Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 21 May 2026

Site visit made on 21 May 2026

by N Praine BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6003043
Land off Jackrells Lane, Southwater, West Sussex RH13 9DH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Holbrook Animal Rescue against the decision of Horsham District Council.
- The application Ref is DC/24/0204.
- The development proposed is described as the relocation of Holbrook Animal Rescue with associated buildings and infrastructure.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the relocation of Holbrook Animal Rescue with associated buildings and infrastructure at Land off Jackrells Lane, Southwater, West Sussex RH13 9DH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/24/0204, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule at Annex C.

Background

2. Holbrook Animal Rescue ("HAR") has been operating for over 30 years as an animal rescue charity. It currently operates from Old Holbrook, Horsham and cares for unwanted animals which are brought in by organisations such as the police and the RSPCA, as well as members of the public.

3. HAR primarily takes in dogs, cats, and ponies but all injured wildlife is considered; this includes animals such as goats, sheep, poultry, reptiles, small birds, and hedgehogs. Its main aims are to rehabilitate and re-home animals, however, health or behavioural issues sometimes mean that animals stay at the rescue centre.

4. The existing site includes a dwelling, dog accommodation, cattery, livestock sheds, aviary, grazing land, and exercise areas. Additionally, dogs are walked around a field a short distance to the north of the existing rescue centre. HAR has two owners, two full-time members of staff, and up to six volunteers working regular shifts per day.

Preliminary Matters

5. I will refer to the "appeal site" as part of this decision, this means the 'red line' site as shown on drawing KCC3091/01A[1]. I will also refer to the surrounding land in the appellant's ownership as the 'blue line site'[2], although as confirmed by the main

[1] Location Plan
[2] Also shown on drawing KCC3091/01A

parties at the hearing, the development under consideration is located within the red line.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon:

- The rural landscape character and appearance of the area; and
- The living conditions of existing residential occupiers with particular reference to noise and disturbance.

Reasons

Character and Appearance - Existing

7. The appeal site is broadly level, laid to grass, and accessed from Jackrells Lane; a narrow, tarmac-surfaced rural lane with grass verges and no pavement. The appeal site's boundary with Jackrells Lane is defined by a mixture of mature trees, hedgerow planting, and fencing. Although there are some gaps along this boundary which allow open views into the site from vantage points along Jackrells Lane.

8. Further land within the appellant's ownership is located to the north, west and south of the appeal site, and this forms the blue line site. While also broadly level and laid to grass it has a parkland character with a considerable scattering of tree cover. Its boundaries are mostly planted with mature hedgerows and trees although some gaps do exist. The appeal site is visible from Public Right of Way ("PROW") 1683 albeit across the intervening blue line site. Glimpsed views are also possible from PROW 1689.

9. The appeal site and the blue line site are set within a wider pattern of open fields. There is significant vegetation at varying heights within the area, and this includes strips of boundary trees, hedgerows, blocks of woodland, and field trees featuring frequently within this wider setting. While woodland and shaws enclose and filter some views beyond Jackrells Lane and PROWs, the area has a pleasant rural landscape character with a sense of tranquillity and openness.

10. The broadly undeveloped nature of the existing appeal site makes a valuable contribution to the local field pattern and rural landscape character. However, there are some occasional features within the existing locality which reduce or detract from the tranquillity and rural landscape character of this part of the countryside. These include: the buildings hardstanding and levels of activity associated with Jackrells Farm and Runnymeade Farm; the residential dwellings in Reeds Lane and their associated domestic layouts and activity; occasional equestrian uses; and the hardstanding, levels of activity, commercial paraphernalia and the warehouse associated with the nearby Southern Cranes business.

11. In addition, the rural landscape character and tranquillity of the area is also affected by: the noise of the nearby A24 dual carriageway, although this is not visible from the appeal site or the immediate surrounding area; aircraft arriving and departing from Gatwick Airport; the access roads, holiday homes and levels of activity at Raylands Country Park; the buildings and occasional flights associated with Jackrells Airfield; and the wooden utility poles which carry power cables along and across both Reeds Lane and Jackrells Lane. A transformer box, utility poles and power cables also extend into parts of the blue line site and the appeal site.

12. Overall, the existing area retains a healthy rural landscape character. While there are features which detract from its overall value and tranquillity, the site in its current form makes a key contribution to the area's intrinsic rural landscape character by reinforcing the undeveloped field pattern of this countryside location and providing relief from the occasional detractors.

