



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2025

by **B Pattison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/W/25/3361339**

**Land at Thornhill Stables, Billingshurst Road, Coolham RH13 8QN**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr V Sawyer against the decision of Horsham District Council.
  - The application Ref is DC/24/1486.
  - The development is described as Construction of detached barn style dwelling.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of detached barn style dwelling at Land at Thornhill Stables, Billingshurst Road, Coolham, RH13 8QN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/24/1486, dated 26 September 2024, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
  - whether the site is a suitable location for the proposal having regard to the spatial strategy for the district; and
  - the effect of the proposal on the integrity of the Arun Valley Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar site, with particular regard to water neutrality.

### Reasons

#### *Suitable location*

3. The application site is located to the north of Billingshurst Road, and is accessed via a private track. The site currently comprises an agricultural field, with industrial and storage units situated to the rear, beyond the northern boundary. To the west of the site, on the opposite side of the track there are large detached dwellinghouses.
4. As the appeal site is set within a small cluster of buildings in residential and commercial use, it does not appear isolated within its immediate environment. Nor is it isolated in the context of paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework). Nevertheless, it is located outside of a built-up area boundary and is therefore located in the countryside for planning purposes.

5. Policy 2 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) (HDPF) outlines the Council's spatial strategy, which focusses significant development in Horsham. Further growth shall be distributed across a range of settlements outlined within a hierarchy in Policy 3.
6. Policy 4 of the HDPF supports the expansion of settlements beyond built-up area boundaries, provided that the site is allocated either in the Local Plan or a Neighbourhood Plan, and adjoins the existing settlement edge. In this case, the appellant confirms that the appeal site lies 0.6 miles from the village of Coolham. Therefore, it does not adjoin a settlement edge. Furthermore, policy HD1 of the Shipley Neighbourhood Plan (2020) (NP) outlines areas where housing development will be considered favourably. The proposal does not meet the criteria within Policy HD1, nor is it allocated within the NP and accordingly, the proposal would be in conflict with Policy 4 of the HDPF.
7. Policy 26 of the HDPF states that, outside built-up area boundaries, development must be essential to its countryside location and must also satisfy the criteria set out within the policy. To meet the policy requirements, proposals must be needed to support the needs of agriculture or forestry, enable the extraction of minerals or the disposal of waste, provide for quiet informal recreational use, or enable the sustainable development of rural areas. Given the residential nature of the proposal, it would not meet any of these stated criteria.
8. As the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply in accordance with existing development plan policies, it has produced the Facilitating Appropriate Development Document (2022) (FAD) to support the delivery of housing in the interim period, pending adoption of a new Local Plan. While the FAD is guidance rather than policy, it adopts a more positive approach to residential development outside settlement boundaries. Notably, it allows for the consideration of unallocated sites located outside but adjoining built-up area boundaries. However, the appeal site is not located in close proximity to any built-up area boundaries, and therefore the extent to which it would comply with the other criteria within the FAD is of limited relevance.
9. The appellant argues the site is sustainably located due to its proximity to Coolham which offers limited services such as a primary school, village hall, and public house. Within policy 3 of the HDPF Coolham falls under the 'Unclassified settlements' classification. The policy recognises such settlements as having few facilities and poor accessibility. While Coolham is about 0.6 miles from the site and reachable via pavement, its limited services are unlikely to meet day-to-day needs. Bus stops in the village also provide links to Billingshurst and Horsham.
10. The site is around 2 miles from Billingshurst, a 'Small Town/Larger Village' under Policy 3, offering a good range of services, employment, and public transport. Although buses connect Coolham to Billingshurst, I have not been provided with a timetable and so cannot be certain that the routes or timings would be viable for the typical daily needs of future occupiers. Overall, I find that future occupiers are more likely to rely on private vehicles rather than to undertake local journeys by other modes of transport.
11. As such, the appeal site would not be a suitable location for the appeal scheme when applying the spatial strategy, having regard to local and national planning policy, and the accessibility of the site to services, facilities and employment

opportunities. The proposal fails to accord with policies 1, 2, 3, 4, and 26 of the HDPF and policy HD1 of the NP. Amongst other things, these policies set out the settlement strategy, seek to limit development in the open countryside and minimise less sustainable forms of travel when accessing local services and facilities.

### *Water neutrality*

12. The appeal site is within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone defined by Natural England. Within that Zone, Natural England has advised that developments involving an increased level of water extraction could have a likely significant effect on qualifying features within the Arun Valley Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar Sites. These Habitats Sites include important wetland habitats supporting rare plants, birds and invertebrates.
13. The Council requires that applications within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone, for development involving increased water consumption, are accompanied by evidence of proposed measures for achieving water neutrality within the development. The application was accompanied by a Water Neutrality Report dated 6 June 2024. A subsequent report with updated appendices dated was submitted on 4 November 2024.
14. The updated Water Neutrality Report confirms that the proposed dwelling would be water neutral via the installation of water reducing appliances, installation of rainwater harvesting tanks and via the purchase of credits from Sussex Water Neutrality which would offset remaining water demand. A Water Credit Agreement with Sussex Water Neutrality has been provided.
15. Natural England responded to consultation on the planning appeal and raised no objection to the development, subject to the delivery, management and retention of measures identified in the Water Neutrality Report to achieve water neutrality.
16. Having taken account of the above evidence, including advice from Natural England, and subject to securing further details by planning condition I am satisfied that the development would be water neutral and that the measures required to achieve that status can be adequately secured. Consequently, there would be no adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley Habitats Sites, and the proposal would meet the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), Policy 31 of the HDPF and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework to protect the biodiversity of European sites.

