Appeal 6008091

Interested party comments

Appeal type	Planning
Appeal procedure	Written
Appeal site	Land adjoining, Nuthurst Street, Nuthurst, Horsham, RH13 6RG
Agent contact details	[redacted]
Local planning authority	Horsham District Council
Application number	DC/25/1044

Interested party 1

Comments	The concern is the location of one of the houses onto the main road. It is an overused highway, it's become a cut through and it now has a lot of school traffic use. The other concern is the potential for over development within a small parish that has very limited services. The environment we live in is in increasing danger of being destroyed to the detriment of not only the residents but also the wonderful diverse wildlife we have. This development is yet another example of inconsiderate planning and unsuitability. Read more
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 2

Comments	I object to this appeal because the proposed development site is situated outside the designated Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB) and has not been allocated for development within either the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) or the Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan. It does not offer affordable housing. It is out of context of the surrounding houses. Furthermore, the site lies within the setting of Micklepage Farmhouse, a Grade II listed heritage asset, and the proposal would likely have a harmful impact on its historic context, and its use as a retreat venue. I feel this is a speculative application for the purpose of making

	money for the applicants and not for helping those in need of affordable housing. It is high end property for the wealthy. We do not need that type of housing. Read more
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 3

Comments	I write as Principal of JCL Planning on behalf of Clients who are residents of Nuthurst. There is little that needs to be added to the reasons for refusal of Horsham planning application DC/25/1044. When read in conjunction with the Officer's report it correctly reflects the concerns of my Clients as set out in the submission which I made at application stage. whilst the need for new housing is, of course, well known and understood, this should be on suitable well serviced sites in accordance withe Horsham District Planning Framework, the Parish Neighbourhood Plan and the NPPF. The appeal proposals do not accord with their policies. In addition the general rural location of the appeal site, the concerns expressed by Officers about potential impact on protected species, the established landscape character and , importantly, the settings of neighbouring listed buildings, make the case for dismissing the appeal very strong. Read more
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 4

Comments	I do not support this appeal and I continue to be against this proposal. I am a directly affected neighbour and my original comments on the planning application still stand. My additional comments here are responding directly to the points made in the appellant’s Planning Appeal Statement, which draws my concern due to several misleading, and in some cases self-evidently incorrect, statements. Re: Section 2, “The site is effectively enclosed on three sides by existing residential properties and on two further boundaries by public carriageways” This statement is incorrect. It suggests that the field is fully bounded on three sides by residential properties, however on the east side there is only the Grade 2 listed farmhouse and adjoining Grade 2 listed Micklepage barn religious retreat, which is not a residence, and these lie at the south east corner. The southern boundary of the field is by far the shortest of the field’s 4 sides and this is the only boundary that properties closely adjoin. There are no properties along the eastern edge and none to the north. Note the north edge is approx. 4-5 times the length of the southern edge, due to the field’s shape, therefore the appellent’s statement is quite misleading as to the extent of adjoining properties. The statement suggests the southern boundary is a ‘public carriageway’. I believe this single track road is privately owned with

private Rights of Way for access. It is a no-through road and has no name or designation.

“To the south of the lane, the Council has previously granted planning consent for three detached houses.”

The three detached properties referred to are bungalows, not houses. When planning permission was granted these bungalows were explicitly mandated to be a maximum of 1.5 storeys to match the character of existing bungalows along Nuthurst Street. These three properties were entered into the Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan and designed into the area’s allocation of newbuilds. Assurances were given at the time that the decision to allow these bungalows to be built (more than 5 years ago) would not lead to further developments being granted in the vicinity, which would suburbanise the rural character of the area.

“The site is not an isolated rural plot; it sits within a context that is clearly residential in character.”

This part of Nuthurst Street is semi-rural, not residential. Properties here consist mainly of detached bungalows surrounded by agricultural land, meadows, and woodland. From the footpath along the hill to the north of the proposed development site, the Grade 2 listed barn and farmhouse can be seen below in their historical rural setting, and views towards the South Downs in the distance can be enjoyed. The historical buildings can also be seen from Nuthurst Street itself, views which would be blocked by this development. Any development on this site, especially of such large and imposing 2-storey houses with significant height of roofs, would detract from the rural setting and context of the Grade 2 buildings and the rural views beyond. To suggest this field sits within a residential area is not correct.

“The proposed development comprises four detached two-storey houses, each with a double garage.” ..”The houses are … set well back from the highway in generous plots that replicate the character and pattern of existing development along Nuthurst Street.“

The proposed development consists of four 2-storey detached houses with roof structures of substantial height. Such designs are totally out of keeping with nearby properties along this part of Nuthurst Street which are nearly all 1 or 1.5-storey bungalows. This can be easily verified on Google Street View.

Re: Section 4.1, “The Factual Position: This is Not an Isolated Countryside Location”

This is in my view a very isolated countryside location. There is only a single bus per week to connect residents here with Horsham, the nearest town. To reach Horsham by foot is infeasible. Car is the only access and Nuthurst Street is a country lane in poor condition. Therefore Nuthurst perfectly fits the description of an isolated countryside location.

