APP/Z3825/W25/3375892

Response to the objections and HDC letter dated the 8th January 2026 emailed to us on the 12th January 2026.

There are three objectors this time although from just two people, one however claiming he speaks for 38 residents and submits two objections In fact it would appear from a Google search he will not see any development whatsoever. The objections are full or errors and false claims. Most are not relevant, but we would wish to correct a few of their claims as follows;-

1. The barn is not built a meter higher than approved and there is no enforcement notice outstanding. However the planning officer has recommended that we be granted consent to turn the barn into a dwelling. (Copy email attached). We do not wish to convert our barn, but unless we can build something on our land we will have no option. We have had to abandon our re-wilding as without any daylight to the first floor of the barn our volunteers have no where to meet. We had planning consent specifically to use the barn for that purpose.
2. The wild life and especially the butterflies are present due very much to the re-wilding work we have carried out over the past twenty years and the ecological surveys should be noted. Our proposals will have no harmful effect according to the experts. In fact the development will enhance the biodiversity and improve the ecology as can be seen from the plan A (a further copy is attached).
3. We have not claimed this as an agricultural dwelling. However it is intended to be occupied by myself. I have been the architect of the Priory Vineyard, Matt's Wood and Priory Fields. I have been the Honorary estates manager to the Norbertine Order since 1986. I work in the fields every week especially in the summer and hope to continue for as many years as possible. Whilst the land is no longer owned by the Order what is important is that the Norbertine Order own the development rights.
4. As your inspector can see we build to the highest standards. Our Sussex style Oak Barn has been admired by everyone that has used it and our Priory Close development, now eleven year old is generally considered the best new development in Storrington. (Priory Close is just a few meters away from the site. A map is attached duly marked for your convenience).
5. As you can see from County Highway whilst some residents may wish to think of Kithurst Lane being their private road it is in fact a public highway. (Plan attached for your convenience).
6. An indication of the hysteria is apparent when the objectors states that a chalet style dwelling would be so harmful when it is next door to a totally inappropriate three story block of flat with a flat roof covered in the usual paraphernalia associated with such construction. There is yet another two story block of flats next door.
7. Water neutrality, this is no longer relevant in our district, but all our figures have been taken from approved tables and regulations. We have allowed for a large margin in addition to the required standards for storage.
8. There is no chalk stream to the south. The old ditch was covered in and has had no water in it for well over sixty years according to a previous Prior of our Church.
9. It would appear that the objectors are mixing this appeal with another application which has been recommended for approval by the planning department. The barn has nothing to do with this application other than if this is approved we will not have to convert our barn to a dwelling and we might be able to gather our old volunteers in order to restart our re-wilding.
10. This is not an area of outstanding Natural beauty and neither is it considered in the Neighbourhood plan to be an important view in need of protection or an important green space.
11. It is clear this objector has not only failed to read the application properly, but has ignored expert opinion and the facts in his vehemence.

Response to HDC letter dated the 8th January 2026 and attachments

1. The issue of the BUAB we believe we have dealt with, but raised again by the LPA so we attach our recent analysis of their old report. Horsham DC strategic planning department is now re-considering their errors and looking to see if this might now be accepted as a windfall site. It has been suggested several times by the Parish Council and previous Inspectors that this might be considered a windfall site. (See also rule 73 D of the NPPF). You will be aware

that the councils draft new plan has now been thrown out twice by the Inspector. It also fails completely to comply with policy framework specifically framework rule 73 A and 76B.

