



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0450

Carylls , Faygate Lane, Faygate, West Sussex, RH12 4SN

DESCRIPTION:

Demolition of 'Building B' and erection of replacement accommodation comprising 2no. self-contained dwellings. Demolition of 'Building C' to form a self-contained caretakers lodge.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/21/0335	Erection of sign at entrance to site.	Application Permitted on 03.09.2021
DC/21/2855	Outline Application for an extension to the existing business to form an additional 13 one and two bedroom units with all matters reserved.	Application Refused on 12.08.2022
DC/25/1197	Increasing total units from 19 to 22. Alterations to internal layout of existing property to form new self contained C3 units. Two new units proposed through internal alterations using unused areas and storage rooms. One existing unit modified to create two separate units.	Application Permitted on 27.11.2025

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The application site comprises Carylls Country House, a substantial Victorian country house located to the south of Faygate Lane within a spacious landscaped plot extending to approximately 2 hectares. The site lies outside any defined Built-Up Area Boundary within the open countryside and is accessed via an existing private driveway from Faygate Lane.

The principal building is a non-designated heritage asset and has been converted into multiple self-contained residential units. The site contains a number of ancillary outbuildings of varying age and quality together with areas of hardstanding, parking, mature landscaping and protected trees. The grounds are characterised by mature specimen trees, established planting and open lawns which contribute positively to the setting and significance of the non-designated heritage asset. The site is enclosed by mature vegetation and boundary planting which provides a strong landscaped setting.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of existing Buildings B and C and their replacement with new residential accommodation. The proposal comprises the erection of a replacement Building B to provide two self-contained residential dwellings and the replacement of Building C with a self-contained caretaker's lodge.

The proposal would replace two existing ancillary buildings within the grounds of Carylls Country House with new buildings providing a total of three residential units. Associated external works include alterations to the surrounding hardstanding, access arrangements and landscaping.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):

Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development
Policy 3 - Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy
Policy 4 - Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion
Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection
Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles
Policy 34 - Cultural and Heritage Assets
Policy 35 - Strategic Policy: Climate Change
Policy 36 - Strategic Policy: Appropriate Energy Use
Policy 37 - Sustainable Construction
Policy 38 - Strategic Policy: Flooding
Policy 39 - Strategic Policy: Infrastructure Provision
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 – Parking

Rusper Neighbourhood Plan

RUS1: Spatial Plan
RUS3: Design
RUS5: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
RUS10: Dark Skies
RUA11: Promoting Sustainable Transport

Paragraph 33 of the NPPF requires that all development plans complete their reviews no later than 5 years from their adoption. Horsham District Council is currently in the process of reviewing its development plan however at this stage the emerging policies carry only limited weight in decision making. As the HDPF is now over 5 years old, the most important policies for the determination of this application must be considered as to whether they are 'out of date' (NPPF paragraph 11d). This includes, for applications involving the provision of housing, whether the Council can demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (NPPF footnote 8).

The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, with the supply currently calculated as being 1 year. The presumption in favour of development within Paragraph 11d) of the NPPF therefore applies in the consideration of all applications for housing development within the District (unless footnote 7 or Paragraph 14 applies to relevant applications), with Policies 2, 4, 15 and 26 now carrying only moderate weight in decision making.

All other policies within the HDPF as itemised above have been assessed against the NPPF and are considered to be consistent such that they continue to attract significant weight in decision making.

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: Comment - The Tree Officer raises concerns regarding the proposed replacement dwelling as it would encroach into the Root Protection Area (RPA) of a mature cedar tree (T1) protected by Tree Preservation Order TPO/1530. While an existing structure currently occupies the proposed building location, site inspection suggests it is supported by a shallow slab foundation laid largely on crushed stone or rubble, allowing the cedar's roots to establish beneath it with minimal disturbance. The officer considers that excavation for new conventional foundations would likely result in significant root damage, potentially affecting the tree's long-term health and structural stability. It is therefore recommended that the replacement building be relocated approximately 2–3 metres further south so that it sits outside the cedar's RPA, thereby reducing the risk of harm to the protected tree and achieving a more sustainable relationship between the development and retained vegetation. No objections are raised to the removal of the Leyland Cypress groups (G2 and G3), as they are not considered to have significant arboricultural value. However, replacement planting is recommended to maintain screening, canopy cover and site amenity.