Re: “4.2 Policy 2 — Strategic Development Policy 2 of the HDPF promotes sustainable development…”

This site is not sustainable:
- No shops, services, or healthcare nearby
- Only one bus a week
- Nuthurst Street is narrow, unlit, and potholed, making walking or cycling infeasible
- Mobile phone connectivity is poor to none existent
- The proposed houses are large detached dwellings with double detached garages and hardstanding all of which will encourage more car dependency on Nuthurst Street which is a narrow unlit country road in generally bad condition with many potholes
- This style of large detached housing is not affordable
- Building these houses will destroy many metres of mature hedgerows in order to connect driveways with the nearby roads
- One of the proposed properties fronts directly onto Nuthurst Street on a blind bend in both directions and would be dangerous
- Broadband at this site is unreliable and barely reaches 25 Mbps
- This field is not in the neighbourhood plan
- Horsham area already has ample sustainable housing projects underway (which include affordable housing), e.g. Southwater to the west

Re: “4.3 Policy 3 — Development Hierarchy” … “The proposed development is of an appropriate nature and scale for such a settlement, consistent with the policy aim of maintaining settlement characteristics...“

As already discussed, the proposed development would not be in keeping with the style of surrounding properties. The proposed houses are substantial in height and scale and would appear imposing over the listed buildings and surrounding bungalows to the south and along Nuthurst Street. Hence the design is not appropriate in nature or scale nor would maintain settlement characteristics.

Re: “4.4 Policy 4 — Settlement Expansion” … “The Appellants contend that the proposal satisfies criteria 2 (appropriate scale), 3 (meeting local housing need), 4 (no prejudice to long-term strategy), and 5 (contained within defensible boundaries with landscape character maintained)”

As already discussed, the designs are not appropriate in scale; do not meet local housing need as they are not affordable; and would cause harm to landscape character.

Re: 4.11 Policy 31 Compliance “The Appellants' proposals retain the existing mature boundary hedges and trees …”
and
4.12 “The Landscape Assessment is Incorrect: The Council's landscape consultee concluded … 'the loss of existing planting and hedgerows.”... “The Appellants' scheme expressly retains all existing boundary hedgerows and tree screening. No significant hedgerow or tree is proposed to be removed.”

This statement is impossible. Mature trees and hedgerows line the full southern and western boundaries of the field and four new houses cannot be connected to these roads without substantial portions being removed. A comfortable single width entrance per house being 3 to 4m, means at least 12-16 metres of mature hedgerows will need to be removed when constructing the

driveways.

Re: 4.13 “The Site Context Does Not Support a Significant Harm Finding” - “The landscape context is semi-rural and domesticated, not open countryside of high scenic quality. “

As previously discussed, views of the Grade 2 buildings in their rural setting, and views stretching south to the South Downs, are very much high scenic quality, and this development would cause considerable harm.

Re: Section 5, “5. Planning Balance and the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development”
• The design is of traditional quality, respecting the character of the locality.
• All existing boundary trees and hedgerows are retained.”

As already discussed, these two points are not correct.

This concludes my comments on the appellent’s Planning Appeal Statement. Many thanks for your time.

[redacted]
Mickle Cottage, Nuthurst Street, Nuthurst RH13 6RG Read more

Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 5

Comments	I object to this appeal as a local resident and strongly support Horsham District Council’s decision to refuse planning permission. My objections to the original planning application DC/25/1044 still stand and I would like the following comments to be taken into account. The proposal is fundamentally contrary to the Nuthurst neighbourhood development plan. The site lies outside any defined built-up area and is not allocated for housing. The Council correctly identified this as a countryside location where development is restricted. The Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan provides a clear spatial strategy. It directs development to a specific group of allocated sites, delivering around 50 homes across the parish. The appeal site is not included in that list. This is not an omission but a deliberate outcome of the plan-making process. Allowing development here would undermine the agreed, plan-led approach and weaken the role of the Neighbourhood Plan. The appellant places weight on pre-application advice. However, such advice is informal and cannot override adopted planning policy. The final decision must be based on the development plan and full consultation responses.

In this case, the Council clearly concluded that the proposal is not acceptable in principle due to its countryside location. This is a fundamental policy issue that could not be resolved through further dialogue or minor amendments.

The appellant refers to nearby housing and permissions across the road. This comparison is misleading as those 3 detached dwellings were brought forward through the Neighbourhood Plan process. By contrast, this proposal is:
• unallocated
• outside settlement boundaries
• not supported by the spatial strategy

Allowing it would undermine the carefully planned distribution of growth across the parish. Protecting the rural character of Nuthurst is a clear objective of local policy.

The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to preserve the largely rural nature of the parish, including its fields, hedgerows and landscape setting. The Parish Design Statement also stresses the need to avoid development that creates a suburbanising effect and erodes this character.

Even though there are houses nearby, this site forms part of the transition between settlement and open countryside. The Council's finding of a suburbanising effect and landscape harm is consistent with how the area is experienced locally. Once these edge-of-settlement spaces are developed, the character of the area is permanently changed.

The Council found that insufficient information had been provided to demonstrate that the development would not harm protected species or biodiversity, or deliver biodiversity net gain. This is a fundamental requirement of planning policy. The absence of adequate information at the application stage is a valid and significant reason for refusal.

The appellant raises concerns about consultation and timing. While this is noted, it does not alter the planning merits of the case. The key reason for refusal is the principle of development in the countryside, which is a policy constraint that cannot be overcome through further consultation.

Similarly, the requirement for sufficient ecological information lies with the applicant at the time of submission. Even if additional time had been given, it would not overcome the fundamental conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion
This proposal:
• conflicts with the clear spatial strategy of the development plan
• undermines the Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan and its allocated sites
• would harm the rural character and landscape of the area
The appellant's arguments regarding pre-application advice, nearby development and procedural matters do not outweigh these fundamental issues.
For these reasons, I respectfully request that the appeal is dismissed. Read more

Supporting documents	No documents