Character and Appearance – Proposed

13. It is proposed to relocate the existing rescue centre at Old Holbrook to the appeal site. A cluster of seven single storey buildings would be erected, and these would include: a staff / manager's dwelling with dog accommodation, two outbuildings, a two-bay garage, stables, animal building, and education block / meet and greet building. In addition, a water tank and treatment plant would be installed and a grazing and outdoor exercise area.

14. The dwelling would be finished in brick and the outbuildings would be of timber cladding construction. The grazing and exercise areas would be enclosed by secure fencing, and native planting would supplement gaps within the existing boundary vegetation with further planting of native field trees. A new access is proposed onto Jackrells Lane, and hardstanding would link the access to a parking area. All materials could be agreed via condition.

15. Visits would largely occur between the hours of 10:30 to 16:30 and these would be appointment only. It is likely that the site would also receive deliveries and other servicing during the day and there would be arrivals and departures of staff, and volunteers. In the case of emergencies animals or vets could arrive or leave at any time.

16. While some highway users on Jackrells Lane would be using vehicles and cycles, other users would be walking particularly when using the lane as a connecting link between PROWs. Users of the lane would experience the appeal site at close range with walkers traveling at slower speeds than vehicles and cycles. This creates a high to medium level of sensitivity when the appeal site is viewed from Jackrells Lane.

17. The appeal site, as existing, positively contributes toward the rural character of the area and on this basis the appeal site and its environs are sensitive to incremental change. The proposed buildings would be single storey with a rustic character and appearance. They would also be arranged in an agrarian cluster, and these factors reduce their harm.

18. However, the physical presence of the buildings, hardstanding, fences, parked vehicles, paraphernalia associated with the use, artificial lighting, and more intense levels of activity than existing would nonetheless erode the rural character harmfully changing the receiving landscape and its tranquillity. This would be particularly felt along Jackrells Lane given the important contribution the existing site makes to the undeveloped field pattern of this countryside location.

19. The impact would be less intensely felt from PROW 1683 and 1670 given the separation of the appeal site from these footpaths and the intervening layering of trees and shrub planting, however, there would still be some impact albeit much more limited. When exiting PROW 1689 at Jackrells Lane, the impact would be felt more acutely as one approaches Jackrells Lane given the proximity of the appeal site.

20. I have carefully considered all the landscape evidence submitted both in writing and at the hearing. While the existing landscaping in combination with the proposed landscaping could mitigate some impacts, the proposed development would still be visible through the planted gaps at Year 1 and new landscaping would take a considerable time to mature and establish. During the process from planting, through to growth and containment, there would be visual harm to the rural character and appearance of the area. This period has not been robustly shown to be brief, and it is likely to take many seasons before a satisfactory screen develops.

21. Even after the planting has established, visibility would increase during the winter months albeit through filtered views. However, even if I set that aside, there is no mechanism before me to secure sufficient screening would be retained in perpetuity. I say this as I cannot be certain that established planting would be protected indefinitely from factors such as poor health, leaf wilting, dieback, death, accidental damage, or removal. Even if a mechanism were before me, any replacements would need time to establish and open views of the site would be reintroduced.

22. Taken together, these considerations reduce the mitigative impact landscaping would have upon the adverse visual effects. Furthermore, it has not been robustly shown that screening would adequately reduce the impact of activity and artificial lighting upon the tranquillity, or the intrinsic rural character and appearance of the area.

23. A number of detractors exist within this rural landscape, and these are identified above. However, I have found that the site in its current form makes an important contribution to the character and appearance of this rural area. The landscaping, both existing and proposed, would not be sufficient to satisfactorily mitigate the impact of the proposed development upon the rural landscape character and appearance of the area.

24. The proposed development would therefore unacceptably conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies 10, 25, 26, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015 (“the HDPF”). These, amongst other things, require development to maintain the quality and character of the countryside.

Noise

25. The nearest sensitive residential occupiers are the holiday homes at Raylands Country Park, and the dwellings at Jackrells Farm and Reeds Lane. Dogs would be housed at the appeal site, and the evidence shows that they would live in the same building as the owners.

26. In terms of baseline noise the A24 is a consistent noise source, however, dog barking can be impulsive and therefore unpredictable and intermittent. It can occur without warning and may last for extended periods if not managed properly. The appeal is therefore supported by a Noise Management Plan (“NMP”) authored by Acoustic South East and an Environment and Noise Policy (“ENP”) authored by the appellant.

