



**TO:** Planning Committee North

**BY:** Head of Development

**DATE:** 8 September 2020

**DEVELOPMENT:** Removal of mobile home and erection of replacement dwelling for a rural worker

**SITE:** Perrets Smithers Hill Lane Shipley West Sussex RH13 8PP

**WARD:** Southwater South and Shipley

**APPLICATION:** DC/20/0805

**APPLICANT:** **Name:** Mr N Millard **Address:** c/o Agent City Place Gatwick RH6 0PA

**REASON FOR INCLUSION ON THE AGENDA:** More than 8 letters received contrary to Officer recommendation

**RECOMMENDATION:** To refuse planning permission

**1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT**

1.1 To consider the planning application.

**DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION**

- 1.2 The proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of a new two-storey, 4-bed detached rural workers dwelling and the removal of the existing mobile home located adjacent to the older barns on site, slightly east of the application site. The proposal seeks to increase the size and scale of the rural workers dwelling as previously approved under planning reference DC/18/1326 (September 2018) from a 3-bed to a 4-bed dwelling (inclusive of 1 bedroom for a groom) and includes alterations to the access and parking arrangements previously approved.
- 1.3 The proposed rural workers dwelling is located alongside an open-fronted barn (itself a recent addition to the farmland), in the same location as the previously approved scheme for a 3-bed rural workers dwelling. The new dwelling would have a footprint of approximately 191sqm, with a total ground and first floor area of 372.68sqm as compared to the previous scheme which had a total floor area of 160sqm for family use, with no grooms accommodation included. The total floor area identified for family use is 275.27sqm (over ground and first floor) equivalent to nearly 74% of the total floor area, and 97.4sqm (over ground and first floor) equivalent to just over 26% of the total floor area proposed for farm use.
- 1.4 The new dwelling would include brick elevations to the ground floor and tile-hanging above, with a full ridged roof and front and rear wall-dormers. Parking and turning would be provided

to the front (south) side of the new dwelling and the overall site area is indicated to be some 1037sqm compared to the previous site area of 517sqm.

- 1.5 The location is stated to have been chosen as alternative locations (i.e. closer to the stables) would potentially disturb the mares during foaling, particularly if the employee living in the property has a family. It is intended to improve direct access from the dwelling to the stables.
- 1.6 A previous application was submitted under planning reference DC/19/2443 for the same proposal but was subsequently withdrawn by the agent as there was insufficient information to adequately justify the increase in the size of the proposed dwelling at the time.
- 1.7 Since the application was submitted, and as this report was prepared, the applicant has provided additional information seeking to justify this application.

#### DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

- 1.8 The application relates to a sizable farm holding which includes both equine and agricultural elements, both used to generate income for the property. Perrets Farm comprises of 16.2 hectares (40 acres) of grassland and has a mixed agricultural and private equestrian use and is owned by Neill Millard, the applicant.
- 1.9 The applicant runs a privately-owned equestrian enterprise comprising two stable buildings containing a total of 16 stables, tack rooms, wash facilities, a 60m by 30m manège and a storage building. It is understood that the manège forms part of the training facility for applicant's horses. It is advised that hay and haylage are produced on the holding, however it is noted that there is no mention of the additional rented land used for hay production and grazing which was previously noted in the submission documents for application DC/18/1326.
- 1.10 The applicant owns 6 brood mares and 12 sport horses which are kept on site. The site visit revealed that the applicant has been breeding horses as a hobby for 20 years with foaling taking place normally during the spring and early summer. It is advised that the applicant's family is fully involved in the equestrian operations on site although they live off site. The applicant employs a full-time groom (equine worker) to manage the horses. The justification statement notes the requirement to provide accommodation for an experienced equine worker who will be involved in the foaling of mares and training of horses. This has been accepted by RAC and the Council in the permitting of application DC/18/1326.
- 1.11 There is a small agricultural enterprise comprising approximately 50 South Down breeding ewes on site and there has been no change in these numbers since the previous application. The justification statement advises that the applicant is looking to expand this agricultural enterprise to approximately 100 breeding ewes and this will be done slowly over the forthcoming years. This expansion was previously noted in the earlier application, albeit the expansion was over the following two years. This change in farm policy has no further explanation. The applicant has a DEFRA holding number and has an agricultural Single Business Identifier number registered with the Rural Payments Agency (RPA).
- 1.12 The planning history on the site indicates that in 2017, a new agricultural barn was permitted adjacent to the application site for purposes of housing the unwrapped hay bales and machinery, as the existing barn on the land was too small to accommodate all storage requirements. In 2014, permission was granted for the existing mobile home on the farm, for year-round use by a full-time groom employed at the farm; a groom has since occupied this mobile home since at least 2014. Prior to this, planning history indicates that the mobile home, on site since 2003, had previously been occupied by up to 6 polo players.

