Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DISC/26/0318
Land North of Glebe Farm and Kings Barn Lane Kings Barn Lane Steyning West Sussex

DESCRIPTION:
Application for Approval of Details Reserved by Conditions 17 (advance planting) and 20 (Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy) to approved application DC/26/0325 (Removal of conditions 19 (water efficiency measures) and 21 (water neutrality strategy) and variation of trigger of Condition 14 (traffic noise mitigation) of planning approval DC/21/2233 (Outline application for up to 265 dwellings, demolition of No. 37 Kings Barn Lane to provide new pedestrian/cycle/emergency link, provision of vehicular access from the A283 Steyning by-pass. All matters reserved except for vehicular access from A283).

DETAILED DESCRIPTION:
Planning Application DC/21/2233 was permitted in 2024. This permitted up to 265 dwellings, demolition of No. 37 Kings Barn Lane to provide new pedestrian/cycle/emergency link, provision of vehicular access from the A283 Steyning by-pass, provision of public open space, community orchard, sustainable drainage and other ancillary and enabling works. All matters reserved except for vehicular access from A283.

Following approval of Reserved Matters (DC/25/1138 refers), a subsequent Section 73 planning application to the above Outline Permission was permitted (DC/26/0325 refers), which amongst other things, informed the reordering of certain planning conditions.

Approval is now sought for the discharge of Conditions 17 (advance planting) and 20 (Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy) of planning permission DC/26/0325.

The details submitted comprises:

- TOR-XX-XX-DR-L-P-021 REV F ENABLING WORKS STRUCTURAL PLANTING PLAN
- Final 23rd May 2025 BIODIVERSITY ENHANCEMENT STRATEGY/LANDSCAPE AND ECOLOGICAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (Conditions 20 & 25) Glebe Farm, Steyning by EcoSupport

These reflect the details submitted at Outline Stage and in subsequent Reserved Matters (DC/25/1138) and the Section 73 permission (DC/26/0325) and a non-material amendment (NMA) to the site layout (DC/26/0493 refers).

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/21/2233	Outline application for up to 265 dwellings, demolition of No. 37 Kings Barn Lane to provide new pedestrian/cycle/emergency link, provision of vehicular access from the A283 Steyning by-pass, provision of public open space, community orchard, sustainable drainage and other ancillary and enabling works. All matters reserved except for vehicular access from A283	Permitted 29-11-2024
DC/25/0739	Non Material Amendment to application DC/21/2233 (Outline for up to 265 dwellings, demolition of No. 37 Kings Barn Lane, and provision of vehicular access	Permitted 03-06-2025

	from the A283 Steyning by-pass), to allow delivery of approved access roundabout off the Steyning Bypass (A283) as first phase of the development in line with Condition 10 of the Outline Planning Permission.	
DC/25/1138	Approval of Reserved Matters following the Outline Planning Permission (reference DC/21/2233) relating to the Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 265no. dwellings, demolition of No. 37 Kings Barn Lane to provide new pedestrian/cycle/emergency link, provision of vehicular access from the A283 Steyning by-pass, provision of public open space, community orchard, sustainable drainage and other ancillary and enabling works.	Permitted 19-12-2025
DC/26/0325	Removal of conditions 19 (water efficiency measures) and 21 (water neutrality strategy) and variation of trigger of Condition 14 (traffic noise mitigation) of planning approval DC/21/2233 (Outline application for up to 265 dwellings, demolition of No. 37 Kings Barn Lane to provide new pedestrian/cycle/emergency link, provision of vehicular access from the A283 Steyning by-pass. All matters reserved except for vehicular access from A283).	Permitted 20-05-2026
DC/26/0493	Non Material Amendment to previously approved application DC/25/1138 (Approval of Reserved Matters following the Outline Planning Permission (reference DC/21/2233) relating to the Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 265no. dwellings, demolition of No. 37 Kings Barn Lane to provide new pedestrian/cycle/emergency link, provision of vehicular access from the A283 Steyning by-pass, provision of public open space, community orchard, sustainable drainage and other ancillary and enabling works.) Regarding repositioning of dwellinghouse plots and eastern and western substations.	Permitted 15-04-2026

CONSULTATIONS (summarised)

HDC Consultant Ecologist: Recommend discharge

HDC Landscape Architect: Condition 17 - No Objection/Advice Condition 20 – Advice

The discharge of Condition 17 can be recommended, provided that the uncertainty regarding the delivery of 'infill planting by residents' is addressed through the subsequent pre-occupation landscape condition, with this requirement identified on the decision notice. Nevertheless, it is recommended that the relevant area is identified on the plan as 'Details to be provided under Condition 6 of DC/25/1138', rather than as infill planting to be carried out by residents