27. The owners, staff and volunteers are experienced in running animal rescue facilities, particularly for dogs, and both documents indicate that the proposed layout of the appeal site has been designed to ensure dogs would not be agitated

or encouraged to bark. Animals would be checked regularly, and stress or barking would be responded to as part of the care offered at HAR.

28. The NMP sets out the day-to-day dog routine, dogs would spend much of their time within the appeal site either inside the dwelling or within the enclosed outdoor exercise area. The NMP indicates that four to five volunteers would individually walk up to three dogs at a time, twice a day at approximately 11:00 and 15:00, for 90 minutes each. This would occur around the blue line site perimeter. The NMP also points out that not all dogs would be walked daily for instance some may be anxious or not lead trained.

29. I acknowledge that holiday homes have different materials and insulation to that of a traditionally designed dwellinghouse and people on holiday enjoy time outdoors either sitting or enjoying light recreation. Mindful of the holiday homes and other dwellings nearby, the technical author of the NMP measured barking from a large dog and found it to be consistent with other measured literature for dog barking. The NMP states that a large dog barking would be a worst-case scenario, and it demonstrates that sound traveling out of the proposed buildings to the nearest residential occupiers would be unlikely to be audible over the respective separation distances.

30. However, dog barking would also be likely to occur outside. The NMP indicates that dogs would receive a regular daily schedule, as is the case currently at the existing Old Holbrook site. The NMP recommends solid fencing with a density of no less than 10kg/m2 for the outdoor exercise area to minimise barking. This could be controlled via condition to ensure the development would be implemented in accordance with the NMP.

31. The NMP also confirms that routine and consistency keep the dogs engaged and not bored or seeking attention. The appellant states that dogs would be assessed before coming to the rescue centre followed by a trial period. Some dogs may not be accepted if they continually bark and would be taken to a more specialist facility or cared for internally to alleviate this issue.

32. The appellant is experienced in managing and caring for dogs. The existing site at Old Holbrook is sited close to residential dwellings, closer than the appeal site. In its considerable years of operation, the Council confirmed at the Hearing that no noise nuisance cases or complaints exist at the Old Holbrook site, including where the dogs are regularly walked near to residential dwellings. The ENP also highlights that the owners would live on site and it would therefore be in their own interests to control dog barking.

33. The NMP confirms that volunteers all receive training and their knowledge can identify why a dog may be barking and what interventions may be needed to minimise barking. For example: treats, grooming, general handling, and play. I also note from the NMP that the A24 is likely to be a dominant noise source and the Council's own technical consultee from Environmental Health raised no objections to the proposed development subject to condition.

34. While there would be increased comings and goings and other non-barking activity at the site, this would not be to the scale or degree which would be harmful to the living conditions of existing residential occupiers given the separation distances and scale of the proposed development.

35. To conclude on this main issue and based on the evidence before me, the proposed use is likely to generate more noise than the existing scenario. Additionally, noise may sometimes be heard beyond the site. However, the evidence shows that the effect of noise and disturbance associated with the proposed development and its impact upon the living conditions of the existing residential occupiers would be acceptable. As such, it would not conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy 33 of the HDPF which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure a satisfactory level of amenity for occupiers of nearby properties.

Other Matters

Highway Matters

36. Jackrells Lane and the surrounding lanes are narrow, while a snapshot in time, I also found the lanes to be lightly trafficked with occasional vehicles meeting each other and waiting at passing points. The appellant confirms that visits would be by appointment only, although animal emergencies cannot be predicted. The appellant confirms that visits would be between 10 to 15 per day and parking would be provided onsite.

37. I have also considered the evidence before me, including the Local Highway Authority consultation response and the representations from interested parties. In this case, vehicular movements onto the highway network would be modest both during the construction phase and once the proposed development would be in operation. Accordingly, any highway impacts have not been clearly shown to be unacceptable.

Ecology

38. The appeal is supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report, and this report identifies that the site and its environs support protected and priority species. It acknowledges the risks associated with development such as habitat loss, disturbance to protected species, and potential light pollution.

39. The report makes recommendations for avoidance, mitigation, and enhancements and this includes the retention of species-rich hedgerow with further planting and enhancements. Planning conditions could also be imposed to secure a Construction Environmental Management Plan and a Biodiversity Enhancement Plan.