## 2. INTRODUCTION

### STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

### RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

- 2.2 The following Policies are considered to be relevant to the assessment of this application:

#### **National Planning Policy Framework**

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

Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development  
Policy 2 - Strategic Policy: Strategic Development  
Policy 10 - Rural Economic Development  
Policy 20 - Rural Workers Accommodation  
Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection  
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character  
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection  
Policy 29 - Equestrian Development  
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 39 - Strategic Policy: Infrastructure Provision  
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport  
Policy 41 – Parking

### RELEVANT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

- 2.3 There is no made plan for the parish.

### PLANNING HISTORY AND RELEVANT APPLICATIONS

- 2.4 The most recent and relevant planning history is as follows:

DC/19/2443	Removal of existing mobile home and erection of a detached two storey rural workers dwelling	Withdrawn Application on 30.01.2020
DC/17/1843	Construction of barn for storage of agricultural machinery and equipment in association with the production of hay and the grazing and breeding of sheep.	Application Permitted on 12.10.2017
DC/18/1326	Removal of existing mobile home and erection of a detached two storey rural workers dwelling	Application Permitted on 20.09.2018
DC/15/1630	Prior approval for change of use from agricultural building to dwelling (C3 Use class)	Prior Approval Required and REFUSED on 03.09.2015

## 3. OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1 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)

#### INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

- 3.2 **Reading Agricultural Adviser: Objection (June 2020)**
- Overall if the dwelling is to be considered as a rural worker's dwelling, the proposed amendments to include the increased size of the dwelling is not of a scale that is commensurate with the needs of a full-time rural worker or the level of activity of the applicant's private Equine enterprise and is therefore considered to be contrary to the NPPF and Local Plan Policy 26 and Policy 29.
  - RAC continues to accept that there is an established essential need for a rural worker's dwelling at Perrets Farm. This need is met by the existing mobile home on site and the proposed size of the dwelling as identified in the plans permitted in DC/18/1326.

#### Response to Further Information (July 2020)

- Overall, the RAC still holds the view that if the dwelling is to be considered as a rural worker's dwelling, the proposed amendments to include the increased size of the dwelling is not of a scale that is commensurate with the needs of a full-time rural worker or the level of activity of the applicant's private equine enterprise and is therefore considered to be contrary to the NPPF and Local Plan Policy 26 and Policy 29.
- RAC continues to accept that there is an established essential need for a rural worker's dwelling at Perrets Farm. If it is accepted that the applicant and his family provide the majority of the labour that meets that need and there is no requirement to employ a full-time rural worker, the overall size of dwelling should be reduced significantly.

#### OUTSIDE AGENCIES

- 3.3 **WSCC Highways: No objection** subject to comments
- 3.4 **WSCC Fire & Rescue Services: Comment**. Conditions are recommended regarding a fire hydrant to be provided.
- 3.5 **Southern Water: Comment**. There are no public foul sewers in the area to serve this development. The applicant is advised to examine alternative means of foul disposal. It is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.

#### PARISH COUNCIL

- 3.6 **Shingley Parish Council – No objections**

#### PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

- 3.7 10 neighbour letters have been received (from 10 different households) **supporting** the proposal on the following grounds:
- The proposal makes best use of the land and will enable the family to live and work on the premises without the need for travel.
  - The proposal is an improvement. The dwelling is sympathetic to the area and will not be readily visible.
  - The proposal supports rural enterprise with no negative impact on close by neighbours.

#### **4. HOW THE PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION WILL PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS**

- 4.1 Article 8 (Right to respect of a Private and Family Life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to this application, Consideration of Human rights forms part of the planning assessment below.