Condition 20 should be discharged to the satisfaction of the relevant specialist. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that the submitted Combined Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy / Landscape and Ecological Management Plan is also intended to support the discharge of Condition 25. With this in mind, there appear to be some inconsistencies between the Enabling Works Structural Planting Plan Rev E, and the Combined BES/LEMP. In particular, the tree species identified within Section 4.3.1 of the LEMP do not fully correspond with those specified on Revision E, and the documents should therefore be reviewed to ensure appropriate coordination. The LEMP also identifies the developer as initially responsible for the implementation and maintenance of newly created and enhanced habitats, whereas Revision E identifies areas of 'infill planting to be carried out by residents'. A further internal inconsistency is noted within the LEMP: Section 4.6.1 refers to the dry wildflower meadow mix as EM3, whereas Section 4.6.2 and the Implementation Plan identify EM2. This should be clarified and corrected as part of any subsequent consideration of the LEMP under Condition 25

The submitted Enabling Works Structural Planting Plan, Revision E identifies areas of 'infill planting to be carried out by residents', which introduces uncertainty regarding the delivery and retention of this element of the landscape scheme. For the purposes of the current pre commencement condition, this need not prevent discharge, provided the matter is addressed through the subsequent landscape condition prior to occupation, under Condition 6 of reserved matters DC/25/1138. The detailed landscape proposals should secure delivery of the necessary infill planting as part of the approved landscape scheme, rather than relying on individual residents to undertake the planting. Area in question shown below for clarity:
Rev D Rev E
Some minor changes have been made to the proposed tree species and sizes within the planting schedule between Revision D (approved under DC/25/1138) and Revision E (submitted for consideration under this discharge of condition application), details of which are set out below:
Species / size Rev D Rev E Change
Acer campestre 18–20 cm 3 5 +2
Acer pseudoplatanus 18–20 cm 3 1 −2
Acer pseudoplatanus 20–25 cm 2 2 unchanged
Aesculus hippocastanum 20–25 cm 1 1 unchanged
Aesculus hippocastanum 18–20 cm 2 2 unchanged
Alnus cordata 20–25 cm 1 1 unchanged
Betula pendula 18–20 cm 2 1 −1
Betula pubescens 18–20 cm 3 5 +2
Crataegus monogyna 18–20 cm 11 7 −4
Fagus sylvatica 18–20 cm 5 6 +1
Fagus sylvatica 20–25 cm 8 7 −1
Prunus avium 18–20 cm 10 8 −2
Quercus robur 18–20 cm 3 1 −2
Quercus robur 20–25 cm 7 6 −1
Sorbus aria 'Majestica' 18–20 cm 4 4 unchanged
Sorbus aria 'Majestica' 20–25 cm – 1 +1 / new specification
Tilia cordata 18–20 cm 1 1 unchanged
Having reviewed the proposed locations of the amended tree species and sizes, these changes are considered acceptable from a landscape perspective

REPRESENTATIONS (summarised)

2 no. Representations received, content summarised below:

The submitted proposals differ from previously approved southern boundary landscaping arrangements and still fail to adequately demonstrate how planting will be delivered, 1 2 maintained or used to protect the privacy of existing Kings Barn Lane residents. I request clarification and, where necessary, amended drawings before discharge. 1. Hedgerow and Resident Infill Planting The latest plan appears to remove the previously proposed native mixed hedgerow adjoining existing gardens between Plots 114 and 121, replacing it with a hatched area marked "Infill planting to be carried out by residents". Vistry should explain why this change has happened with no consultation, identify which residents are responsible (current or future), and specify the planting, timing, funding, maintenance, land ownership and lawful access arrangements. If the annotation relates to previous requests to transfer land to existing residents, the legal arrangements must be explicit. Essential screening should not depend on an undefined obligation on residents, current or future. If the annotation reflects neither arrangement, a revised drawing should show how boundary treatment previously consulted upon and agreed with residents will be honoured.

2. Planting Within and Beyond the Utility Easement Previous easement drawings identify a yellow restricted strip and an adjoining purple area understood to lie outside the electrical easement restrictions. Section G-GG of the approved reserved matters drawings shows native shrub planting along this boundary. My understanding is that suitable native shrubs may be planted within the yellow strip, subject to utility operator requirements. Vistry should confirm the permissible species and planting arrangements, including how the proposed planting will achieve sufficient height and density to provide

effective screening and protect the residential amenity of 43 Kings Barn Lane, and demonstrate that the planting illustrated in Section G-GG will be delivered.