### **Other Matters**

17. Comments from the Parish Council raise concerns in relation to the proposal creating overdevelopment and because the proposal would not provide affordable housing. The barn style dwelling is appropriate to the rural character of the area and would generally integrate well with the form of nearby buildings. I have not been directed to any policy which indicates that the proposal is required to provide affordable housing.
18. Third party concerns relate to the potential noise impacts from the nearby industrial uses on the future residential occupiers. As the industrial estate is subject to planning conditions controlling noise levels, the proposal would not have

a harmful effect on the operations of the nearby industrial estate. An interested party raises concerns about an increase in traffic on the private access track. The appeal proposal provides a single new house within an access which is shared with dwellings and an industrial estate. It would result in a very limited increase in local traffic, and consequently would not harm highway safety.

19. The proposal would provide benefits associated such as making an efficient use of the site and contributing to local housing supply. The Framework seeks to significantly boost housing supply and emphasises the importance of small and medium sized sites. It also encourages the optimal use of underutilised land. The appellant indicates that there is an opportunity to improve on-site biodiversity through landscape planting. These matters weigh in favour of the development. The development would have temporary economic benefits through the creation of construction jobs during the construction phase. The proposal's future residents would provide economic benefits through expenditure in local shops and services. Whilst limited due to the size of the proposal, these also weigh in favour of the development.
20. The design would reflect the appellant's individual requirements, and some evidence has been provided to indicate an intention for the dwelling to be delivered as a self-build project. However, no legal mechanism is proposed to secure its delivery as self-build housing in accordance with the relevant statutory definition. Consequently, there is no certainty that the scheme would contribute towards meeting the Council's legal duty to grant sufficient permissions for self-build housing. For this reason, this matter attracts only limited positive weight.
21. I recognise that the proposal would be built to be energy efficient and would have an electric vehicle charging point. The proposed dwellings would also have good internal space, with a functional layout and future occupiers would have sufficient external amenity areas. These weigh neither for nor against the proposal and are therefore considered neutral in the planning balance.
22. The site is located within a red risk zone for great crested newts (GCN), a European protected species. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the Regulations) therefore impose a duty to consider whether the GCN would be adequately protected. The appellant has provided a District Licencing Scheme Certificate received from NatureSpace Partnership. This confirms that the proposal can be authorised under District Licence WML-OR136 or a further licence, subject to two conditions.
23. The first condition requires the development is undertaken in accordance with the Council's Organisational Licence. The second condition requires the development only takes place in accordance with the GCN Mitigation Principles set out within District Licence WML-OR136. I consider that these conditions are necessary to ensure that any potential adverse impacts on GCN are suitably mitigated and the necessary compensation measures are undertaken. Subject to these conditions, I am satisfied that the proposal would safeguard GCN in line with the Regulations.

## **Planning Balance**

24. The appellant and the Council are in agreement that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply. The appellant indicates that the Council has a 2.9 year supply of housing land, and this is reflected in the Council's

most recent Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) 2022/23 (January 2024). This is a significant shortfall.

25. In these circumstances, footnote 8 of paragraph 11(d) of the Framework confirms that insufficient housing delivery dictates that planning permission should be granted unless, as per paragraph 11(d)(i); the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or (ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
26. The development would fall within the zone of influence of European sites, but the mitigation measures identified within the Water Neutrality Report would ensure that it does not harm the qualifying features of those sites. As such, the scheme falls to be considered against the second limb of Paragraph 11 d).
27. The proposed dwelling would be in a location that is not considered suitable when assessed against the relevant HDPF and NP policies. The site lacks close proximity to a wide range of essential services and facilities. Although there are some opportunities for travel by means other than private car, reliance on car journeys is likely to be significant. In these respects, the proposal would conflict with key development plan policies.
28. Balanced against the harm are a number of benefits. The overall housing supply remains significantly deficient, and the provision of an additional dwelling would make a meaningful contribution to addressing this shortfall. The Framework recognises that small sites can make an important contribution to housing supply and are often built out quickly. There would also be modest economic benefits during construction and through local spending, as well as a small contribution to housing diversity. While the scale of these benefits is modest given that only one dwelling is proposed, in the context of current housing pressures, even a single additional home represents a valuable and positive contribution.
29. Taking all matters into account, the adverse impacts of granting permission would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework as a whole. Consequently, the proposal benefits from the presumption in favour of sustainable development as defined in paragraph 11d of the Framework.

## **Conditions**

30. I have had regard to the various planning conditions that have been suggested. I have considered them against the tests in the Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). I have made such amendments as necessary to comply with those documents and for clarity and consistency.
31. In addition to the standard time limit, I have imposed an approved plans condition in the interests of certainty.
32. A condition requiring a contamination risk assessment is necessary to ensure that there are no unacceptable risks to humans, controlled waters or the wider environment. Similarly, a condition is required to ensure that suitable drainage measures are implemented at an early stage, to support the introduction of a residential use.

33. A condition related to water neutrality is necessary to ensure that the development does not affect the integrity of Habitats Sites. A condition requiring compliance with the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal is imposed in the interests of protected species.
34. Given the site's rural location and the associated accessibility constraints, a condition related to broadband infrastructure is reasonable to satisfy the requirements of Policy 37 in the HDP. I have imposed a condition requiring the layout and provision of on-site car parking in the interests of highway safety. A condition related to cycle parking spaces is imposed to promote sustainable travel modes.
35. The Framework outlines that planning conditions should not be used to restrict national permitted development rights unless there is clear justification to do so. As a result, and in the absence of any specific justification, I have not imposed the suggested condition which would restrict future permitted development rights.

