably required and necessary for the purposes of the continued development of this well-established mushroom enterprise on the holding.

RAC would accept that the applicant's proposal for the erection of a larger wooden building to be used as a replacement for five existing small separate wooden sheds, may be reasonably required and necessary for the purposes of the continued development of this well-established mushroom enterprise on the holding.

In summary provided the Council is satisfied that the additional floor area as proposed in the new wooden building is genuinely required, RAC would accept that the applicant's proposal is compliant with national and local plan policy.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:

Representations:

None received.

Parish Comments: Comments

TPC recognises that the proposed site is situated on Grade 2 listed agricultural land. Building any development on this site in light of the need for increased food security, especially since the council feel that the site has not been previously marketed correctly as it was artificially annexed with boundary greenery from the main farming field. Any overdevelopment of the land would be in breach of the Thakeham Parish Neighbourhood Plan (TPNP), policies Thakeham6: Design, Thakeham9: Development in the Countryside, Thakeham10: Green Infrastructure and Valued Landscapes and Thakeham14: Soils.

Several mature trees along the southern boundary of the proposed access route, growing out of the southern bank of the ditch proposed for culverting, are protected with TPOs. The applicant does not propose their removal and suggests that they will be protected, but Council submits that these intentions cannot be delivered.

It is firstly unclear how a substantial road-bearing culvert can be inserted in this ditch without causing substantial damage to the roots of these trees. Even if this was achievable, once a culvert is in place it will cut these trees off from a main source of water. Thirdly, these trees grow outwards (northerly) to overhang the proposed access road, and their lower main branches are low enough to be damaged by tall vehicles.

Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate with a sufficient degree of certainty that the proposed development would not result in any adverse impacts upon the habitats or roosting features of bats, contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Paragraphs 179 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority habitats & species).

The initial TPC Highways assessment, and dozens of resident comments, also highlight concerns about the speeds that northbound vehicles on the B2139 are actually travelling at down Jackets Hill, as they approach the proposed access junction. The existing 30mph speed sign has to flash a majority of vehicles, and as Highways note, the applicant has not yet undertaken or submitted a proper vehicle movement/speed survey.

Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate with a sufficient degree of certainty that the proposed development would not result in any adverse impacts upon the habitats or roosting features of bats, contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Paragraphs 179 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority habitats & species).

Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate with a sufficient degree of certainty that the proposed development would not contribute to an existing adverse effect upon the integrity of the internationally designated Arun Valley Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar sites by way of increased water abstraction, contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Paragraphs 179 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority habitats & species).

TPC feels that there is insufficient plans in place for the robust protection of the water quality of the site and that the applicant has not tested the site appropriately.

Serious sustainability deficits include:

- Retail facilities limited to a single small shop/café (with no scope/prospect for viable growth) – other shops and services are all at least 3km away in central Storrington.
- Education facilities (beyond pre-school) are 1.8km distant in Storrington.
- No medical facilities (other than a veterinary surgery) – nearest such facilities are all in Storrington.
- Effectively zero employment – the Monaghans Mushrooms operation is the only substantial employer (mainly of skilled pickers from outside the area) but they have just announced closure.

- Effectively zero public transport (the only return bus service to Storrington is on a Thursday)
- Poor non-vehicle connections – the B2139 is narrow, fast and unsafe and intimidating for cyclists, especially over Jackets Hill adjacent to this site, and there is no safe access to the nearest footpath.

Therefore central Thakeham residents are overwhelmingly reliant on distant facilities/services, mainly in the hub village of Storrington, and are also overwhelmingly reliant on private vehicles to get there. Vehicle journeys from Thakeham residents add to the well-known problem of traffic bottlenecks and air pollution in central Storrington.

There is also no evidence in recent years that contributions from local developments have expanded either educational or healthcare services in Storrington, which remain over-subscribed with no sign of improvement.