#### **5. HOW THE PROPOSAL WILL HELP TO REDUCE CRIME AND DISORDER**

- 5.1 It is not considered that the development would be likely to have any significant impact on crime and disorder.

#### **6. PLANNING ASSESSMENTS**

- 6.1 The main issues in this case are considered to be:-
- The principle of development
  - The impact on the visual amenities of the countryside
  - The amenities of the occupiers of adjoining properties
  - The existing parking and traffic conditions in the area
  - Justification for the proposed development

##### **Background**

- 6.2 In 2018 planning permission was granted for the removal of existing mobile home and erection of a detached two storey rural workers dwelling. Given the existing extant permission granted under DC/18/1326, it is considered that the principle of a workers dwelling on the site has therefore been previously established.
- 6.3 In 2019 a further permission was submitted under DC/19/2443. The consultation response relating to that application from Reading Agricultural Consultants (RAC) concluded that *'Overall it is considered that there is an established essential need to meet the daily requirements of the applicant's private equestrian enterprise at Perrets Farm. This has been accepted by the Council in permitting a permanent rural worker's dwelling under DC/18/1326. The proposed amendments under application (DC/19/2443) significantly increase the size of the permanent rural worker's dwelling. RAC considers that the proposed increase in size of the dwelling has not been justified for a rural worker and is not of an appropriate scale commensurate with the needs of a full-time rural worker employed by the applicant's private equestrian unit and would be contrary to Local Plan Policy 26 and Policy 29'*. This application was subsequently withdrawn as insufficient justification for the increase in the size of the rural workers dwelling was provided with the application.
- 6.4 The current application under DC/20/0805 seeks to address the concerns raised by RAC in respect of the increase in size of the rural workers accommodation subject to this application. The details are the same as the proposals submitted and subsequently withdrawn under DC/19/2443, but further clarification has been provided regarding the split of accommodation proposed to be used by Neill Millard and his family and the part to be used for the employed rural worker which is integral to the proposed dwelling.
- 6.5 The Council's agricultural adviser has assessed the submitted supporting information and has advised that the thrust of the applicant's supporting information in previous cases was that in order to attract and retain a suitably experienced equine worker to manage the applicant's privately funded equine enterprise, the removal and replacement of the permitted mobile home with a permanent rural worker's dwelling would be acceptable in planning terms for an isolated dwelling in the countryside. The Council in approving the application agreed

that there was an essential need for a rural worker to live on site, manage the horses and ensure their welfare was not compromised.

- 6.6 The provision of residential accommodation at Perrets Farm for the applicant and his family (who live locally off-site) was not considered to be part of the application (DC/18/1326) in any of the submitted plans and supporting documents for the proposed rural worker's dwelling notably the "*Planning Design and Access Statement (June 2018) prepared by NJA Town Planning Ltd, the applicant's agent*", and "*A agricultural justification statement (undated) prepared by Robert Schiller of Sussex Rural Planning*".
- 6.7 As such it is necessary to consider whether there has been a change in circumstances that justify the increase in the size and scale of the proposed rural workers dwelling as sought. This is considered in more detail below.

### **Principle**

- 6.8 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has a golden thread running through it which seeks to ensure a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The NPPF seeks to ensure that the planning system performs an economic, social and environmental role, and requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the local development plan. Paragraph 79 of the NPPF advises that new isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided, unless there are special circumstances involved, such as the essential need for a rural worker, including those taking the majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside.
- 6.9 Section 5 of the NPPF is concerned with 'Delivering a sufficient supply of homes' and at paragraph 79 it notes:
- "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;...*"
- 6.10 New Planning Practice Guidance 'Housing Needs of Different Groups' (July 2019) provides some guidance relevant to paragraph 79 of the NPPF in the section '*How can the need for isolated homes in the countryside for essential rural workers be assessed?*' These include:
- *"Evidence of the necessity for a rural worker to live at or in close proximity to their place of work to ensure the effective operation of agricultural, forestry or similar land-based rural enterprise (for instance where farm animals or agricultural processes require on-site attendance 24 hours a day and where otherwise there would be a risk to human or animal health or from crime, or to deal quickly with emergencies that could cause serious loss of crops or products);*
  - *The degree to which there is confidence that the enterprise will remain viable for the foreseeable future;*
  - *Whether the provision of an additional dwelling on site is essential for the continued viability of a farming business through the farm succession process;*
  - *Whether the need could be met through improvements to existing accommodation on the site; providing such improvements are appropriate taking into account their scale, appearance and the local context; and*
  - *In the case of new enterprises whether it is appropriate to consider granting permission for a temporary dwelling for a trial period."*
- 6.11 It further notes that "*Employment on an assembly or food packing line, or the need to accommodate seasonal workers, will generally not be sufficient to justify building isolated rural dwellings*"