### **Conclusion**

36. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan. However, other material considerations, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development as defined in the Framework, indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*B Pattison*

INSPECTOR

## **SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS**

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: DE1257/01/P1; DE1257/02/P1; DE1257/03/P1; DE1257/04/P1; DE1257/05/P1; and DE1257/06/P2.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 3) No development shall commence until the following components of a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination, (including asbestos contamination), of the site be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority:
  - (a) A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
    - all previous uses
    - potential contaminants associated with those uses
    - a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors
    - Potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.The following aspects (b) - (d) shall be dependent on the outcome of the above preliminary risk assessment (a) and may not necessarily be required.
  - (b) An intrusive site investigation scheme, based on (a) to provide information for a detailed risk assessment to the degree and nature of the risk posed by any contamination to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.
  - (c) The intrusive site investigation results following (b) and, based on these, a detailed method statement, giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
  - (d) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in (c) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action where required.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) No development shall commence until a drainage strategy detailing the proposed means of foul and surface water disposal has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.
- 5) The dwelling hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until evidence has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority that the approved water neutrality strategy for the proposal has been implemented in full. The evidence shall include the specification of fittings and appliances used, evidence of their installation, completion of the as built Part G water calculator or equivalent and water harvesting system installation. The installed measures shall be retained as such thereafter.
- 6) Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted, the necessary in-building physical infrastructure and external site-wide infrastructure to enable superfast broadband speeds of 30 megabits per second through full fibre broadband connection shall be provided to the premises.

- 7) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a plan showing the layout of the proposed development and the provision of car parking spaces for vehicles has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The dwelling hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the parking spaces associated with it have been provided in accordance with the approved details. The areas of land so provided shall thereafter be retained for the parking of vehicles.
- 8) No part of the development shall be first occupied until covered and secure cycle parking spaces have been provided in accordance with plans and details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking spaces shall thereafter be retained.
- 9) All mitigation and enhancement measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal as submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the local planning authority prior to determination.  
This may include the appointment of an appropriately competent person e.g. an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) to provide on-site ecological expertise during construction. The appointed person shall undertake all activities, and works shall be carried out, in accordance with the approved details
- 10) No development hereby permitted shall take place except in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Council's Organisational Licence (WML-OR136, or a 'Further Licence') and with the proposals detailed on plan "Land at Thornhill Stables: Impact plan for great crested newt District Licensing (Version 1)" dated 11th November 2024.
- 11) No development hereby permitted shall take place except in accordance with Part 1 of the Great Crested Newt Mitigation Principles, as set out in the District Licence (WML-OR136, or a 'Further Licence'), and works which will affect likely newt hibernacula may only be undertaken during the active period for amphibians.

## **END OF SCHEDULE**

Mr Nikolas Antoniou  
NJA Town Planning Ltd  
The Beehive  
City Place  
Gatwick  
RH6 0PA

Application Number: DC/24/1486

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT, 1990 (as amended)  
TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

On behalf of: Mr v Sawyer

In pursuance of their powers under the above-mentioned Act and Order, the Council hereby **REFUSE** to permit the works specified hereunder, that is to say:

**Construction of a two storey four bedroom barn style dwelling.**

**Land Parcel at Thornhill Stables Billingshurst Road Coolham West Sussex**

as shown on Plan and Application Number DC/24/1486 submitted to the Council on 26/09/2024. The reasons for the Council's decision to refuse to permit the above works are specified hereunder.

- 1 The proposed development would be sited within an unsustainable 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 (2023) 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) and Policy Ship HD1 of the Shipley Parish Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2 Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate with a sufficient degree of certainty that the proposed development would not contribute to an existing adverse effect upon the integrity of the internationally designated Arun Valley Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar sites by way of increased water abstraction, contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Paragraphs 185 and 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), thus the Local Planning Authority is unable to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority Habitats & Species).

Schedule of plans/documents:

| Plan Type             | Description                | Drawing Number        | Received Date |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Location & Block plan | Location and Block Plan    | DE1257 / 01 REV<br>P1 | 26.09.2024    |
| Floor plan            | Proposed Ground Floor Plan | DE1257 / 02 REV       | 26.09.2024    |

|                 |                                                                       |                           |            |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------|
|                 |                                                                       | P1                        |            |
| Floor plan      | Proposed First Floor Plan                                             | DE1257 / 03 REV<br>P1     | 26.09.2024 |
| Roof plan       | Proposed Roof Plan                                                    | DE1257 / 04 REV<br>P1     | 26.09.2024 |
| Elevation plan  | Proposed Elevations                                                   | DE1257 / 05 REV<br>P1     | 26.09.2024 |
| Site plan       | Site Block Plan                                                       | DE1257 / 06 REV<br>P1     | 26.09.2024 |
| Supporting Docs | Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Arun Ecology dated September 2024 | C-NJA-011-001-001 REV 001 | 26.09.2024 |
| Supporting Docs | Reptile Survey Report by Arun Ecology dated September 2024            | C-NJA-011-002-001 REV 1   | 26.09.2024 |
| Supporting Docs | Water Neutrality Report by cgs civils dated 28 June 2024              | C3236 REV P-              | 26.09.2024 |

### **Note to Applicant – Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL):**

Horsham District Council has adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule which took effect on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2017. **This development constitutes CIL liable development.**


If you have not received a Liability Notice from the Council within 1 month of the decision date please contact the CIL Team at [cil@horsham.gov.uk](mailto:cil@horsham.gov.uk)

CIL is a mandatory financial charge on development. To avoid additional financial penalties, the requirements of CIL must be managed before development is commenced (including in the event of any successful appeal).

Payment must be made in accordance with the requirements of the CIL Demand Notice issued.