The applicant's Transport Strategy acknowledges the current vehicle-reliance of central Thakeham residents, yet suggests that it is unproblematic for a further 28 households to be placed in the same position going forward. It also suggests, quite wrongly, that cycling and walking links are adequate for residents of this site to access facilities in Storrington. Council considers these suggestions to be inaccurate and unacceptable. TPC concludes that the development is in breach of the Thakeham Parish Neighbourhood Plan (TPNP) policies Thakeham1: A Spatial Plan for the Parish. HDC LP Strategic Policies 1, 12, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30 & 34.

TPC would like to draw attention to the comments made by HDC Housing as no mention is made of a potential affordable housing provider, and Housing Officers would urge the applicant to reach an agreement with a provider as soon as possible, to clarify and confirm tenure split, and secure funding arrangements for the affordable homes and ensure the layout and specifications of the affordable units meet the provider's requirements. Housing Officers cannot support this application until confirmation of unit sizes for affordable housing has been confirmed.

***Officer Note**: It would seem that some aspects of the Parish Council's response refer to development not proposed as part of this application.*

Member Comments:

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

Principle of Development:

Policy 26 of the HDPF states that outside built-up area boundaries, the rural character and undeveloped nature of the countryside will be protected against inappropriate development. Any proposal must be essential to its countryside location, and in addition meet one of the following criteria: support the needs of agriculture or forestry; enable the extraction of minerals or the disposal of waste; provide for quiet informal recreational use; or enable the sustainable development of rural areas.

In addition, proposals must be of a scale appropriate to its countryside character and location. Development will be considered acceptable where it does not lead, either individually or cumulatively, to a significant increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside, and protects, and/or conserves, and/or enhances, the key features and characteristics of the landscape character area in which it is located.

Policy 10 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) states that sustainable rural economic development and enterprise within the District will be encouraged in order to generate local employment opportunities and economic, social, and environmental benefits for local communities. In the countryside, development which maintains the quality and character of the area, whilst sustaining its varied and productive social and economic activity will be supported in principle. Any development should be appropriate to the countryside location and must:

1. Contribute to the diverse and sustainable farming enterprises within the District or, in the case of other countryside-based enterprises and activities, contribute to the wider rural economy and/or promote recreation in, and the enjoyment of, the countryside; and either:
    a. Be contained wherever possible within suitably located buildings which are appropriate for conversion or, in the case of an established rural industrial estate, within the existing boundaries of the estate; or
    b. Result in substantial environmental improvement and reduce the impact on the countryside, particularly if there are exceptional cases where new or replacement buildings are involved. New buildings or development in the rural area will be acceptable provided that it supports sustainable economic growth towards balanced living and working communities and criteria a) has been considered first.
2. Demonstrate that car parking requirements can be accommodated satisfactorily within the immediate surrounds of the buildings, or an alternative, logical solution is proposed.

Policy Thakeham1 of the Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan states that development plan policies for development in the countryside apply outside the built-up area boundaries.

The proposal to replace five outbuildings with a single barn for Merryhill Mushrooms is supported by policies in both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF), which prioritize sustainable economic growth in rural areas. Policy 10 (Rural Economic Development) of the HDPF encourages developments that support rural employment opportunities and generate economic and social benefits for local communities, provided that the developments respect the character of the countryside. The Planning Statement outlines that this proposal is crucial for the Merryhill Mushrooms business, which has operated successfully since 2006 but now requires a more modern, consolidated structure to improve operational efficiency and adapt to evolving business demands, including online sales and the production of mushroom-related products.

The applicant has clarified that the expansion of the business activity is for efficiency rather than increased intensity. The nature of operations is detailed, emphasising the shift to internet-based sales of mushroom-related products. Detailed frequency and nature of dispatch and collection have been provided, emphasizing minimal local impact, which is considered satisfactory.

The Agricultural Consultant's assessment supports the proposal, affirming that the existing outbuildings are outdated and insufficient to meet the needs of the growing enterprise. The consultant confirms that a larger, insulated, and more functional building is essential for the continued development of the business. The current five sheds lack necessary insulation and space, limiting the applicant's ability to meet increased demand for mushroom growing kits and other seasonal products. The proposed barn would consolidate production and storage under one roof, facilitating improved workflow and product quality by providing a dry, hygienic, and energy-efficient environment.