- 6.12 Policy 20 of the HDPF states "Outside the defined built-up area new housing for rural workers will be supported provided that;
- a) There is a functional need for the dwelling and the occupation of the dwelling is to support the established business use.
  - b) Evidence is submitted to demonstrate the viability of the rural business for which the housing is required."
- 6.13 Parts a) and b) of the policy are required to ensure that only development which can justify a countryside location may be permitted in order to protect the character and appearance of the countryside. In order to demonstrate that there is an essential need for a worker to live on site, it is necessary to consider whether it is essential for the proper functioning of the enterprise for one or more workers to be readily available at most times. Such a requirement might arise, for example, if workers are needed to be on hand day and night:
- in case animals or agricultural processes require essential care at short notice;
  - to deal quickly with emergencies that could otherwise cause serious loss of crops or products, for example, by frost damage or the failure of automatic systems.
- 6.14 The Council in approving DC/18/1326 have previously accepted there is an essential need for a resident on-site full-time equine worker and therefore the principle of a rural workers dwelling on site in terms of need has been established. Whilst this is the case, a much larger rural workers dwelling is now sought and it is therefore necessary to consider whether the size and scale of the proposed rural workers dwelling is appropriate to meet the needs of the rural worker or the level of activity of the applicant's private equine enterprise.
- 6.15 Policy 26 of the HDPF requires that development outside the built-up area boundaries to be essential to its countryside location in order to protect the rural character and undeveloped nature of the countryside against inappropriate development. In addition, it must meet one of the following criteria:
- 1) Support the needs of agriculture or forestry
  - 2) Enable the extraction of minerals or the disposal of waste
  - 3) Provide for quite informal recreational uses, or
  - 4) Enable the sustainable development of rural areas
- 6.16 Additionally, Policy 26 of the HDPF requires that development does not lead, cumulatively or individually, to a significant increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside, and protects, and/or conserves, and/or enhances the key features and characteristics of the landscape character in which it is located.
- 6.17 Whilst equestrian uses are not considered to be 'agricultural', they are generally acceptable land uses within a rural location. It is generally held that new permanent rural dwellings should only be allowed to support existing agricultural / rural activities on well-established agricultural / rural units, and where the unit and rural activity should have been established for at least three years and have been profitable for at least one of them, along with being financially sound and having a clear prospect of remaining so.
- 6.18 RAC in its appraisal of DC/18/1326 for the 'Removal of mobile home and erection of replacement dwelling for the employed rural worker' concluded that "*Overall it is considered that there is an established essential need to meet the daily requirements of the applicant's private equestrian enterprise at Perrets Farm. This is currently met by the permitted mobile home on site*". The Council in approving DC/18/1326 have accepted there is an essential need for a resident on-site full-time equine worker.
- 6.19 The justification statement has provided details of the labour requirements for the applicant's privately owned horses using the Andersons Business Equine Guide. The labour requirement for the 18 horses is calculated at 4.69 full-time workers. Whilst RAC accepts the

calculation, it notes that this is only a guide to the labour requirement and does not imply there is an essential need for that number of workers to live on the site. The applicant has permission for an employed resident groom and this continues to be met by the mobile home and would then be met by the erection of a permanent dwelling permitted under DC/18/1326.