HDC Conservation Officer: Comment - The Conservation Officer raises concerns about the design of the proposed replacement Building B, considering it to be an uninspiring chalet bungalow that would harm the setting of the non-designated heritage asset. In contrast, Building C is considered to reflect a more traditional service building and is viewed more favourably. The officer advises that a more sympathetic design for Building B should be explored and notes that the identified harm should be assessed against any public benefits in accordance with paragraph 216 of the NPPF. Overall, the comments indicate concerns with the design quality and heritage impact of Building B.

WSCC Highways: No Objection

Southern Water: Standard Advice

Representations:
None Received

Parish Comments:
No Objection

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:

Policies 2, 3 and 4 of the HDPF establish the spatial strategy for the District by directing new development towards settlements with defined Built-Up Area Boundaries. Development outside these boundaries is strictly controlled and will only be permitted where it is essential to its countryside location or otherwise complies with the criteria contained within Policy 26. Policy RUS1 of the Ruspur Neighbourhood Plan similarly seeks to resist new residential development outside the defined built-up area boundary.

The application site lies within the open countryside outside of any defined Built-Up Area Boundary and the provision of additional housing in such a location without any identified essential need would directly conflict with the above policies. While the proposal relates to previously developed land (which forms part of the wider incidental curtilage of Carylls) the proposal would be located outside of a defined settlement, where the proposal would not be compliant with paragraph 125 of the NPPF, which states that planning decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlement for homes, proposals for which should be approved unless substantial harm would be caused.

The proposed development would not accord with the spatial strategy as set out in Policies 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the HDPF and would therefore be unacceptable in principle. Whether there are other material considerations that would outweigh the conflict as identified, will be discussed in the Planning Balance and Conclusions section below.

Design, Appearance and Heritage:

Policies 25 and 26 of the HDPF seek to safeguard the District's natural environment and landscape character by ensuring development protects, conserves and where possible enhances the character of the landscape and countryside.

Policy 32 identifies good design as a fundamental component of sustainable development, whilst Policy 33 requires development to integrate successfully with its surroundings, respond positively to local character, utilise appropriate materials and avoid harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Policy 34 requires development to preserve or enhance the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings.

Policy RUS3 of the Rusper Neighbourhood Plan requires development to reflect the character, scale and appearance of surrounding buildings and demonstrate how the significance of the rural setting will be sustained and enhanced. Policy RUS10 seeks to minimise light pollution through appropriate lighting design.

Carylls Country House is recognised as a non-designated heritage asset whose significance derives not only from the principal Victorian building but also from its spacious landscaped grounds, hierarchy of ancillary buildings and verdant rural setting. Proposed Building 'C' is considered to reflect the character of a traditional ancillary service building and its presence would not be expected in the grounds of a building such as this. In contrast, proposed Building 'B' would appear uninspiring and would fail to respond positively to the historic context of the site. Its domestic proportions, detailing and appearance would appear incongruous within the grounds of Carylls Country House and would diminish the architectural hierarchy between the principal dwelling and its ancillary structures.

Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with Policies 25, 32, 33 and 34 of the HDPF, Policies RUS3 and RUS10 of the Rusper Neighbourhood Plan, and paragraph 216 of the NPPF. As the proposal would consequently result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, in accordance with paragraph 216 of the NPPF, this harm would need to be balanced against any public benefits arising from the proposal. This is considered in the Conclusion and Planning Balance section of this report.

Trees and Landscaping:

Policy 25 of the HDPF seeks to protect the natural environment by ensuring development conserves landscape character and important landscape features. Policy 31 seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure, whilst Policy 33 requires development to be designed to avoid unacceptable impacts on existing landscape features, including mature trees. These policies are supported by BS5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations, which seeks to safeguard retained trees throughout the development process.

The application site contains a number of mature trees which make a significant contribution to the landscape character of the site and the setting of Carylls Country House. In particular, a mature cedar

tree (T1), protected by Tree Preservation Order TPO/1530, occupies a prominent position adjacent to the proposed replacement Building B.

The Council's Arboricultural Officer has raised significant concerns regarding the proposal. Whilst an existing building currently occupies a similar position, site inspection indicates that the existing structure is supported by a shallow slab foundation constructed largely above ground level on crushed stone or rubble. This has allowed the protected cedar's root system to establish beneath the building with minimal disturbance. In contrast, the proposed replacement building would require new foundations within the Root Protection Area of the protected tree, resulting in excavation that is likely to sever important roots and adversely affect the tree's long-term health, stability and longevity. The Arboricultural Officer advises that, in accordance with BS5837:2012, development within the RPA should normally be avoided and recommends relocating the replacement building approximately 2–3 metres further south to avoid conflict with the protected tree.