The consultant also highlighted that the consolidated structure would allow for better product testing, packaging, and storage capabilities, which are essential for the business's future growth. As a replacement for existing, unsuitable structures, the proposal contributes to the sustainable

development of the rural area while ensuring environmental improvements through the removal of deteriorating sheds.

Whilst it is recognised that Merryhill Mushrooms has been operating from the site for an extended period of time, it is considered that the proposal would provide a floor area and facility that has the potential to intensify the level of activity carried out at the site. The building would support the operation of the business known as Merryhill Mushrooms, however insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the activities associated with the business would not result in a level and intensity of activity that would detract from the countryside location. It is acknowledged that the proposal would contribute to the wider rural economy, where this would provide economic and social benefits, however it has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the resulting activity when considered cumulatively, would not result in a significant increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 10 and 26 of the HDPF.

Design and Appearance:

Policy 25 reinforces the importance of preserving landscape character in rural settings, but the proposed siting of the barn fails to meet this requirement. The placement detracts from the overall harmony of the area and does not sufficiently conserve or enhance the rural setting, contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF, which emphasize high-quality, functional designs that harmonize with the local character. The barn's inappropriate location diminishes the effectiveness of the design elements intended to blend with the surroundings, resulting in a proposal that is not in keeping with the established rural character of the site.

Policy Thakeham6 of the Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan states that the scale, density, massing, height, landscape design, layout and materials of all development proposals, including alterations to existing buildings, should reflect any architectural or historic characteristics of particular merit in, and the scale of the surrounding buildings and in the wider area.

The proposed barn, while incorporating rural design features such as timber cladding and a mono-pitched roof, would be situated in close proximity to the sit boundary and the adjacent residential dwelling. The proposed barn would be of a size, scale, and form that would exceed the height of the adjacent residential dwelling, with the overall massing and bulk considered to result in overdevelopment along the frontage of the site.

The proposal would therefore be of a scale, massing, and bulk that would result in overdevelopment of the site and would fail to relate sympathetically to the built characteristics and proportions of the nearby built form. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 25, 32, and 33 of the HDPF and Policy Thakeham6 of the Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan

Trees and Landscaping:

In compliance with Policy 31, which mandates the protection and enhancement of green infrastructure, the proposal retains the dense vegetation surrounding the site. The Arboricultural Report specifies that the barn will be constructed using ground screws to limit soil disturbance, thereby protecting nearby tree roots and preserving the tree line's ecological and visual function. Additionally, low branches that may impact the new structure will be pruned, as outlined in the report, ensuring minimal interference with the existing natural landscape.

Residential Amenity:

The proposal adheres to Policy 33, which requires that new developments do not harm the amenities of nearby properties.

The siting of the proposed barn close to the existing dwelling, when considered alongside the likely activities, has the potential to result in adverse harm to the amenities of the nearby occupiers. No information has been provided with regard to operating hours, nature of activities, delivery/dispatch etc, and it is not therefore possible to conclude that future occupiers would not be adversely impact.

Whilst it is recognised that the Planning Statement suggests that the business is operated by occupiers of the nearby dwellings, no mechanism has been put forward to secure that this remains the case in the future. The level of activity and nature of the proposal, when coupled with its siting and scale, therefore has the potential to result in adverse harm to neighbouring residential properties through noise, odour, overbearing impact, and loss of natural light. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF.

Highways Impacts:

The proposed barn will not alter existing access or increase vehicle activity, aligning with Policy 40 and Policy 41, which require safe access and sufficient parking provision for new developments. The family-operated business will continue its current use of a single, small delivery van for daily distribution. Existing parking and turning areas within the property meet the operational requirements and ensure that vehicles can exit onto the road in forward gear, thereby preventing any adverse effect on road safety or traffic flow in the area.

Ecology:

The proposal aligns with Policy 31 of the HDPF, which promotes the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity in development projects. According to the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) conducted by Arun Ecology Ltd, the demolition of existing sheds and construction of a new barn will largely remain within the current footprint, minimizing the impact on additional land and surrounding ecological features. The site itself does not contain any protected habitats; however, the PEA has recommended precautionary mitigation measures to ensure compliance with biodiversity legislation and reduce potential impacts on local wildlife during construction.

