

Daniel.Holmes

From: Planning
Sent: 10 June 2026 14:24
To: Daniel.Holmes
Subject: FW: : DC/26/0732 – Coombewick House Mobile Home, London Road, Ashington
Attachments: Appendix_1_Before_and_Current_Photos_Access_Field_Track_and_Screening.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi

Please see email below marked for your attention

Thanks
Hils

Hilary Brine

Planning Support Assistant

Telephone: 01403 215124

Email: Hilary.Brine@horsham.gov.uk



Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB

Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton

Horsham District Council will only accept service of documents by email if they are sent to legal@horsham.gov.uk. Any documents sent to individual email addresses will not be accepted under any circumstances.

Communications received after 5pm will be regarded as being served on the next working day.

Please contact us in advance if your email, including any attachments, is going to exceed 30MB.

From: tim walker [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 June 2026 13:34
To: Planning <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: : DC/26/0732 – Coombewick House Mobile Home, London Road, Ashington

Re: DC/26/0732 – Coombewick House Mobile Home, London Road, Ashington
Applicant response to Wiston Parish Council and Coombewick Farm objections

Please forward this to Daniel Holmes, case officer for DC/26/0732, and place this correspondence on the application file as applicant clarification in response to the objections submitted by Wiston Parish Council and on behalf of Coombewick Farm.

Dear Mr Holmes,

I have reviewed both objections. I do not propose to respond to every point line by line, as the principal planning issues are already addressed in the submitted Planning Supporting Statement. However, I would like to clarify the applicant's position on the main issues raised.

First, the application is not an application for a new unrestricted permanent dwelling in the countryside. It is deliberately framed as a limited and proportionate proposal: a further temporary permission for the existing mobile home and associated decking/ramped access, together with permanent retention of the already constructed access track and turning area.

That distinction is important. The mobile home and associated decking/ramped access are sought for a further temporary period. The access track is separate infrastructure which already exists, has been in place for a substantial period, and has become part of the established practical access arrangements for the site.

The objections place considerable weight on the overall passage of time. However, the prolonged planning history is not properly characterised as simple inaction or as an attempt to create a permanent dwelling by default. As explained in the submitted Planning Supporting Statement, the history has involved appeal proceedings, implementation delays, neighbour-triggered investigations, [REDACTED] a revised development strategy, replacement dwelling proposals, extensive professional and technical work, and prolonged water neutrality constraints. The current application should therefore be assessed on its planning merits and by reference to actual demonstrable planning harm, rather than by passage of time alone.

In particular, following the original appeal, the development strategy evolved from implementation of the barn conversion to a replacement-dwelling proposal, which involved substantial professional and technical input. That was a genuine planning strategy, not an absence of intent. When the replacement-dwelling route did not proceed, and following the prolonged period during which water neutrality materially affected

development across the district, the applicant reverted to the Class Q/barn conversion position. The present application therefore arises from a sequence of genuine planning steps and constraints, rather than from any attempt to use the mobile home as a permanent dwelling by default.

The national Planning Practice Guidance point regarding repeated temporary permissions is noted. However, the guidance does not impose an absolute prohibition. The circumstances of this site are unusual, and there is a clear planning rationale for considering the current application on its merits: the established planning history, the existing residential fallback, the previous appeal findings, the absence of material intensification, the established access arrangements, and the absence of demonstrable unacceptable planning harm over the period the development has existed.

The existing Class Q residential fallback remains a material planning consideration. The fact that alternative replacement-dwelling options have also been explored does not negate the existence or relevance of the Class Q position, nor does it convert the present application into an application for a permanent new-build dwelling. The current application seeks only a further temporary period for the mobile home arrangement and permanent retention of the already constructed access infrastructure.

The 2017 appeal decision also remains a material consideration. The Inspector considered the character and appearance effects of the mobile home and access arrangements. The Inspector found that the mobile home sat comfortably on the site as part of a cluster of relatively modest buildings, did not appear out of context, did not draw the eye, and was not visible from North Lane. The Inspector also found that the access track, using sympathetic materials, would not result in significant harm to the overall character and appearance of the countryside location.

It is accepted that the original appeal was determined on the basis of a temporary permission. However, the Inspector's findings on the visual relationship of the mobile home, the access track, the existing buildings, landform and surrounding rural character remain relevant to the present assessment. The current proposal does not introduce a materially greater visual impact than the development previously considered. Instead, the Council now has the benefit of being able to assess the actual effect of the development on the ground after a substantial period in situ.

