



PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT - ADDENDUM

TO: Planning Committee North

BY: Head of Development and Building Control

DATE: 11 April 2024

DEVELOPMENT: Demolition of existing amenity building, removal of two yurts and associated infrastructure. Change of use of land to residential and erection of 1no single storey dwellinghouse incorporated into the landscape

SITE: Holme Farm Orchard, Winterpit Lane, Mannings Heath, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 6LZ

WARD: Nuthurst and Lower Beeding

APPLICATION: DC/22/2045

APPLICANT: **Name:** Mr and Mrs Wayne Bayley **Address:** Holme Farm Orchard, Winterpit Lane, Mannings Heath, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 6LZ

- 1.1 Members are advised that the previous committee report made available to the public on 21/03/2024 has omitted accurate Parish council comments.
- 1.2 Officers draw attention to paragraph 3.2 in reference to Nuthurst Parish Council comments. These comments are removed for consideration and are replaced with the following. The Parish would like to object to the proposal for the following reasons:
 - Outside of BUAB
 - Site not in Lower Beeding's Neighbourhood plan
 - Development in the countryside
 - Believe the site to be a Greenfield site
 - Out of character with surrounding properties
 - Noise implications from neighbouring hotel
 - Parish council not in a position to comment on water neutrality or sustainability
- 1.3 In addition to the above Parish council objection, Lower Beeding Parish council have also commented neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application. The reasons for comment were for the following:
 - Design
 - Loss of general amenity
 - Other

The Parish council made the additional comments of '*The Lower Beeding Parish Council (PC) were divided on this application. They were supportive of the design and layout of the proposed new building however there were the following comments regarding their concerns about the project:*

- 1/ *The site is currently a tourist attraction with Yurts on the site. The proposal would take away the attraction and thereby any local employment.*
- 2/ *The proposed building will be in the proximity of a wedding venue (Brookfield Barn) which frequently hold many functions outside if weather permits.*
- 3/ *The site is outside the Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB) and was not proposed in the*

4/ The PC disputed the applicants claim that this is classed as a brownfield site.'

- 1.4 Whilst paragraph 6.5 of the committee report highlighted that paragraph 84 of the NPPF was formerly known as paragraph 80, paragraph 7.1 of the report has omitted mention of the new paragraph numbering. For the avoidance of doubt, the first reason for the recommendation of refusal is:
- The development is within a countryside location outside of the built-up area boundary of any settlement on a site which has not been allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework or an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. The development would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchical approach of concentrating development within the main settlements and is not essential to its countryside location. There are no material considerations which outweigh this harm, and the development is not considered an exceptional circumstance when considering the requirements of Paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023). The proposal therefore represents unsustainable development contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).*
- 1.5 A further amendment is made to the committee report in regards to 6.35 where it is noted that the applicant had sent in an environmental agency licence to impound water. Whilst this is noted, it would not be considered to overcome concern with regards to water neutrality. It is further noted that the numbering for paragraph 6.35 has been repeated twice.
- 1.6 It is noted that since the committee report has been made publicly available, an additional letter of representation has been received due to concern over design, highway access and parking, loss of general amenity, privacy, light and noise, concern over river running dry.
- 2 A letter received from the applicant raises concerns with the committee report in regards to several points. These include:
- 1) That the report raises concerns with insufficient information when insufficient information was not requested.
 - 2) The applicant believes that the dwellinghouse would be self sufficient which would make it 'unique' and that councillors should have an opportunity to decide if they believe the application is 'exceptional'.
 - 3) Believe that the proposal would be water neutral such that this should not be a reason for refusal.
 - 4) The Environmental Agency licence is not included in the report.
- 2.1 In response to the first point raised within the applicant's letter, an application should be determined based on the information provided, and any meaningful engagement should take place at pre-application stage. Furthermore, in such instances where there are multiple concerns, additional information will not be requested where it is not considered that it will overcome reason for refusal.
- 2.2 In response to the second point raised within the applicant's letter, it is considered that the application will be determined at committee such that councillors will have an opportunity to assess the application on its merits. The NPPF does though set out the policy test and there are various appeal decisions which discuss what is exceptional.
- 2.3 In response to the third and fourth points raised within the applicants letter, the Licence sent on by the applicant in regards to the Environmental Agency does not form part of the

submitted proposed water neutrality strategy, which instead relies on the existing water use of the site. Further technical information would be needed if this is to be proposed as a strategy with further consultation necessary with Natural England.

3 Officers remain of the view that the application should be refused for the reasons set out within section 7 of the Officers' report.

END