40. I note that the Council's ecology and nature space consultees also raised no objections in this respect. Therefore, the appeal proposal would not unacceptably harm existing biodiversity or any associated habitat.

Water Neutrality

41. The site is within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone ("SNWSZ") and therefore has a functional relationship with the Arun Valley Special Area of Conservation ("SAC"), Special Protection Area ("SPA"), and Ramsar site, which are European sites afforded protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 as amended. The qualifying features of these designated sites include diverse plant, invertebrate and bird assemblage.

42. These sites are likely, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects, to be significantly affected by the proposed development. In addition, the appeal is

not directly connected with or necessary to the management of these designated sites.

43. Natural England have been consulted and they raised no objection. I have also taken into account the scale of the development, the reduced potable water demand, and the incorporation of water efficiency measures. Therefore, and subject to a planning condition to limit water usage, I conclude that the proposed development would not lead to an adverse effect on the integrity of the designated sites.

Heritage Assets

44. Jackrells Farmhouse[3] is a circa eighteenth-century farmhouse principally constructed in red brick. Other features include a brick modillion eaves cornice, Horsham slab roof, and a small central gable at first floor.

45. Sedgwick Park[4] comprises formal gardens and a grade II listed seventeenth-century mansion. The list entry describes the mansion as having the appearance of a late nineteenth-century Arts and Crafts styled building despite its earlier parts of construction. The gardens were designed in 1886 by Harold Peto and Ernest George to complement the remodelling of the house in the Arts and Crafts style.

46. The Council did not raise objection in respect to the impact of the proposed development upon heritage assets. Considering the separation distance and intervening boundary treatments, I agree with the Council that the setting and significance of the heritage assets would not be unacceptably harmed.

Any Other Matters

47. There is limited evidence before me to suggest the privacy of existing neighbouring residential occupiers would be unduly affected. In addition, there is no convincing evidence to suggest that odour produced from the proposed development would unacceptably harm the living conditions of existing residential occupiers.

48. The site lies in Flood Zone One and there are no compelling reasons as to why an acceptable drainage strategy could not be satisfactorily achieved for this site. This matter could therefore be controlled and maintained by an appropriately worded condition. There is also no robust evidence to suggest any ancient woodland would be unacceptably harmed by the proposal.

Other Considerations

Need

49. There is no doubt that HAR provide a valuable service rescuing, rehabilitating, and rehoming unwanted animals. They are a well-established organisation, and the substantial level of community support reflects their reputation and credibility as a rescue centre. Additionally independent scrutiny of their finances show they are financially viable and could support the relocation and construction of a new facility including its future operating costs.

50. HAR's current premises at Old Holbrook sit within part of a wider site north of Horsham which is the subject of considerable strategic level redevelopment. Some

[3] List Entry Number:1193576
[4] List Entry Number:1001279

phases of this development have already commenced, and it is a matter of common ground that there is a need for HAR to relocate as their current site will be redeveloped as part of the strategic level works[5]. The need for HAR to move is therefore becoming increasingly urgent and I therefore place substantial importance on this need.

Site Selection

51. Countryside development should first explore if existing sites are available with suitably located buildings which would be appropriate for conversion. I have considered the evidence put forward for the site selection process and I note the rescue charity is well established relying on local volunteers, fosterers, and relationships built up with other local organisations. The search area needs to reflect this. I also acknowledge that HAR is a charity and the resources to purchase land are limited.

52. Horsham, Dorking, Crawley, and Hampshire Councils were contacted by the appellant. However, there is limited documented evidence before me to corroborate the content of discussions in this respect. I note that other sites were also reviewed but they presented their own challenges, however, no detailed evidence has been provided in this respect, beyond stating that there were access and easement challenges or the sites were prohibitively expensive.

53. The evidence before me does not robustly demonstrate the condition of the market or how each site was investigated and eventually discounted. As such I have some doubts whether other preferable sites were adequately considered and I will return to this in my planning balance below.

Planning Balance

Harms

54. I have found that the proposal would harm the rural character of the area. I note the localised nature of the harm as well as the existing and proposed landscaping. Nonetheless, this harm would be long lasting and considerable. It has also not been robustly shown that other more suitable sites are not available. Taking all these considerations together I ascribe this harm significant negative weight.

Benefits

55. The proposed development would deliver environmental improvements, and these include the planting of native trees, hedgerows, and meadow grassland areas. Species mix could be agreed with the Council, and these benefits would contribute toward green infrastructure. Rainwater harvesting is also proposed. However, considering the emphasis in the National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework") on contributing to and enhancing the natural and local environment, it is not unusual for new development to deliver such environmental improvements. For these reasons, I give moderate positive weight to these benefits.