In line with best practices, these measures have been conditioned as part of the planning approval to ensure that ecological impacts are minimized. Additionally, the PEA suggests installing two solitary bee boxes and two-house sparrow nest boxes, offering ecological enhancements that contribute to biodiversity net gain on-site.

This approach fully complies with Policy 31, ensuring that the development is sensitive to ecological features and incorporates enhancements that align with national and local biodiversity goals.

Water Neutrality:

The application site is located within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone, an area where Natural England has expressed significant concerns regarding groundwater abstraction. This concern extends to several designated sites, including the Amberley Wild Brooks Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the Pulborough Brooks SSSI, which collectively form part of the Arun Valley Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Conservation Area (SAC), and Ramsar Site. Given the existing adverse effects on these European sites, any new development that could potentially increase water abstraction poses a risk of further exacerbating these impacts.

Natural England has issued a Position Statement for developments within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone, indicating that it cannot be concluded with sufficient certainty that new developments would not adversely affect the integrity of the Arun Valley designated sites. Therefore, developments within this zone are required to demonstrate water neutrality, ensuring that any water use is offset to avoid additional pressure on local water resources.

The supporting information outlines that that the operations do not necessitate any water consumption. In addition, there is no proposed increase in staff numbers, and the existing employees reside on-site, utilizing the facilities available in the adjacent dwellings. This operational structure means that there will be no increase in water demand resulting from the proposed application.

Although the application asserts that the current business operations do not require water consumption, the proposed building's potential for unrestricted future use introduces a risk of increased water demand. This risk cannot be mitigated adequately without imposing restrictive conditions that are

not considered reasonable or enforceable. As such, the proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with water neutrality requirements, contrary to Natural England's Position Statement and HDPF Policy 31.

Biodiversity Net Gain:

Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021) mandates that every development must achieve at least a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG (unless the development qualifies as exempt under the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024) and that every planning permission granted for the development of land in England shall be deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that development must not be begun unless a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority and the planning authority has approved the Plan.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must show how the development will achieve the required minimum 10% BNG using the statutory biodiversity metric tool and must demonstrate how the habitats will be managed and maintained for 30 years, starting from the date the development is completed. Off-site gains and significant on-site enhancements will be secured over this period by way of a Legal Agreement.

Conclusions:

The proposed development conflicts with Policies 10, 26, and 31 of the HDPF.

The cumulative issues identified, including the inappropriate siting of the barn, its potential impact on the rural character of the area, and its inability to ensure compliance with water neutrality requirements, render the application unacceptable. While the modernisation of rural businesses would result in economic and social benefits, this is not considered to outweigh the harm identified.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the resulting activity when considered cumulatively, would not result in a significant increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 10 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy Thakeham1 of the Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan.

2. The proposed development would be of a scale, massing, and bulk that would result in overdevelopment of the site and would fail to relate sympathetically to the built characteristics and proportions of the nearby built form. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 25, 32, and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy Thakeham6 of the Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan.

3. The level of activity and nature of the proposal, when coupled with its siting and scale, has the potential to result in adverse harm to neighbouring residential properties through noise, odour, overbearing impact, and loss of natural light. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

4. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate with a sufficient degree of certainty that the proposed development would not contribute to an existing adverse effect upon the integrity of the internationally designated Arun Valley Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar sites by way of increased water abstraction, contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Paragraphs 193 and 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), thus the Local Planning Authority is unable to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority Habitats & Species).

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/24/1404
(The approved plans will form Condition 1 on the Decision Notice of all Permitted applications)

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

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Floor plan	Existing Plans	DE1223 / 02 REV P1	12.09.2024
Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed Floor Layouts	DE1223 / 04 REV P1	26.11.2024
Tree plan		NONE	12.09.2024
Details plan		DE1223.3 REV P1	12.09.2024
Elevation plan	Existing Elevations	DE1223 / 03 REV P1	12.09.2024
Location & Site plan	Site Plan	DE1223 / 01 REV P2	26.11.2024

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Shazia Penne Date: 07.01.2025

Authorising Officer sign/initial Tamara Dale Date: 21.01.2025