2. Clearly this site unlike the sites proposed by our LPA is sustainable. Inspectors have stated this and so has the councils own planning department. The 2015 framework is out of date, based on an out of date NPPF and has never been consistently complied with by the LPA. If one read policy 1 this application does comply. The policy starts by stating the council will take a positive approach in favour of sustainable development. They seems to have ignored NPPF 2.10-2.11A,C,D-23- 83-84E. Perhaps the council have a different version on their 2015 framework. The copy we printed off shows most of the policies they quote support our application. When it suits the LPA they have failed to enforce their policies and have ignored in their latest attempted draft plans requirements under the new NPPF. Our application complies with policy 1-2-3-4 and 26. Policy 2 "meet the needs— through sustainable growth" "allow growth" "encourage the effective use of land" "support rural housing" "support development which protects, conserves and enhances". Policy 3 Storrington is confirmed as suitable for expansion due to having a good range of service. Policy 4 confirms growth of settlements will continue to be supported by our LPA and our work and proposal now satisfies all 5 points. Policy 26 builds on policy 4 and again our work and proposal complies with three of the first four points but is only required to meet one. It complies with all thee of the further points.
3. The LPA have already granted consent for 232 dwellings to be built outside the BUAB in the past three year alone, none of these have been of any benefit to the environment, most are not in sustainable locations. All fail to comply with the councils 2015 framework in some way or another.(copy emails attached).
4. The adverse impact is not supported by the facts or any expert opinion including the council's own conservation department. The Parish Council have also stated that this is not a green flield site and the views are not in need of protection. Whilst sadly it is not the experts that make the final planning decision. Unlike the LPA experts do often visit the site and can therefore make a valid and unbiased report that should be taken into account. Why waste tax payers money seeking several so called independent experts advice then ignore it? Much of the LPA demands seem reserved for our applications only. DC/18/2721 and DC/25/0520 never required a great crested newt survey even though only a few meters from our pond. Both were approved within weeks of the application.
5. All and any development alters the character of a site. If considering the character surely common sense would require one to listen to expert opinion especially when so many errors have already been made in the council original site report.
6. Being on the right side of the BUAB should not automatically mean that the development complies with the LPA framework or the NPPF. It suggests that the LPA don't care what a development looks like or how out of character it is so long as it sits within the BUAB. This can be seen from the Glebe Field development (DC/16/2108) . In breach of design, massing, material and strongly objected to by the Parish Council, the councils own conservation experts, damaging to the village and listed building, but approved in record time. The chair of the planning committee has the main house on that development. That major development was recommended for consent within three months. Our Priory Close proposal, within the BUAB took eight years and then only granted after a successful appeal.
7. The council have made demands to prove this will be a self build dwelling and we are happy to comply with those demands. I am on the councils list as looking for a self build site.
8. Despite sending over a hundred pages of examples of the LPA dishonest claims the council have never agreed to properly investigate a single one. You will be aware of the Ombudsman lack of concern regarding dishonesty, incompetence and corruption in planning departments.

With regard the conditions we consider these in breach of NPPF section 57. They are excessive as this is not in a conservation area and the requirements are not even normal for a conservation area. Some of the requirements would be out of keeping with the existing surrounding dwellings.

Whilst we accept some conditions, number 5 is unreasonable as machinery and site investigation will be needed in order to design and draw up plans in order to comply with items 3-4. We agree to the second paragraph regarding trees.
Item 6 seems excessive.

APP/Z3825/W25/3375892

Items 7-8-9-10-11 are excessive, repetitive and not usually required by our LPA. The scale 1;5 should be unnecessary. If the planners are suitably qualified as require by legislation they should be able to understand plans to the normally accepted scale.
Item 13 is not in our control but provided this service is available in Kithurst Lane we can accept.
Item 14 is not relevant.
Item 17 should not be required as DNA test shown no GCN present. It can be noted that no testing was required by our LPA for the development next door, just a few meters away from our pond.
Item 18 is excessive in view of surrounding structure. We will however have to supply further detailed drawings for approval so this can be dealt with at that stage.
Item 19 again is excessive and not normally required. Insulated aluminium is approved for passive house fittings.
Item 20 again is excessive and not even required of listed buildings however we hope not to have any such roof lights.

Informative. Again excessive and not a usual requirement. However we try to use as little chemicals as possible on our land. We would like to be able to use a household weed killer if needed.

We could find no other small development approved recently by our LPA that has six full A4 pages of conditions. As an example the dwelling next door and within a few meters to the site had two very large extensions and we attach their approval and conditions. This is a further indication that our LPA does not base decisions on planning policy or NPPF but on personal prejudice or reasons. (See DC/18/0316 where is was recommended for refusal but approved by the committee stating "taking account into account the personal circumstances"). The Inspector might also be supported by his colleagues statement in the appeal of DC/18/0371 where the Inspector did not agree with the councils views of the level of supposed harm the development would do and he did not accept it was in breach of the councils policies. The Inspector subsequently upheld the appeal.

The LPA planners don't know the difference between a public highway and an adopted public highway, don't know their own councils list of requirement and when caught out falsely claim they are central government requirements. It is this lack of integrity and professionalism from the decision makers that is the main reason our planning system is broken. The appeal system does not always employ qualified staff. One recent Inspectors main work was freelancing for LPA's as a mentor and consultant. The Ombudsman can't be bothered to even investigate 93% of the referrals made to them and dismisses complaints against planning authorities as there is an appeal system available. We are therefore obliged to be persistent until our application is eventually decided by someone with common sense and integrity.

Attached as evidence or to assist.

1. Map of area to show the Inspector where they might park and the location of Priory Close
2. Email to confirm recommendation to approve our barn may have change of use to a dwelling. We expect this to be challenged by the planning committee however, so might well be the subject of another appeal.
3. Plan A 2 giving a brief description of the very basic landscape proposals for the site and surrounding area.
4. DC/25/0520 consent and conditions for property next door. Also GCN comments.
5. West Sussex County Highways plan of public roads showing Kithurst Lane is a public road but not adopted.
6. Analysis of HDC site report on SAO21.
7. Emails confirming the number of dwellings built outside of the built up area boundary.