In that respect, the objections give insufficient weight to the actual present condition of the access field. The access track has now assimilated into the site. It is formed from rural-appropriate/recycled planings and is substantially screened from North Lane by established hedgerow growth and tree planting. The surrounding field has also been materially improved and landscaped since the original works, including clearance of rough ground and removal of substantial buried/excavated material in order to allow hedgerow and tree planting. Some of that excavated stone/rubble material remains neatly stacked to the side of the access.

I attach a short photographic appendix. The earlier photographs were submitted with the original access/driveway application in 2016/2017 and show the access field before driveway surfacing and landscaping had matured. The current photographs show the field and access in June 2026, including the grassed and planted field setting, the rural access surface, established hedgerow/tree planting, screening from North Lane, and the relationship between the field access and the wider access arrangements serving Coombewick House and neighbouring properties.

The photographs demonstrate that the access track has not resulted in the harsh, urbanising or visually intrusive effect suggested by the objections. Rather, the access now sits within a managed and landscaped field setting, is visually contained, and has not caused demonstrable unacceptable harm to countryside character, landscape character or visual amenity over the period it has existed.

It is also relevant that West Sussex County Council Highways has reviewed the current application and raises no objection. WSCC recognises that the proposal concerns retention of an existing mobile home, does not represent material intensification, has no apparent visibility issue at the A24 junction, has suitable off-street parking and turning provision, and gives no transport ground to resist the proposal.

The practical access position should also be considered. If the existing field access were removed, access to Coombewick House would revert to reliance on the shared access route associated with Coombewick Farm. Retention of the existing access track has a practical planning benefit: it reduces reliance on the shared access arrangement, avoids unnecessary vehicle movements in close proximity to the neighbouring residential property, and provides a more self-contained and orderly access arrangement for Coombewick House. In circumstances where WSCC Highways raises no objection, and where the access has assimilated into the landscape, its permanent retention would be a proportionate and practical outcome.

In policy terms, the proposal should be considered as a limited temporary continuation of an existing residential occupation, together with retention of established access infrastructure. It would not create a new unrestricted dwelling, would not materially intensify the existing use, and would not cause unacceptable harm to countryside character, landscape character, visual amenity, highway safety, neighbour amenity, drainage or ecology. On that basis, I do not consider that the proposal gives rise to a conflict with the development-plan objectives relied on in the objections sufficient to justify refusal, including those concerning sustainable development, countryside protection, landscape character, design, amenity or transport.

The suggestion that refusal and enforcement would be the appropriate response is not accepted. There is a live planning application before the Council which seeks to regularise the current position in a controlled and proportionate way. The proposal provides the Council with an opportunity to manage the current position by condition, rather than requiring removal of an established access arrangement which has not caused demonstrable unacceptable harm and which serves a practical planning purpose.

For those reasons, I respectfully ask the Council to determine the application by reference to:

1. the full and unusual planning history of the site;
2. the limited and proportionate scope of the current application;
3. the existing Class Q residential fallback;
4. the previous appeal findings on character and appearance;
5. the absence of material intensification;
6. the current no-objection response from WSCC Highways;
7. the present landscaped and screened condition of the access field; and
8. the practical benefit of retaining a self-contained access arrangement rather than reverting to reliance on the shared access route.

In light of those matters, I do not consider that the Parish Council or neighbour objections justify refusal of the application.

Kind regards,

Appendix 1 – Before and Current Photographs of Access Field, Track and Screening

Photo 1 – Access field before driveway surfacing and landscaping had matured, 2016/2017.

Photo 2 – Entrance/access area before driveway surfacing and landscaping had matured, 2016/2017.

Photo 3 – Field boundary/screening area before later hedgerow and tree planting matured, 2016/2017.

Photo 4 – Current view from North Lane showing mature hedgerow screening of the access field, with Coombewick Farmhouse visible beyond, June 2026.

Photo 5 – Current entrance view showing gate, rural access surface and established hedgerow screening, June 2026.

Photo 6 – Current wider view showing the access route assimilated into a grassed and planted field setting, June 2026.

Photo 7 – Current wider view showing landscaped field, tree planting and rural access surface, June 2026.

Photo 8 – Current internal view showing established access track, planted field and retained excavated stone/rubble to the side following clearance works, June 2026.