56. There would also be benefits to the rural economy during the construction phase and once the development is operational and this would include local employment, as well as demand for goods and services. However, given the scale of the development proposed, these benefits would be modest.

[5] Paragraph 7.2 of the Statement of Common Ground and as confirmed at the Hearing.

57. Community and social benefits would include educational visits, where groups and individuals could come to the rescue centre and learn about the work the appellant does and the importance of animal welfare. Volunteers would learn new skills and the evidence before me points strongly to the sense of purpose and the emotional rewards of working with rescue animals. I place moderate positive weight on these benefits.

58. New facilities are essential for the continued operation of this organisation. HAR are well-established and the work they do is important and of great value. There is no evidence before me to suggest the work they currently do could be absorbed within other existing rescue facilities if they were to cease operating. I have found elsewhere in this decision that there is a pressing need for HAR to find new premises given the progressing strategic site and this need carries substantial positive weight.

Final Balance

59. The proposal would result in harm to the rural character of the area, and it has not been robustly shown that other more suitable sites are not available. This harm carries significant negative weight.

60. I have ascribed moderate weight to the environmental benefits and these in isolation would not be sufficient to result in the substantial environmental improvements which are needed to comply with Policy 10 of the HDPF.

61. However, I am required to balance all material considerations as part of this appeal decision. the proposal would deliver environmental, social and economic benefits. Most importantly, there is a pressing need for the relocation, which carries substantial weight. In totality, the harms and conflicts would be fewer and of lesser overall weight than the benefits and I am satisfied that the benefits identified would outweigh the harms. Therefore, and in this instance, there are material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.

Conditions

62. Section 70(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (“the Act”) empowers the decision maker to grant planning permission ‘subject to such conditions as they think fit’. The Framework at paragraph 57 says that conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they would be necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise, and reasonable in all other respects.

63. The Act allows conditions to be applied to any other land under the applicant's control, even if it falls outside the red line, provided it is relevant to the development.

64. The main parties have agreed a list of suggested conditions, and this is set out in the Statement of Common Ground. These were also further discussed at the Hearing, and I have considered them against the tests set out within the Framework. Consequently, where my final suite of conditions materially differs from those suggested to me, reasons are given below. In the interests of clarity, precision and to avoid duplication, I have also made minor changes to some conditions.

65. For the benefit of certainty, I have imposed standard planning permission conditions in respect of the time limitation and the carrying out of the development in accordance with the approved plans. I have applied landscaping and lighting conditions which are in the interests of the rural character of the area as well as biodiversity. A water usage condition is also needed to limit water use to improve sustainability and to avoid an adverse impact on designated sites.

66. Conditions to agree materials and tying the occupation of the dwelling to the proposed use are necessary in respect to the rural character of the area. Environmental management and biodiversity conditions are necessary in the interests of protected and priority species. Concerning the safe and efficient operation of the highway network, parking and visibility conditions are also necessary. To protect the living conditions of existing residential occupiers noise conditions would be required. Firefighting, refuse, recycling, broadband and drainage conditions are also relevant.

67. Following discussions at the Hearing it was agreed that fifteen years would be a suitable period for the Landscaping Management and Maintenance Strategy given the time it would take for planting to establish. I have amended this condition to reflect those discussions.

68. With respect to the playing of music on site, it would not be unreasonable to have low level sources of personal music entertainment, such as a radio playing within the appeal site. I have therefore amended condition eighteen to permit this while preventing any such music being audible at the appeal site boundary.

Conclusion

69. For the above reasons, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant considerations, the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions listed in the attached schedule at Annex C.

N Praine

INSPECTOR

ANNEX A: APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Tony Kernon, Kernon Countryside Consultants, Agent.
Dan Miller, Kernon Countryside Consultants, Agent.
Daniel Haigh, Tyler Grange, Witness.
Cliff Santini-Bradbury, Holbrook Animal Rescue, Appellant.
Laura Santini-Bradbury, Holbrook Animal Rescue, Appellant.

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Daniel Holmes, Senior Planning Officer.
Inês I L C Watson, Specialists Team Leader (and In-House Landscape Architect).
Hannah Darley, Senior Planning Officer.