3. Structural Planting and Privacy The purple area appears to offer scope for additional structural planting outside the identified electrical easement restrictions, as previously discussed with Vistry during site visits. I seek appropriately sized trees or substantial shrubs positioned to interrupt direct sightlines from ground-floor and, where feasible, upper-floor windows of the proposed development towards the property and garden at 43 Kings Barn Lane. Vistry should consider additional structural planting adjoining Plots 108-114 as a minimum, preferably advanced planting for earlier screening. Proposals should specify species, initial heights, spacing, expected growth and maintenance.

4. Consultation and Discharge I understand Condition 6 of the reserved matters approval requires consultation with the relevant district councillor(s) on southern boundary treatment. Please confirm whether this consultation has taken place, whether the current landscaping proposals were included, and how any resident representations were addressed. Although Conditions 6 and 17 are separate, both concern the southern boundary treatment and are therefore closely interrelated. I consider it premature to discharge Condition 17 without first establishing that the consultation requirements of Condition 6 have been satisfied and that any resulting representations from residents have been appropriately considered.

5. Fence Alignment and Maintenance The precise southern boundary fence alignment remains unclear. Vistry should provide a dimensioned plan showing its relationship to existing garden boundaries, Plots 108-121, planting areas and utility easements, consistent with approved reserved matters Section GGG. Until the alignment and boundary treatment are confirmed, including relevant Condition 6 consultation, it is unclear how the landscaping can be assessed as deliverable. Discharge of Condition 17 is therefore premature.

Requested Decision I request that Condition 17 is not discharged until Vistry has: 3 - Clarified removal of the hedgerow and responsibilities for resident infill planting. Who the residents are and any legal and/or maintenance obligations. - Confirmed permitted easement planting and demonstrated that approved native shrubs will achieve sufficient height and density, consistent with previously approved landscaping proposals (RM section G-GG) and discussions with residents. - Assessed additional structural planting outside the easement, particularly adjoining Plots 108- 114, to protect residential privacy. - Confirmed that Condition 6 consultation requirements have been satisfied. - Clarified fence alignment, land ownership, access and ongoing maintenance, in line with RM Approved section G-GG. Where necessary, revised drawings and a written response should be provided to impacted Kings Barn Lane residents. I support appropriate southern boundary landscaping, but the current proposals leave material questions about consistency with approved arrangements, deliverability and residential amenity. I therefore request that Condition 17 remains undischarged until these matters have been satisfactorily addressed and the consultation requirements of Condition 6 have been fulfilled through the agreed consultation process.

Having reviewed the latest plan, the residents of 37a to 43 Kings Barn Lane are concerned that the "native mixed hedgerow" previously shown between our rear garden boundaries and the development has been removed. In its place, the plan now shows a hatched area labelled "Infill planting to be carried out by residents".

Hedgerow and Infill Planting The affected strip runs along the southern boundary from Plot 114 to Plot 121, to the right of the access point. This appears to be the only hatched area along the boundary adjoining existing Kings Barn Lane residents. Vistry to clarify what "Infill planting to be carried out by residents" refers to:
- which residents? Existing Kings Barn Lane or new development?
- when will the planting be conducted.
- who will own and maintain the planted area.
- who will fund and conduct the planting.
- what work is included within "infill planting".
- how residents would gain lawful and practical access if they are expected to undertake or maintain the planting; and
- why this responsibility appears to apply only to this section of the boundary.

Previous discussions were about maintaining and adding more structural planting. Advanced planting is preferable to protect amenity but if this is not possible then structural planting is still preferable.

Residents have previously requested that part of this land be transferred for their use. Vistry to confirm whether the notation on the latest plan is intended to respond to that request. If so, please set out the proposed ownership and legal arrangements.

Southern Boundary Fence I understand this application refers to the advanced planting Condition 17 of the Outline Planning. However, how can this be discharged before the boundary is established? Appreciate this is a planting condition, but the boundary has an impact. Vistry has not yet confirmed the precise alignment of the proposed new fence line along the southern boundary. They need to provide a plan showing its exact position relative to the existing residential boundaries, the proposed planting strip, and Plots 114 to 121. Confirmation of the fence alignment is necessary before residents can accurately assess the ownership, access, and maintenance implications.

Additional Tree Planting Only two trees are currently shown near Plot 121. I would like to request additional advanced tree planting in this area to provide more effective screening and reduce overlooking and loss of privacy of existing homes. The available area appears capable of accommodating further planting. Advanced planting is desirable, but if not possible then I request planting of mature trees afterwards. I would also request no tree planting near the boundary line in this area to avoid loss of light and encroachment of overhanging. If additional trees cannot be provided, please explain the relevant landscaping or technical constraints.