### **Note To Applicant:**

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.



Emma Parkes  
Head of Development and Building Control

Date: 21/11/2024

### **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

#### **Right of Appeals**

If you are aggrieved by the decision to refuse permission for the proposed development or to grant it subject to conditions, then you can appeal to the Secretary of State under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

You must appeal within 12 weeks of the date of the decision notice for a householder application or 'minor commercial' (shop front) development, and within 6 months for other types of planning applications. There are different timescale – usually 28 days – if an enforcement notice is/has been served for the same (or very similar) land and development. Please note, only the applicant possesses the right of appeal.

Appeals can be made online at: <https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate>. If you are unable to access the online appeal form, please contact the Planning Inspectorate to obtain a paper copy of the appeal form on tel: 0303 444 5000.

The Secretary of State can allow a longer period for giving notice of an appeal but will not normally be prepared to use this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal.

The Secretary of State need not consider an appeal if it seems to the Secretary of State that the local planning authority could not have granted planning permission for the proposed development or could not have granted it without the conditions they imposed, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provisions of any development order and to any directions given under a development order.

If you intend to submit an appeal that you would like examined by inquiry then you must notify the Local Planning Authority and Planning Inspectorate ([inquiryappeals@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:inquiryappeals@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)) at least 10 days before submitting the appeal. Further details are at <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/casework-dealt-with-by-inquiries>.



## **DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET**

### **APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:**

DC/24/1486

Land Parcel at Thornhill Stables, Billingshurst Road, Coolham, West Sussex,

### **DESCRIPTION:**

Construction of a two storey four bedroom barn style dwelling.

### **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:**

No relevant planning history

### **DETAILED DESCRIPTION AND SITE AND SURROUNDS**

The application seeks permission for a change of use of part of an agricultural field and erection of a two storey four bedroom dwelling with a width of 19.3 metres, a depth of 11.3 metres and an overall height of approximately 8 metres and an eaves height of 4.6 metres with the catslide element having an eaves of approximately 2.5 metres.

The roof slope would be part catslide at the front and would be part hipped with four rooflights and one rooflight to the rear. The front elevation would have a large amount of glazing to the front located right of centre to the dwelling and would have a mixture of materials including part brick at the ground floor level, timber cladding and plain clay roof tiles.

The application site is set to the north of Billingshurst road approximately 0.68km away from Coolham and currently consists of an agricultural field with industrial and storage units to the rear of the site to the north. There is sporadic residential dwellings along Billingshurst road. To the west of the application site on the other side of the access, there are detached large dwellinghouses. Two parking spaces are proposed as indicated within the application form and would include a road running from the access road along to dwelling running the width of the plot.

### **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES**

#### **The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

#### **Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):**

Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development

Policy 2 - Strategic Policy: Strategic Development

Policy 3 - Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy

Policy 4 - Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion

Policy 15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision

Policy 16 - Strategic Policy: Meeting Local Housing Needs

Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection

Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character

Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection

Policy 28 - Replacement Dwellings and House Extensions in the Countryside

Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development

Policy 33 - Development Principles  
Policy 35 - Strategic Policy: Climate Change  
Policy 36 - Strategic Policy: Appropriate Energy Use  
Policy 37 - Sustainable Construction  
Policy 38 - Strategic Policy: Flooding  
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport  
Policy 41 - Parking

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 2.9 years. 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.

### **The Horsham District Local Plan 2023-2040**

The Horsham District Local Plan 2023-2040 was submitted for examination on the 26th of July 2024. Paragraph 48 of the NPPF states that *“local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:*

- a) *the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);*
- b) *the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and*
- c) *the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework [NPPF] (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)”*

Policies in this Plan do not carry full statutory weight but are gathering weight as the Plan proceeds through its stages. They provide an indication of the direction of future policy. Since the 26th of July 2024, when the Plan was agreed for submission to the Secretary of State, it has gained weight for the determination of planning applications. The relevant policies are:

Strategic Policy 1: Sustainable Development  
Strategic Policy 2: Development Hierarchy  
Strategic Policy 3: Settlement Expansion  
Strategic Policy 6: Climate Change  
Strategic Policy 7: Appropriate Energy Use  
Strategic Policy 8: Sustainable Design and Construction  
Strategic Policy 9: Water Neutrality  
Strategic Policy 11: Environmental Protection  
Strategic Policy 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character  
Strategic Policy 14: Countryside Protection  
Strategic Policy 15: Settlement Coalescence  
Strategic Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity  
Strategic Policy 19: Development Quality  
Strategic Policy 20: Development Principles

Strategic Policy 23: Infrastructure Provision  
Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport  
Policy 25: Parking  
Strategic Policy 37: Housing Provision  
Strategic Policy 38: Meeting Local Housing Needs  
Policy 39: Affordable Housing  
Policy 40: Improving Housing Standards in the District

### **Shipley Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2031:**

Policy HD3 High quality design

### **Shipley Parish Design Guidance**

#### **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](http://www.horsham.gov.uk)

#### Consultations:

##### **Natural England:** Objection

Concur with the conclusion of your authority's HRA appropriate assessment, insofar that further information is required in order to determine the significance of impacts on designated sites and the scope for mitigation, chiefly

- Objection due to additional information to evidence of the purchase of water credits

##### **Naturespace:** Objection, further information required

An ecological report has been submitted and notes that further information would be required to assess the level of impact of the development on Great Crested Newts, it is recommended that the applicant enter into the Mid Sussex District license.