The submitted plans do not demonstrate that the proposed development can be constructed without causing unacceptable harm to the protected cedar tree, with insufficient technical justification provided to demonstrate that the encroachment into the RPA can be satisfactorily mitigated. The proposal therefore gives rise to an unacceptable risk of damage to a protected tree that makes an important contribution to the character of the site and the wider landscape.

Whilst no objection is raised to the removal of the Leyland Cypress groups, subject to replacement planting, this does not overcome the significant concerns relating to the protected cedar tree. The proposed development would therefore fail to adequately protect important landscape features and would conflict with Policies 25, 31 and 33 of the HDPF and the guidance contained within BS5837:2012. As such, the proposal is unacceptable in arboricultural and landscape terms.

Residential Amenity:

Policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF require that development provides a safe, attractive and functional environment and avoids unacceptable harm to the amenity of existing and future occupiers. The NPPF similarly seeks a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

The application site is located within the grounds of Carylls Country House and is surrounded by existing residential accommodation associated with the wider site. The nearest neighbouring properties outside the site are separated by substantial distances, mature landscaping and boundary vegetation.

Having regard to the siting, scale and orientation of the proposed replacement buildings, it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable overlooking, overshadowing, loss of privacy or an overbearing impact upon neighbouring occupiers. Furthermore, the proposal would utilise the existing access arrangements and would not generate a level of activity that would result in materially greater noise or disturbance than the existing lawful residential use of the site.

The proposed dwellings would provide satisfactory internal accommodation and would benefit from adequate private amenity space and access to parking within the site. Subject to compliance with the approved plans, the proposal is therefore considered to provide an acceptable standard of residential amenity for both existing and future occupiers. As such the proposal accords with Policy 33 of the HDPF and paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF.

Highways Impacts:

HDPF Policies 40 and 41 require development to provide safe and suitable access for all users and to ensure that the level of parking and traffic generation does not result in an unacceptable impact on the highway network. Rusper Neighbourhood Plan Policy RUA11 seeks to promote sustainable transport and minimise adverse transport impacts.

The application site comprises a large country house with associated outbuildings, a private driveway and an extensive parking area. The proposed development would generate a requirement for approximately four additional parking spaces. The existing driveway and parking area are of a substantial size and are considered capable of accommodating the additional parking demand.

associated with the development. No alterations are proposed to the existing parking layout, access arrangements or internal circulation within the site.

Access to the site would continue to be taken from the existing access onto Faygate Lane. WSCC, as Highway Authority, has advised that the existing access arrangement is acceptable to serve the additional three dwellings and raises no objection to the proposal.

Given the modest scale of the proposal, the retention of the existing access arrangements, and the availability of sufficient on-site parking provision, it is not considered that the development would result in any material harm to highway safety, parking provision or the operation of the local highway network. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with HDPF Policies 40 and 41 and Ruspur Neighbourhood Plan Policy RUA11.

Water Neutrality:

A 2021 Position Statement from Natural England identified that it could not be concluded with the required degree of certainty that new development in the Sussex North Water Supply Zone would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites. As a consequence, and to comply with the legal duties set out in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (known as the Habitat Regulations), all new development since has been required to demonstrate water neutrality.

On 31st October 2025 Natural England formally withdrew the 2021 Position Statement, citing a package of measures that they were satisfied would safeguard the Arun Valley sites. Principal amongst these measures is a reduction in the Southern Water abstraction licence 'by March 2026'. However, given the licence change has not yet taken place Horsham District Council, as competent authority under the Habitats Regulations, cannot yet be certain that new development will not result in adverse impacts on the Arun Valley sites.

To ensure development can come forward as water neutral in the meantime, the Council has agreed with Natural England to use the significant water savings made by Southern Water in 2024/25 through their programme of leakage reduction (amongst other measures). This has generated some 3,240,000 litres per day of water savings that can now be attributed to new development without increasing water abstraction in the Arun Valley beyond baseline. These savings were previously to be used to launch the Sussex North Water Certification Scheme (SNWCS), however following the withdrawal statement SNWCS will no longer be launching. Natural England standing advice dated 10 November 2025 raises no objection to using these savings to enable development to come forward. The standing advice clarifies that it functions as Natural England's formal response pursuant to Regulation 63(3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 to all relevant planning applications which seek to achieve water neutrality using the above Southern Water savings.

Officers have undertaken an Appropriate Assessment which demonstrates that the anticipated increase in mains water consumption from this development, alongside all other development granted since the 31st October 2025, will not exceed 3,240,000 litres per day.