INTERESTED PARTIES (denoting those persons who took part in the Hearing and whose names were recorded):

Councillor Derek Moore, Parish Councillor and Chairman, Southwater Parish Council.
Rosie Kent, Managing Director, Raylands Country Park.
Ben Gumbrell, Park Manager, Raylands Country Park.
Natalie Williams, Warden, Raylands Country Park.
Lesley Carpenter, Homeowner, Raylands Country Park.
Keith Wyatt, Local Resident.
Siân Peach, Trustee, Holbrook Animal Rescue.
Gaye Cheal, Trustee, Holbrook Animal Rescue.
Veronika Gorsanova, Volunteer, Holbrook Animal Rescue.
Suzanne Davis, Volunteer, Holbrook Animal Rescue.
Paul Curry, Volunteer, Holbrook Animal Rescue.
Jan Stacey, Volunteer, Holbrook Animal Rescue.

Dawn Weedon, Volunteer, Holbrook Animal Rescue.

Rachel Bohlen, Volunteer, Holbrook Animal Rescue.

Melanie Freeborn, Volunteer, Holbrook Animal Rescue.

Fiona Clark, Volunteer, Holbrook Animal Rescue.

ANNEX B: DOCUMENTS ACCEPTED DURING THE HEARING

HD1 – Email exchange dated 11 May 2026 between the Council and appellant's agent regarding planting and landscape conditions.

HD2 – Appellant's site selection information, dated June 2024.

ANNEX C: SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS (20 IN TOTAL)

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

   KCC3091-01A Location Plan,
   KCC3091-02 Block Plan,
   KCC3091-03A Proposed Dwelling Elevations and Floorplan,
   KCC3091-04A Proposed Animal Building Elevations and Floorplan,
   KCC3091-05 Proposed Stable Elevations and Floorplan,
   KCC3091-06A Proposed Education Block Elevations and Floorplan,
   KCC3091-07 Proposed Garage and Outbuilding Elevations and Floorplan,
   KCC3091-08A Landscaping Plan,
   KCC3091-09 Visibility Splay, and
   KCC3091-10 Site Layout.

2. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

3. No development shall commence until a drainage strategy detailing the proposed means of foul and surface water disposal has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme prior to first occupation of the development hereby allowed.

4. Prior to commencement of development a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

   The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following:

   a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
   b) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones". to include Priority habitats as shown in Section 7.1 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (aLyne Ecology, September 2024.

c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements). To include a Precautionary Method Statement for mobile species.
d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers, and warning signs.

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details.

5. No development shall commence until a full and detailed landscaping scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include measures to mitigate the identified adverse landscape and visual effects and address the concerns outlined in the Landscape Consultation Response received 16.04.2025. The submitted details shall include:

   Existing Vegetation and Retention Measures

   - A plan identifying all existing trees, hedgerows, and vegetation to be retained and removed.
   - Protective measures for existing trees and hedgerows, in line with BS5837:2012 - Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition, and Construction.

   Proposed Planting and Green Infrastructure

   - A schedule specifying proposed tree and plant species, planting densities, sizes, heights, and locations.
   - Details of native hedgerow reinstatement and additional boundary planting to mitigate visual impact and enhance the site's integration into the rural landscape.
   - Details of tree pit specifications and soil preparation methods to ensure healthy establishment.

   Hard Landscaping and Site Boundaries

   - Full details of all hard landscaping, including proposed surfacing materials and treatments for access tracks, pathways, and parking areas.
   - Details of boundary treatments, including fencing, gates, and hedgerow planting to screen-built elements from public views, particularly from Jackrells Lane and nearby public rights of way (PRoWs 1683 and 1689).

   Others:

- Hard and soft written specifications (NBS compliant) including ground preparation, cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment.
- Details of existing and proposed levels for all external earthworks associated with the landscape proposals.
- Proposed and existing functional services above and below ground - such as drainage, power, communications cables, and pipelines - including lines, manholes, supports, and other technical features.

Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan

- A 15-year landscape management and maintenance strategy, including description of landscape components, management prescriptions including replacement of failed planting, heights hedgerows are to be maintained at, etc and maintenance schedules including watering, hedgerow trimming schedules, etc.

The approved landscaping scheme shall be implemented in full in the first planting season following completion of development. Any trees, plants, or hedgerows that die, are removed, or become seriously damaged within fifteen years of planting shall be replaced in the next planting season with species of a similar size and type unless the Local Planning Authority gives prior written consent to a variation. The landscape areas shall thereafter be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

6. No development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until a schedule of materials and finishes and colours to be used for external walls, windows and roofs of the approved building(s) has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. All materials used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall conform to those approved.