##### **HDC Environmental Health:** Objection given further information required

The application site is located immediately adjacent to established commercial uses including a recently approved permission for redevelopment for class B8 and Class E uses. An acoustic assessment is required to show that the approved commercial uses will not be prejudiced by the introduction of the residential use and that the agent of change principle has been appropriately considered. Commercial or agricultural buildings can be subject to significant contamination risks arising from their use, construction and storage of machinery equipment fuels or other chemicals. Due to the immediate proximity of the application site to the commercial uses, a preliminary risk assessment should be provided to ensure the application is properly determined. Information with respect to water neutrality is also required.

##### **Ecology Consultant:** No Objection

No buildings on site are noted within the Reptile Survey report, (Arun Ecology, September 2024) and preliminary ecology appraisal (Arun Ecology, September 2024). There is within the site, deciduous woodland and a line of trees which would not be impacted such that there would be no severance to the flight lines of foraging or commuting bats.

##### **Southern Water:** Comment

Recommendation to follow Building regulations and note that there is published guidance from Southern water in respect of tree planting near water mains and sewers.

## **Highways: No Objection**

Subject to the inclusion of recommended conditions concerning parking provision and cycle parking

### Shipley Parish Council:

- Conflict with policies within the Neighbourhood Plan
- Outside the built-up area boundary
- Not affordable housing
- Conflicts with Design Statement
- Overdevelopment
- Arboricultural concerns in respect of removal of three oak trees

### Representations:

1 letter of objection received, and this can be summarised as follows:

- Location of entrance
- Access to the private road

2 letters received neither objecting to or supporting the application. These can be summarised as follows:

- Restrictions in place on noise levels for the nearby light industrial
- No noise impacts
- Suitable access
- Proximity to watercourse ditch
- Ownership of access lane

1 letter of response provided by the Applicant to the comments submitted, and this can be summarised as follows:

- Design is of a rural barn
- Set back to limit loss of privacy
- Same or similar size to detached houses in adjacent Mill Lane
- Self build development
- Generous spacing
- No trees will be removed and more will be added

### 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:**

Policy 2 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) sets out the main growth strategy, focusing development in the main settlements. The application site is situated outside of any of the defined settlements as categorised under Policy 3 of the HDPF, and therefore is considered to be in a countryside location in policy terms.

Policy 4 of the HDPF outlines that the expansion of settlements outside the built-up area are supported where the site is allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan and adjoins an existing settlement edge; the level of expansion is appropriate to the scale and function of the settlement type; the development is demonstrated to meet the identified local housing needs; the impact of development individually or cumulatively does not prejudice comprehensive long term development; and the development is contained within an existing defensible boundary and the landscape and townscape character features are maintained and enhanced. The HDPF outlines that the proposed settlement hierarchy is the most sustainable approach to delivering housing; with new development focused in the larger settlements of Horsham, Southwater and Billingshurst; with limited new development elsewhere, only where it accords with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. Specifically, Policy 3 of the Horsham District Planning Framework seeks to retain the existing settlement pattern and ensure that development takes place in the most sustainable locations as possible.

Emerging Strategic Policy 2 of the draft Horsham District Local Plan (HDLP) promotes a similar development hierarchy within the defined BUAB as in Policy 3 of the HDPF. Therefore, as the proposal is located outside the defined BUAB this proposal does not accord with Emerging Strategic Policy 2. Emerging Strategic Policy 3 of the HDLP supports the expansion of existing settlements to meet identified local housing needs where all the criteria detailed within the policy is met. This includes the site being either allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan and adjoining the existing settlement edge. It is noted that Coolham is within the emerging HDLP is a secondary settlement, however the application site is approximately 0.68km from this boundary. Given that the application site is entirely outside of the boundaries of the secondary settlement it would not be in accordance to policy 2 in this regard.

Policy Ship HD1 of the Shipley Neighbourhood Plan states that applications for housing development within Shipley and Coolham villages and Dragons Green and Brooks Green hamlets will be considered favourably where the proposals meet all of the following criteria: the proposed development is for an infill gap, or on previously developed land, within the continuity of existing buildings; the proposed development will not result in the outward extension of the villages or hamlets onto greenfield land; the proposed development delivers new affordable housing; the proposed development reflects the scale and density of existing development in the village or hamlet where it is located; the proposed development responds positively to Shipley Parish Design Guidance.

Paragraph 70 of the NPPF outlines that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly. To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should: support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions - giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes.

Paragraph 83 of the NPPF states that “to promote development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.”

Paragraph 84 of the NPPF continues that “planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:

- a) there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;
- b) the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;

- c) the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;
- d) the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential dwelling; or
- e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it:
  - is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and
  - would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

As the site is located outside of any defined built-up area boundary, Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF are of significant weight in the determination of the application. As stated within Policy 3 of the HDPF, development will be permitted within towns and villages that have defined built-up areas; with development in the countryside more strictly controlled through the provisions of Policy 4. This policy states that development outside of built up areas will only be supported where the site is allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan and adjoins a settlement edge. The pre-application site is not identified in the Local Plan and is not allocated within an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed development would not therefore accord with the spatial strategy expressed through Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF, and is considered unacceptable in principle.

In this countryside location, the proposal is also considered against Policy 26 'Countryside Protection' which protects the countryside against inappropriate development unless it is considered essential and appropriate in scale; whilst also meeting one of four criteria. This criteria includes: supporting the needs of agriculture or forestry; enabling the extraction of minerals or the disposal of waste; providing for quiet informal recreational use; or enabling the sustainable development of rural areas. The proposed development would not meet any of this criteria, nor is it considered to be essential to the countryside location.

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.