Accordingly, Officers consider that the proposed development will not have an Adverse Effect on the Integrity of the Arun Valley Site, either alone or in combination with other plan and projects, thereby complying with Regulations 63 and 70 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, HDPF Policy 31, and paragraph 193 of the NPPF.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG):

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 (on unregistered sites) and significant on-site enhancements will be secured over this period by way of a Legal Agreement.

The application is accompanied by a Biodiversity Net Gain Statement, a Statutory Small Sites Metric and a Biodiversity Gain Plan. The submitted information confirms that the proposal has been designed to utilise existing developed areas and hardstanding where possible in order to minimise impacts on existing habitats. The supporting documents further advise that no habitats above moderate condition would be adversely affected by the proposal and that habitat enhancements would be delivered within the application site.

The submitted Statutory Small Sites Metric demonstrates a baseline value of 0.0695 area habitat units and a post-development value of 0.0803 area habitat units, representing a net gain of 0.0109 habitat units, equivalent to 15.63% Biodiversity Net Gain. The metric confirms that the statutory trading rules are satisfied and that the proposal exceeds the mandatory 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirement. No hedgerow or watercourse units are affected by the development.

Conclusion and Planning Balance:

The site is not allocated for development within the HDPF or a Made neighbourhood plan, owing to the site's location outside of the built-up area boundary the principle of the proposed development would be contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the HDPF. Furthermore, proposed Building 'B' would represent an unsynamtehtic form of development, failing to preserve or enhance the setting and significance of the non-designated heritage asset and encoracing into the roof protection area of a protected cedar tree.

The Council published its Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) in December 2025. Chapter 3 of the AMR revealed that the Council currently benefits from a deliverable supply of housing sites of 1.7-years. Therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development at paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged in this instance, meaning the 'tilted balance' applies to the assessment.

NPPF paragraph 11(d)(ii) states that where the policies most important for determining the application are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

The Shaping Development in Horsham District Planning Advice Note (SDPAN) was endorsed at Cabinet on 17 September 2025. The SDPAN recognises at 5.12 that the Council is likely to receive applications outside of defined BUABs and on unallocated sites (such as this proposal) as it is unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. Given this position and the principles behind HDPF Policy 4, it will consider positively applications that meet all of the criteria:

- The site adjoins the existing settlement edge as defined by the BUAB;
- The level of expansion is appropriate to the scale and function of the settlement the proposal relates to;
- The proposal demonstrates that it meets local housing needs or will assist the retention and enhancement of community facilities and services;
- The impact of the development individually or cumulatively does not prejudice comprehensive long-term development; and
- The development is contained within an existing defensible boundary and the landscape character features are maintained and enhanced.

The site is located in a countryside location, though not isolated in the truest sense, it is a relatively remote location that does not adjoin the settlement edge. Therefore, the proposal fails on the first criterion and therefore the development does not benefit from the provisions of the SDPAN.

The proposal would provide three additional residential units, and, in the context of the Council's current housing land supply position, the delivery of additional housing attracts significant weight. It is also acknowledged that the development would generate limited economic benefits during both the construction phase and through future occupation. It is also recognised that the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers and would not result in unacceptable harm to neighbouring residential amenity or highway safety. These are, however, neutral matters which demonstrate compliance with relevant planning policy rather than benefits weighing positively in favour of the development.

Balanced against these benefits is the significant harm identified within this report. The proposed Building B would fail to respond sympathetically to the character and significance of Caryl's Country House, resulting in less than substantial harm to the setting of a non-designated heritage. In addition, the proposal would require development within the RPA of a protected cedar tree subject to Tree Preservation Order TPO/1530, with insufficient evidence to demonstrate that unacceptable harm to the tree can be avoided. These conflicts attract significant weight.

Whilst the principle of redeveloping previously developed parts of the site is acknowledged, the proposal fails to preserve the significance of the non-designated heritage asset and fails to adequately safeguard an important protected landscape feature. These harms are fundamental design constraints rather than matters capable of being addressed by planning condition.

The application site is located on Faygate Lane, which is not lit and does not benefit from a dedicated pedestrian footway. While there are public rights of way in the wider vicinity these are not considered to be viable or attractive routes, as they remain unlit and unmade. In this context, it is likely that future occupiers would be reliant on private vehicles to access everyday services, amenities and facilities. Future occupants would be dependent upon accessing Crawley and Horsham for day to day services, and while Faygate would provide some transport links this is approximately 1km to the south of the site. The future occupiers would therefore be reliant upon the amenities, services and facilities of other settlements, which has the potential to further increase reliance on private vehicles. While acknowledged that there are existing dwellings on the site which would be similarly reliant on private vehicles, this failing would not justify further housing with similar limitations.