- 6.20 RAC have advised that there is no information in the 'Justification Statement' that there has been any changes to the management, breeding policy and organisation of the well-established privately owned equine enterprise that requires an essential need for more than one person to be resident on the holding. RAC also advise that the use of CCTV camera systems are commonly used in many equine breeding establishments to alert the equine worker to imminent foaling, or other emergencies, where prompt action is required by the resident full-time worker.
- 6.21 RAC note in the supporting information that the applicant has a small sheep breeding enterprise which lamb in the spring, and that the justification statement infers there is, in addition to the privately run equine enterprise, a labour requirement for the sheep enterprise. RAC advise that this is an agricultural enterprise and would be considered a commercial agricultural business as the applicant will be selling stock. As such if this is considered to have an additional and valid essential need it would have to be supported by a viability statement. In the previous submission (DC/18/1326) it was made clear that the groom had responsibility for the sheep enterprise and therefore any essential need at lambing would have been met by the existing mobile home and now the approved rural workers dwelling. RAC is not aware that the labour management of the flock has changed and notes that for 100 sheep the labour requirement would be 38 Standard Man Days (SMD). A full time requirement equates to 275 SMD.
- 6.22 In terms of the justification for a larger rural workers dwelling on the site, in the previous appraisal of the application submitted under DC/19/2443 (withdrawn) it was concluded by the Council's agricultural advisor that *"the proposed amendments DC/19/2443 significantly increase the size of the permanent rural worker's dwelling"* and that *'RAC considers that the proposed increase in size of the dwelling has not been justified for a rural worker and is not of an appropriate scale commensurate with the needs of a full-time rural worker employed by the applicant's private equestrian unit and would be contrary to Local Plan Policy 26 and Policy 29'*. In RAC's appraisal of DC/18/1326 (approved scheme) the Design and Access Statement noted that the dwelling *'...provides three bedrooms, one with en-suite facilities, and a family bathroom at first floor level, with a kitchen/diner, utility room, lounge and study downstairs. The main footprint of the dwelling measures 12.35m by 7.1m with a small projection at the north-eastern end to accommodate the utility room'*.
- 6.23 The latest Design and Access Statement for DC/20/0805, the subject of this application, notes that *"the revised proposal comprises a detached 2 storey dwelling. It provides four bedrooms, two with en-suite facilities, and a family bathroom at first floor level. One of the en-suite rooms is designated as accommodation for the groom, along with a small box room. On the ground floor, a kitchen/breakfast room, living and dining room are provided for the family, with specially designated areas for a farm office/groom's rest area, wc, utility/laundry room and store room for the groom/equestrian use. The main footprint of the dwelling measures 20.5m by a maximum of 13.9m in an approximate H-shape"*
- 6.24 RAC still has concerns with the size of the dwelling, increasing from the original provision of a floor area of 160m<sup>2</sup> over 1.5 floors to a total of 372.68m over two floors, if it is specifically designated for a full-time rural worker. The amended plans identify one en-suite bedroom for a rural worker, the remaining three bedrooms with one en-suite are for the applicant and his family who currently live off-site. RAC is concerned that the floor area identified within the proposed amended and enlarged dwelling, with the availability of only one bedroom (even though en-suite) for a worker will limit the applicant's future and potential employment of an experienced groom and his family. Furthermore, no justification has been given for the

families 'essential need' to be on site or justification for the increased size and scale of the rural workers dwelling as sought.

- 6.25 The applicants have submitted further information to justify the larger dwelling. The RAC have commented that the justification does not overcome their concerns that the size of the dwelling is not commensurate with the needs of a full-time rural worker or the level of activity of applicant's private equine enterprise. The RAC accept that there is an established essential need for a rural worker's dwelling at Perrets Farm. The applicant has stated that his family can provide the majority of the labour that meets that need and there is no requirement to employ a full-time rural worker. RAC would note that if the applicant and his family are now saying they provide all or the majority of the labour input and this can be justified and meets the essential need of the enterprise, then RAC would accept that there is no longer a requirement to employ a rural worker or provide accommodation for a rural worker. Under such circumstances RAC would expect to see the size of the proposed house reduced significantly. Therefore, there is no requirement or justification for such a large dwelling as is proposed and the overall size should be reduced significantly.
- 6.26 Whilst it is noted that there are no objections raised by Parish or neighbours to the increase in size and scale of the proposed rural workers dwelling, it is not considered that the increase in floor area is justified, and as such the scheme cannot be supported and is therefore considered to be contrary to the NPPF and Local Plan Policy 20 and Policy 26.