### **Design and Appearance:**

Policies 25, 32, and 33 of the HDPF promote development that protects, conserves and enhances the landscape and townscape character from inappropriate development. Proposals should take into account townscape characteristics, with development seeking to provide an attractive, functional and accessible environment that complements the locally distinctive character of the district. Buildings should contribute to a sense of place, and should be of a scale, massing, and appearance that is of a high standard or design and layout which relates sympathetically to the landscape and built surroundings.

Policy Ship HD3 of the Shipley Neighbourhood Plan states that all proposals for new development in Shipley Parish are expected to respond positively to local design characteristics and features as set out in the Shipley Parish Design Guidance. New development should be of a size and scale which respects and, where possible, enhances the character of the area or locality, using materials typical of the area.

The application site would be viewed in the context of an open agricultural field, along with commercial and agricultural development. The application site is located within the immediate context of the commercial development, and whilst the proposed dwelling would be located within a narrow plot of land, it is not considered that the proposal in itself would result in harm to the landscape character and visual amenity of the area.

There are however some concerns regarding the design of the proposal. It is understood that given the wider site context, the design appears to be intended to appear as a converted agricultural barn such that from wider views it would reflect the built form to the north and would not be visually incongruous with this context in wider views of the application site. Whilst this rationale is generally accepted, the design of the proposal does not reflect its intention, with the resultant dwellinghouse being overly domestic in appearance. The proposed dwelling would have a large number of windows of a uniform size and appearance that would be noticeably residential in nature. Had the development been

considered acceptable in all other regards, amendments to the proposal to improve the design would have been encouraged.

### **Amenity Impacts:**

Policy 32 of the HDPF states that development will be expected to provide an attractive, functional, accessible, safe, and adaptable environment that contribute a sense of place both in the buildings and spaces themselves. Policy 33 continues that development shall be required to ensure that it is designed to avoid unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupiers/users of nearby property and land.

The proposed dwelling would retain a considerable separation distance of approximately 15 metres such that the resulting relationship is considered sufficient to prevent any unacceptable impacts to the future occupiers in terms of lack of daylight/sunlight, obtrusive appearance or loss of privacy, subject to the addition of an appropriate site boundary treatment.

Historically the application site to the north as agricultural in nature, but has since been converted to class B8 and Class E uses. Environmental Health have been consulted during the course of the application and object to the proposal on the basis of insufficient information in regards to noise, with the future occupiers being potentially impacted by the use of the immediate neighbouring site. Additionally, they note that commercial and agricultural buildings can be subject to significant contamination risks arising from their use, construction and storage of machinery equipment fuels or other chemicals. Due to the immediate proximity of the application site to the commercial uses, a preliminary risk assessment should be provided to ensure the application is properly determined. Information with respect to water neutrality is also required.

Environmental Health concerns are noted, however given that there are other reasons for refusal it would not in this instance be considered advisable to request further information in light of the lack of information. Furthermore, it is considered that the information requested could be submitted as part of a pre-commencement condition and on balance therefore, there are no objections to the proposal in light of policy 33 of the HDPF.

### **Highways Impacts:**

Policies 40 and 41 of the HDPF promote development that provides safe and adequate access, suitable for all users.

Highways have been consulted as part of the proposal and have no objections to the application subject to the inclusion of relevant conditions. The application includes provision for 2 vehicles. There are no objections to the proposal in light of policies 40 and 41 of the HDPF.

The concerns raised within the representations in respect of the ownership of the access are noted, however this would be a civil matter.

### **Ecology:**

Policy 31 of the HDPF states that development will be supported where it demonstrates that it maintains or enhances the existing network of green infrastructure. Development proposals will be required to contribute to the enhancement of existing biodiversity, and should create and manage new habitats where appropriate.

The Council's Ecological consultant has been consulted during the course of the application and have no objections to the proposal on the basis of the submitted reports.

The Naturespace consultant however has objected to the proposal on the basis of insufficient information, noting that the applicant should enter into the District Newt license scheme. It is considered however, that this license could be sought as part of a pre-commencement condition and therefore would not subject to the recommendations within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, not appear to conflict with policy 31 of the HDPF.

## **Water Neutrality:**

The application site falls within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone as defined by Natural England which draws its water supply from groundwater abstraction at Hardham. Natural England has issued a Position Statement for applications within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone which states that it cannot be concluded with the required degree of certainty that new development in this zone would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites.

Natural England advises that plans and projects affecting sites where an existing adverse effect is known will be required to demonstrate, with sufficient certainty, that they will not contribute further to an existing adverse effect. The received advice note advises that the matter of water neutrality should be addressed in assessments to agree and ensure that water use is offset for all new developments within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone.

The application includes a dedicated Water Neutrality statement. Given that the application site consists of an open field, the baseline is considered zero. It has provided proposed figures from a Part G calculator prior to mitigation and post mitigation. Mitigation in the first instance is efficient fixtures and fittings. This brings the total of 314.6 litres per day to 176.2 litres per day, partly given that their non potable water would be supplied by rainwater harvesting. There is a sufficient information submitted in terms of the rainwater calculations with a roof of approximately 200sqm. The tank provided would be of a sufficient size to account for a 35 day drought period. This would leave 176.2 litres per day on site unaccounted for that they suggest they would account for from off site mitigation of credit purchase from Nicholls boreholes.

There are multiple concerns from the first Water Neutrality statement submitted in regards to whether the offsetting could be secured with reasonable certainty. In this instance, at the time of submitting the appropriate assessment, no basic information was submitted in terms of whether an agreement had been achieved between the applicant and the credit supplier. Limited information had also been provided in respect of the viability and sustainability of the bore hole. This form of offsite mitigation would require a s106 legal agreement and would require checks to ensure that these credits were being double counted by the credit supplier. It appeared at this point that no agreement was made and therefore a S106 legal agreement was not sought.