Requested Response Vistry to provide a written response addressing the planting responsibilities, land ownership, access and maintenance arrangements, proposed fence alignment, and the scope for additional advanced tree planting near Plot 121. I also request that the plan and its annotations be amended where necessary so that these arrangements are clear and unambiguous.

In conclusion, I believe Condition 17 of Outline Planning cannot be met until the issues surrounding advanced planting as detailed above are addressed and amended accordingly.

Member Comment (summarised):
Councillor Finnegan 12/10/2026:

I appreciate the diagram is now not meant to indicate the boundary treatment (fence position). However, if the boundary position still has not been established, I am unsure how the planting can be confirmed in advance of the boundary (e.g. for advance planting of trees). I understand a proposal for the boundary is due imminently, so has this condition come forward too soon?

I would appreciate it if this condition were not approved until "infill by residents" is fully understood. I am not clear if it means the existing KBL residents or new residents of Glebe Fields. It is unclear whether this infill would be the responsibility of the residents or Vistry and when this infill may take place and with what.

My understanding was that near plot 121 the residents of KBL were in favour of structural advanced planting. These trees seem to have been removed from previous plans although have been retained further east. Residents had just remarked on the trees not being too close and overhanging their gardens as per a previous version. There now also seems to be no planting of any sort towards 43 KBL. Please explain and apologies if I have misunderstood.

Other considerations
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

Condition 17 reads:

Pre-commencement (slab level) Condition: No development above ground floor slab level shall commence until a plan showing all areas where advance planting is to be delivered at the various stages of the project, including enabling works stage for any structural planting along buffer zones (including southern boundary and key mitigation and integration measures) that are to be retained / enhanced and then those that can progress alongside with the phasing on drawing P20-2253_18-1, has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The advance planting so agreed shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development that is sympathetic to the landscape and character of the surroundings and setting of the South Downs National Park, and in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policies 30 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policies 1 and 2 of the Steyning Neighbourhood Development Plan (2022).

The Council's Landscape Architect is satisfied the advanced planting details submitted pursuant to Condition 17, provide for a development sympathetic to landscape and character surroundings, including setting of the South Downs National Park.

In the latest drawing, Rev F, the annotation of the relevant area referenced in Representations has been amended to read details to be provided under Condition 6 of DC/25/1138 (Reserved Matters Soft/Hard landscaping prior to occupation), rather than as infill planting to be carried out by residents.

This is for clarity only. This relevant area is not part of the advanced planting proposals and consequentially the boundary position is not determinative to acceptability of details pursuant to condition 17; advanced planting here would not mitigate character and visual effect harms at a scale of the wider landscape setting (i.e. views from public rights of way network and the National Park) arising from the development, which is the reason for condition 17.

The details pursuant to condition 17 are therefore acceptable.

NB. Officers have already advised on several occasions now, directly to the parties involved and via their local ward member, that the boundary dispute in question is a private civil matter for neighbours and Vistry to resolve between themselves.

Condition 20 reads:

Pre-commencement (slab level) Condition: As part of each reserved matters application and prior to ground floor slab level of any development, a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy for Protected and Priority species shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The content of the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy shall include the following: i. Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed enhancement measures; ii. detailed designs to achieve stated objectives; iii. locations of proposed enhancement measures by appropriate maps and plans; iv. persons responsible for implementing the enhancement measures; v. details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant).

The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

Reason: To enhance Protected and Priority Species/habitats and allow the Local Planning Authority to discharge its duties under the s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority habitats & species) in accordance with Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

The Council's consultant Ecologist is satisfied the submitted Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy/ Landscape Ecological Management Plan (Ecosupport, May 2025) includes the detail required by this condition to enhance Protected and Priority Species/habitats.

The details pursuant to condition 20 are therefore acceptable.

NB. The Applicant has been made aware of comments made by HDC Landscapes on the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy and will update the separate future discharge submission for Condition 25 accordingly. There is no need to amend the document for determination of details pursuant condition 20 purposes.

Recommendation: Application Permitted

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: DISC/26/0318
(The approved plans will form Condition 1 on the Decision Notice of all Permitted applications)

Schedule of plans/documents **approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Plans	Enabling Works Structural Planting Plan	TOR-XX-XX-DR-L-P-021 F	28.10.2026
Supporting Docs	Final 23rd May 2025 BIODIVERSITY ENHANCEMENT STRATEGY/LANDSCAPE AND ECOLOGICAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (Conditions 20 & 25) Glebe Farm, Steyning by EcoSupport		21.09.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Matthew Porter Date: 30-10-2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial Adrian Smith Date: 30/10/2026