#### **Design and Appearance:**

- 6.27 Policy 32 of the HDPF requires new development to 'Complement locally distinctive characters and heritage of the district', 'Contribute a sense of place both in the buildings and spaces themselves and in the way they integrate with their surroundings'. Policy 33 of the HDPF requires developments to relate sympathetically with the built surroundings.
- 6.28 The proposed dwelling would have a ridge height of approximately 8.2m as compared to 7.6m as previously approved and would have a maximum width of 20.5m by 13.9m in depth as compared with 12.4m width by 7.1m depth as previously approved. In terms of its size, the dwelling would therefore be significantly more imposing than that of the previously approved rural workers dwelling which has a more traditional and simple architectural design and reflected the size and scale of a typical rural workers dwelling.
- 6.29 It is considered that the cumulative impact of both size and scale of the proposed rural workers dwelling and its location would render the built form conspicuous within the wider landscape when viewed from the access track that continues past the application site and forms a public right of way, albeit that it but would be set alongside a recently completed barn and grouped within the wider complex of structures close by. These are considered to be rural structures that are considered typical within the countryside and are not out of keeping with their rural surroundings, unlike the large scale rural workers dwelling proposed.
- 6.30 It is considered that the scale of the proposed dwelling and its siting would result in an unacceptable intrusion to visual amenities of the wider landscape character and that the proposed development conflicts with policies 25, 32 and 33 of the HDPF.

#### **Amenity Impacts:**

- 6.31 Policy 33 of the HDPF seeks to avoid unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity. The nearest residential and farm properties are separated by significant distances with intervening landscaping features and buildings, with Butterstocks Farm and Butterstocks Cottage to the north-east (some 280m at the closest) and Ashbrook to the south-east (some 290m). Given these distances involved, there would be no adverse impact to neighbouring residential amenity as a result of the proposed new staff dwelling on this site.

### Highways Impacts:

- 6.32 Whilst the LHA notes the existing access to the wider site off the publically maintained highway is sub-standard, and does not meet the current required visibility splays, it is noted that this is an existing and established vehicular access to the site and that the proposal to replace an existing mobile home with a dwelling would not lead to a material intensification of the access and use over and beyond that currently exists. The new access layout and parking provision to the rear of the dwelling is considered acceptable.
- 6.33 Overall, the proposal would not lead to a 'severe' impact on the operation of the highway network which would be contrary to the NPPF or local planning policies. The proposed development is considered to accord with Policy 41 of the HDPF.

### Conclusions and Planning Balance:

- 6.34 In conclusion, the site lies in the countryside where the rural policies of restraint apply. In exceptional circumstances development plan policies do provide support for the provision of new dwellings to support essential rural workers. However, in this case, it is not considered that the information provided justifies the families 'essential need' to be on site or for the increase in size and scale of the rural workers dwelling as sought. The Council's agricultural advisor reports that they have seen no information in the 'Justification Statement' that there have been any changes to the management, breeding policy and organisation of the well-established privately owned equine enterprise that requires an essential need for more than one person to be resident on the holding.

#### COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

- 6.35 Horsham District Council has adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule which took effect on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2017.
- 6.36 **It is considered that this development constitutes CIL liable development.** At the time of drafting this report the proposal involves the following:

Use Description	Proposed	Existing	Net Gain
District Wide Zone 1	372.68		372.68
		<b>Total Gain</b>	<b>372.68</b>
		<b>Total Demolition</b>	<b>0</b>

- 6.38 Please note that exemptions and/or reliefs may be applied for up until the commencement of a chargeable development.
- 6.39 In the event that planning permission is granted, a CIL Liability Notice will be issued thereafter. CIL payments are payable on commencement of development.

## 7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 That planning permission is refused permission for the reason set out below:

#### Reasons for Refusal:

1. It has not been demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, that there is suitable and sufficient justification for an agricultural workers dwelling of this size on the site. The proposed dwelling is not considered to be essential to the countryside location and is contrary to policies 20 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

2. The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its scale and prominence in this rural setting, would encroach into the countryside and detract from the visual amenity and landscape character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 25(1), 26, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Background Papers: DC/20/0805