Although no amendments were requested, it is noted that the applicant has submitted two further Water Neutrality during the course of the application, with the most recent being on the 5<sup>th</sup> November, after the Natural England consultation was received objecting to the proposal. Accepting the further Water Neutrality statements would result in delays to the determination which would not result in the proposal overcoming the other material planning considerations which represent reasons for refusal, including the principle of the development. As such, it would be unreasonable to delay the determination by accepting the amendments and requesting further consultation requests from Natural England when the application would still be refused. The application is considered therefore on the basis of the original submission.

These measures are considered not sufficient to avoid adverse effects on the integrity of the interest features of the Arun Valley SPA, SAC & Ramsar site from the development either alone or in combination with other plans and projects.

## **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG):**

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021). This requires that development must achieve at least 10% BNG on all habitats within the development site.

The Applicant has not submitted a biodiversity net gain metric given that the application would form an exemption to the requirements as a self-build residential dwelling.

## **Conclusions:**

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 relevant policies for the determination of this application must be considered as to whether they are 'out of date' (NPPF paragraph 11d).

Paragraph 11(d) states that where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or 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.

Footnote 7 to Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF states that the policies referred to are those in the Framework relating to habitat sites. Insufficient information has however been provided to demonstrate with a sufficient degree of certainty that the proposed development would not contribute to an existing adverse effect upon the integrity of the internationally designated Arun Valley Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar sites by way of increased water abstraction, contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Paragraphs 185 and 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), thus the Local Planning Authority is unable to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority Habitats & Species). On this basis, the titled balance derived from paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF does not apply.

The provision of housing within the HDPF of any type would attract a *significant* weight. However, the Council considers that this benefit would be very *limited* given the small overall contribution to the supply. The degree of contribution that one market dwellinghouses would make is negligible such that the benefit arising from a singular dwelling in tackling the shortage is in questionable significance.

The proposal's ability to demonstrate no adverse amenity impact, safe access and suitable parking and the use of sustainable technologies and improved energy efficiency are not considered benefits to the scheme, but would rather be necessary to demonstrate compliance with local planning policies.

The development would be located beyond a defined built-up area on a site not allocated within the Development Plan and would not be essential to this countryside location. This would be contrary to the development plan in light of policy 26 and would be afforded moderate weight.

The limited benefits afforded to the provision of one market dwellinghouses in the context of a shortfall are acknowledged, however this would not be outweighed by the adverse impacts arising from the development, including the conflict with the development plan (moderate weight) and the site's unsustainable location (significant weight) or adverse effect upon the integrity of the internationally designated Arun Valley Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar sites by way of increased water abstraction. On balance therefore, the proposal is recommended for refusal.

### **Recommendation: Application Refused**

#### **Reason(s) for Refusal:**

- 1 The proposed development would be sited within an unsustainable 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 (2023) 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) and Policy Ship HD1 of the Shipley Parish Neighbourhood Plan.

- 2 Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate with a sufficient degree of certainty that the proposed development would not contribute to an existing adverse effect upon the integrity of the internationally designated Arun Valley Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar sites by way of increased water abstraction, contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Paragraphs 185 and 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), thus the Local Planning Authority is unable to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority Habitats & Species).

## 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/24/1486**

(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 & Block plan | Location and Block Plan                                               | DE1257 / 01<br>REV P1     | 26.09.2024    |
| Floor plan            | Proposed Ground Floor Plan                                            | DE1257 / 02<br>REV P1     | 26.09.2024    |
| Floor plan            | Proposed First Floor Plan                                             | DE1257 / 03<br>REV P1     | 26.09.2024    |
| Roof plan             | Proposed Roof Plan                                                    | DE1257 / 04<br>REV P1     | 26.09.2024    |
| Elevation plan        | Proposed Elevations                                                   | DE1257 / 05<br>REV P1     | 26.09.2024    |
| Site plan             | Site Block Plan                                                       | DE1257 / 06<br>REV P1     | 26.09.2024    |
| Supporting Docs       | Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Arun Ecology dated September 2024 | C-NJA-011-001-001 REV 001 | 26.09.2024    |
| Supporting Docs       | Reptile Survey Report by Arun Ecology dated September 2024            | C-NJA-011-002-001 REV 1   | 26.09.2024    |
| Supporting Docs       | Water Neutrality Report by cgs civils dated 28 June 2024              | C3236 REV P-              | 26.09.2024    |

## DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial      Hannah Darley      Date: 14.11.2024

Authorising Officer sign/initial Tamara Dale

Date: 21.11.2024



This drawing is to be read in conjunction with all other relevant drawings and specifications.  
Do not scale from this drawing. Use figured dimensions only. All levels and dimensions to be checked on site. All dimensional discrepancies are to be brought to the immediate attention of DMA BUILDING DESIGNS.  
Responsibility cannot be accepted for alteration and/or deviation from this design without prior knowledge of DMA BUILDING DESIGNS.  
Copyright reserved. This drawing may only be used for the client and location specified in the title block. It may not be copied or disclosed to any other third party without prior written consent from DMA BUILDING DESIGNS.  
Prior to any works commencing on site, DMA BUILDING DESIGNS is to be contacted regarding the current status, revision or regulatory approval of this drawing.

**Notes**

**STANDARD DOMESTIC B-REGS NOTES**

**A: STRUCTURE**  
For structural elements and connection details please refer to Structural Engineers Calculations and Design Details.

All foundations to be a minimum of 450mm wide and to a depth of 1000mm minimum below outside ground level, (unless otherwise specified) and to the satisfaction of the Local Authority Building Inspector.