Having regard to the development plan as a whole and the material considerations in this case, it is considered that the adverse impacts arising from the proposal, namely the unsustainable rural location, the unacceptable harm to the setting of the non-designated heritage asset and the likely harm to the protected cedar tree, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of providing three additional dwellings when assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be refused.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. The proposed development would be sited within an inappropriate location in the countryside, outside of a defined built-up area boundary, and on a site not allocated for housing development within the Horsham District Planning Framework, or a made Neighbourhood Plan. Furthermore, the proposed development is not essential to its countryside location. Notwithstanding the absence of a five-year land housing supply, and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) at paragraph 11(d), it is not considered that there are any material considerations in this instance which would outweigh harm arising from conflict with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

2. The proposed replacement Building B, by reason of its design, scale and appearance, would fail to preserve or enhance the setting and significance of the non-designated heritage asset. The proposal would introduce an unsympathetic form of development that detracts from the historic character of the site, and insufficient public benefits have been demonstrated to outweigh this identified harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 32, 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The proposed replacement Building B would be sited within the Root Protection Area of a Cedar tree (T1) which is subject to Tree Preservation Order TPO/1530. The proposal has failed to demonstrate that the required excavation and construction works can be undertaken without causing significant harm to this protected tree, including root severance likely to adversely affect its long-term health and structural stability. In the absence of adequate justification or an alternative design that avoids the Root Protection Area, the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to an important landscape feature and is therefore contrary to Policies 25, 31 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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/26/0450

(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
Location plan	Proposed	CCH-BC-PL-600 REV P02	13.05.2026
Supporting Statement	BNG Small Sites Metric Calculation Tool	NONE	07.04.2026
Supporting Statement	Pre and Post Development plan and maps	NONE	07.04.2026
Supporting Statement	BNG Plan	NONE	07.04.2026
Location plan	Existing	CCH-BC-PL-500 P02	13.05.2026
Site plan	EXISTING BUILDING B AND C	CCH-BC-PL-501 P00	11.03.2026
Floor plan	EXISTING GROUND FLOOR PLAN BUILDING B AND C	CCH-BC-PL-502 P00	11.03.2026
Elevation plan	EXISTING ELEVATIONS AND GROUND FLOOR PLANS BUILDING B	CCH-BC-PL-503 P00	11.03.2026
Elevation plan	EXISTING GROUND FLOOR AND EAST ELEVATION BUILDING B	CCH-BC-PL-504 P00	11.03.2026
Elevation plan	EXISTING GROUND FLOOR AND ELEVATIONS BUILDING C	CCH-BC-PL-505 P00	11.03.2026
Roof plan	EXISTING ROOF PLAN AND	CCH-BC-PL-506	11.03.2026

	EAST ELEVATION BUILDING C	P00	
Site plan	PROPOSED SITE PLAN BUILDING B AND C	CCH-BC-PL-601 P00	11.03.2026
Elevation plan	PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR AND SOUTH AND NORTH ELEVATIONS BUILDING B	CCH-BC-PL-603 P00	11.03.2026
Elevation plan	EAST AND WEST ELEVATIONS BUILDING B	CCH-BC-PL-604 P00	11.03.2026
Roof plan	PROPOSED ROOF AND SITE PLANS BUILDING B	CCH-BC-PL-605 P00	11.03.2026
Floor plan	PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR AND MEZZANINE FLOOR PLANS BUILDING C	CCH-BC-PL-703 P00	11.03.2026
Roof plan	PROPOSED ROOF PLAN AND NORTH AND SOUTH ELEVATIONS BUILDING C	CCH-BC-PL-704 P00	11.03.2026
Elevation plan	PROPOSED EAST, WEST AND SECTION	CCH-BC-PL-705 P00	11.03.2026
Supporting Statement	ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT	GAC0035 - CARYLLS COUNTRY HOUSE	11.03.2026
Supporting Statement	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS	NONE	11.03.2026
Supporting Statement	FIRE	NONE	11.03.2026
Supporting Statement	FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT	NONE	11.03.2026
Supporting Statement	HERITAGE	NONE	11.03.2026
Supporting Docs	PARKING PROVISION	NONE	11.03.2026
Photos	EXISTING SITE PHOTOGRAPHS	NONE	11.03.2026
Supporting Statement	SUSTAINABILTY AND WASTE	NONE	11.03.2026
Supporting Statement	BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN	NONE	13.05.2026
Design & Access Statement		NONE	11.03.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Shazia Penne Date: 06.07.2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial Guy Everest Date: 08.07.2026