7. Prior to the commencement of the development, detailed plans showing the proposed location of one fire hydrant or stored water supply (in accordance with the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004, Part 5, Section 38) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with West Sussex County Council's Fire and Rescue Service. These approvals shall not be unreasonably withheld or delayed.

8. Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, a Biodiversity Enhancement Layout, providing the finalised details and locations of the enhancement measures contained within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (aLyne Ecology, September 2024), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

   The enhancement measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation and all features shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

9. The dwelling hereby permitted shall meet the optional requirement of building regulation G2 to limit its water usage to no more than 110 litres per person per

day. The subsequently installed water limiting measures shall thereafter be retained.

10. Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling or unit forming part of the development, the fire hydrant (or stored water supply, as applicable) agreed in condition seven above, shall be installed at the approved location, in accordance with BS 750 standards, or a suitable stored water supply system shall be provided. The fire hydrant or water supply must be connected to an appropriate water supply in terms of both pressure and volume for firefighting purposes. The fire hydrant shall be maintained by the water undertaker if adopted as part of the public mains supply, or by the owner/occupier if retained as a private network. Access for firefighting vehicles and equipment must be provided in accordance with Building Regulations 2004 and BS 5588 Part B 5.

11. No building hereby permitted shall be first occupied (or use commenced) unless and until provision for the storage of refuse and recycling has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval. These facilities shall thereafter be retained for use at all times in accordance with the approved details.

12. Prior to the first occupation of the development, the necessary in-building physical infrastructure and external site-wide infrastructure to enable superfast broadband speeds of 30 megabits per second through full fibre broadband connection shall be provided to each premises.

13. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the Non-Licensed Method of Works for Great Crested Newts, as detailed in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (aLyne Ecology, September 2024). These measures must be adhered to throughout the construction phase to mitigate any potential risk to great crested newts and other wildlife on site.

    The applicant shall ensure that the appointed ecologist monitors the implementation of the Non-Licensed Method of Works during the construction phase. Prior to occupation of the of approved development, a report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority confirming that the methods have been fully complied with. If any deviations from the approved method are identified, the applicant shall notify the Local Planning Authority immediately and seek further guidance.

    All works shall be undertaken during periods that avoid the sensitive periods for great crested newts, as specified in the submitted ecological report, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the appointed ecologist.

14. All avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (aLyne Ecology, September 2024), as already submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the Local Planning Authority prior to determination.

    This will include the appointment of an appropriately competent person e.g. an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) to provide on-site ecological expertise during

construction. The appointed person shall undertake all activities, and works shall be carried out, in accordance with the approved details and in accordance with the approved plans.

15. No part of the development shall be first occupied until the car parking spaces have been constructed in accordance with plans and details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These spaces shall thereafter be retained at all times for their designated purpose.

16. No part of the development shall be first occupied until visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 53 metres to the north and 2.4 metres by 61 metres to the south have been provided at the proposed site vehicular access onto Jackrells Lane in accordance with the approved planning drawings. Once provided the splays shall thereafter be maintained and kept free of all obstructions over a height of 0.6 metre above adjoining carriageway level.

17. No additional external lighting or floodlighting shall be installed other than with the permission of the Local Planning Authority by way of formal application.

18. No music, live or recorded, shall be audible beyond the site boundary (shown edged in red on the approved location plan, received 06.02.2024).

19. The development hereby permitted shall be used strictly in accordance with the Noise Management Plan dated 31.07.2024, Project: J3878; Issue 1. This includes the incorporation of solid fencing to the outdoor exercise area shown on drawing KCC3091/10 to a density of no less than 10kg/m2. The development shall also be used in accordance with and the Holbrook Animal Rescue Environment and Noise Policy submitted with the appeal.

20. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order amending or revoking and/or re-enacting that Order), the Stable Building, 2 Bay Garage, Animal Rescue Building, Education Block (Use Class F1), 3 storage buildings and Dwelling hereby permitted shall only be used for the purposes relating to and specified in the approved plan (KCC3091/02) covering the overall site and for no other purposes without express planning consent from the Local Planning Authority first being obtained. This includes, but is not limited to, any change of use to other uses within the Use Classes Order or any equivalent statutory provision.

End of Schedule