**B: FIRE SAFETY**  
Smoke alarms should be installed in all circulation spaces (where a house is extended) in accordance with BS 5839-6:2004. All smoke/heat alarms should mains supplied & have a standby power supply.

Elements of structure which are load bearing should have a minimum Fire Resistance of 30mins. Separating (or party) walls/floors should be constructed to have a minimum Fire Resistance of 60mins.

**E: VENTILATION**  
All ventilation should be designed in accordance with the Systems suggested within Approved Document F:

Background Ventilation;  
- Minimum intermittent extract ventilation rates should be provided as follows - Kitchens > 30l/s (adjacent to a hob) or 60l/s (elsewhere). Utility room > 30l/s. Bathroom > 15l/s. Sanitary Accommodation (WC) > 6l/s.  
- Trickle vents to be provided to all new windows at the following rates - Habitable Rooms > 5000mm². Non-Habitable Rooms > 2500mm².

**H: DRAINAGE & WASTE DISPOSAL**  
Where pipes are laid less than 1000mm below formation level, or less than 900mm in fields & gardens, protection should be provided.  
Rigid pipes of 100mm dia with less than 300mm cover, or 150mm dia pipes or greater with less than 600mm cover should be surrounded in 150mm of concrete with joints at max 500mm crs.  
Flexible pipes with less than 600mm cover, NOT under a road, should be protected with a layer of concrete paving slabs with a 75mm layer of granular material between pipe and slab OR be surrounded in 150mm of concrete.

All sanitary pipework above ground level should comply with BS 5572.  
Waste pipes and unplasticised PVC to BS 2871 Part 1. WC 100mm dia salt-glazed clayware, soil connection to manhole or SVP.  
No connections to be within 200mm of WC connection to SVP. Cleaning access to be provided at all waste pipe angles and at all angles/bends at bases of SVPs.  
SVPs to be encased with timber studwork frame and 12.5mm plasterboard, and, where passing through a habitable room, should be wrapped in sound-reducing quilt.

Gutters should be laid to falls, towards the nearest rainwater downpipe outlet. Such an outlet should discharge into a drain or gully, but may also discharge onto another surface if it is suitably drained thereafter. If surface water is to be discharged into a soakaway, this should be situated a minimum of 5m away from any building.

Prior to commencement of any works on site, the line and level of existing drainage systems is to be established and checks carried out to ensure, i) the proposed extension works are not in conflict with existing runs; and ii) proposed connections to the existing system are achievable.

**K: PROTECTION FROM FALLING**  
Private, domestic staircases should be designed as follows - maximum rise and minimum going of 220mm as long as the pitch of the stair does not exceed 42°. A minimum of 2m headroom should be provided from the pitch line of the stair.

Handrails on flights should be between 900-1000mm when measured from the pitch line of the stair to the top of the handrail. Guarding on any flights and landings should be constructed so that a 100mm sphere cannot pass through any openings in it.

**L1: CONSERVATION OF FUEL & POWER**  
New light fittings within the dwelling should be provided with a minimum of 3 dedicated low energy light fitting out of every 4 new (75%).  
Low energy light fittings should have lamps with a luminous efficacy greater than 45 lamp lumens per circuit-watt and a total output greater than 400 lamp lumens.

All new thermal elements on existing dwellings should be designed to the following minimum U-Values;  
Walls 0.28 w/m²K  
Pitched Roof (insulation at ceiling level) 0.18 w/m²K  
Pitched Roof (insulation at rafter level) 0.18 w/m²K  
Flat roof (or roof with integral insulation) 0.18 w/m²K  
Floors 0.22 w/m²K.

All new glazing in windows/doors etc should be sealed double glazed units with a min 6mm air gap, to give a minimum U-Value of 1.6 w/m²K or better.

**N: GLAZING - SAFETY IN RELATION TO IMPACT**  
All glazing below 800mm from FFL, any glazing to doors, and any glazing within 300mm adjacent to doors (eg. side panels) MUST be safety glass. All first and second floor windows with any part opening within 800mm above FFL must be fitted with opening restrictors to limit opening to a maximum of 100mm (unless the window is to be used for egress - in accordance with Approved Document B of the Building Regulations).

**P: ELECTRICAL SAFETY IN DWELLINGS**  
All new electrical work is to be designed, installed, inspected and tested in accordance with BS 7671. On completion of the works, the installers Electrical Installation Certificate should be forwarded to the Local Authority.

**REGULATION 7: MATERIALS & WORKMANSHIP**  
Any building work which is subject to the requirements imposed by Schedule 1 of the Building Regulations should, in accordance with Regulation 7, be carried out with proper materials and in a workmanlike manner.

|     |                              |         |
|-----|------------------------------|---------|
| P1  | ISSUED FOR PLANNING APPROVAL | 08.2024 |
| REV | DESCRIPTION                  | DATE    |

**DMA BUILDING DESIGNS**

KILN HOUSE, RUDGWICK BRICKWORKS, LYNNICK ST  
RUDGWICK, HORSHAM, WEST SUSSEX, RH12 3DH.  
TEL No 01403 822220 Mobile 07730 523447  
Email - info@dmabuildingdesigns.co.uk

CLIENT  
**VIC SAWYER**

PROJECT  
**NEW DOMESTIC DWELLING**

DRAWING  
**LOCATION AND BLOCK PLAN**  
**THORNHILL STABLES LAND, BILLINGSBURST ROAD,**  
**COOLHAM, RH13 8QN**

STATUS  
**PLANNING**

|                             |                     |                       |                |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| SCALE @ A1<br>1:1250, 1:500 | DATE<br>AUGUST 2024 | DRG No<br>DE1257 / 01 | REVISION<br>P1 |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------|