



Applications & Appeals Services
The Beehive, City Place, Gatwick, RH6 0PA
Tel: 01403 252231 email: njaltd@gmail.com

The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

NJA Ref: 26/175

30 June 2026

FINAL COMMENTS

Dear Sir/Madam

Appeal Ref: 6009593
Appellants: Mr and Mrs Ripley
Site: Land east of Spring Gardens, Washington, RH20 3BP

Thank you for your email notification on 26 June 2026 with link to Horsham District Council's Statement of Case and Interested Party Comments (from Washington Parish Council). Please find attached the Appellants' response.

If you have any queries or require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely



Nikolas J. Antoniou
BSc HONS DIPTP MRTPI
Chartered Town Planner
For and on behalf of NJA Town Planning Ltd

Appeal Ref: 6009593

Appellants: Mr and Mrs Ripley

Site: Land East of Spring Gardens, Washington, RH20 3BP

APPELLANTS' FINAL COMMENTS

1.0 Horsham District Council's Statement of Case

- 1.1 The Council maintains its objection in respect of the location of the appeal site however, the Appellant's Statement of Case explains the reasons as to why the site is considered to be sustainably located, in particular due to its close proximity to Ashington where there is a range of local services and facilities, access to public transport and to the nearby farm shop and Squires Garden Centre. It is reiterated that the day-to day needs of the occupiers of the proposed dwelling may therefore be met without necessarily having to rely on the use of the private vehicle.
- 1.2 The Council acknowledges that the appeal site comprises previously developed land (PDL) and although the site does not adjoin a settlement edge, the site is still situated in an appropriate location to accommodate just one dwelling for the reasons set out within the Appellants' Statement of Case. The proposal does not result in significant conflict with the Council's spatial strategy which must in any case be considered in context of the provisions of NPPF paragraph 11 d) and the presumption in favour of sustainable development given that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing land.
- 1.3 It is maintained that the case studies submitted with the appeal are material considerations, particularly in the case of Chanctonview, Spring Gardens. The fact that the appeal site is PDL, but not in residential use, does not sufficiently distinguish the appeal scheme from the Council's decision to permit a single dwelling at Chanctonview. The surrounding context of the site is mixed residential

and commercial and the construction of a dwelling as proposed will not appear out of keeping with the character of the area.

2.0 Interested Party Comments

- 2.1 Washington Parish Council refer to the impact of the proposed dwelling upon the characteristics of the countryside character including in respect of appearance and additional traffic. However, the Council's reasons for refusal refer only to the site's location outside of a defined built-up area.

3.0 Suggested Conditions

- 3.1 The Appellants raise no objections to the Council's suggested conditions.