

Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0423/26

Recommendation – Refuse

Site: Gardeners Arms, West Street, Sompting

Proposal: Change of use from Public House with flat over into full residential dwelling including relevant internal and external changes

Date of site visit: 10th Nov 2025

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to the Gardeners Arms Pub on the south side of West Street within the Sompting Conservation Area. It is a two storey building with a pub on the ground floor and residential flat at first floor. An old railway carriage is attached to the rear of the building and can be accessed from one of the bars.

It is proposed to change the use of the pub to residential and to carry out works to enable its conversion to a single dwelling. The plans show the property will have 4 bedrooms on the upper floors. The ground floor will comprise a lounge, kitchen, dining room, games room and snug. The cellar floor is to be lowered to provide a minimum 2.3m ceiling height to enable its use as an additional living room. Internal works include the removal of the bar, removal of the existing staircase and construction of new staircase.

There are alterations to the windows and doors on the west elevation and the provision of a small front garden, to be secured by a new low level wall and access gate.

A previous application (AWDM/1285/25) was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal would result in the loss of an existing community facility and it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that it is no longer viable, there is no demand for the facility within the area or that the premises have been marketed for a reasonable period of time. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 33 of the Adur Local Plan and Paragraph 98 of the NPPF.

2. The proposed rear dormer extension would, by reason of its size and design, be an unsympathetic addition which would be harmful to the character of the building and the Conservation Area, contrary to Policies 15 and 17 of the Adur Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' and the NPPF

The current application has removed the roof extensions and has provided a more detailed viability assessment and background information.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/1285/25 Change of use from Public House with flat over into full residential dwelling including relevant internal and external changes and loft conversion with dormer, half-gable end and roof windows.

Consultations

West Sussex County Council Highways: No objection from a transport/highways aspect subject to conditions to secure car and cycle parking.

Comments that the site is served by an existing vehicle access, which appears suitable to serve the proposed use. In addition, the proposed development is not anticipated to give rise to a material intensification of use of the existing vehicle access point.

Provision for three off-street car parking spaces can be provided, and this would be considered sufficient for a dwelling of this size and location. The LHA would request that secure cycle parking provision also be provided, to promote the use of sustainable transport methods.

In summary, the LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal

The **Environmental Health** officer has no objection

Planning Policy: The site is within the Sompting Conservation Area, Local Green Gap and is designated as countryside. The application is for a change of use from a Public House to single residential dwelling. There is therefore not anticipated to be any impact on the Conservation Area.

The proposed change of use will result in the loss of a public house. Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 33 defines pubs as a social and community facility where evidence demonstrates they have a community value. Whilst there have been nominations made for the building to be included on the register of assets of community value in 2023 and 2025 both of these were withdrawn. However, paragraph 98 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2025 includes pubs within the definition of community facilities without any dependencies on the services and facilities they offer. Therefore, the loss of the pub as a community facility should be considered in determining the application.

The NPPF and Adur Local Plan set different policy tests when considering the loss of a community facility.

The NPPF requires that planning decisions should:

a) plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments;

b) take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community;
c) guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs;
d) ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise, and are retained for the benefit of the community; and
e) ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services (NPPF paragraph 98) NPPF paragraph 98 part c) is therefore relevant to this application.

Policy 33 of the Adur Local Plan builds on this and sets further detail for how this should be considered and assessed:

Development which would result in the loss of existing social or community facilities will only be permitted where:

- It can be demonstrated there is no demand for the facility within the area and the premises have been marketed for a reasonable period of time; or
- There is alternative provision available locally that is accessible, and at least equivalent in terms of quality; or
- The proposed development would provide an alternative social and community facility (Adur Local Plan 2017, Policy 33).

As there is no alternative provision available locally and the proposed development will not provide alternative provision this application needs to be assessed against bullet point 1 and therefore consideration given as to whether it can be demonstrated that there is no demand for the facility within the area and the premises have been marketed for a reasonable period of time; to be consistent with the Adur Local Plan and the NPPF.

The submitted Planning, Design & Access Statement dated April 2026 includes information on marketing and demand. A viability assessment has also been submitted to address this policy requirement. Recommend that in determining this application a key consideration will be whether the information submitted demonstrates that the test set out in Adur Local Plan Policy 33 relating to demand for the facility and marketing has been met. The weight placed on Policy 33 will need to be considered within the context of housing supply. The latest published Adur Five Year Housing Land Supply 2025- 2030 (March 2026) concluded that the council can demonstrate that a total of 2,115 homes are deliverable within this period, equating to 3.2 years of housing land supply against the Standard Methodology figure of 549 plus a 20% buffer (=659). This means that the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in paragraph 11 d) applies

Heritage Consultant: Objects. The site lies within the Sompting Conservation Area and the building, although not listed, is a visually prominent former public house on West Street which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area through its age, scale, traditional form, frontage relationship with the street, and contribution to the historic village streetscape. Ordnance Survey mapping dates the public house to at least 1898 and, as a pre-1919 building retaining historic and townscape interest, it should be treated as a non-designated heritage asset. The relevant statutory duty is section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which requires special attention to be paid to

the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. The application must also be assessed against section 16 of the NPPF, including the requirement to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, and against Adur Local Plan Policies 15, 16 and 17, which seek high quality design and development that preserves or enhances the historic environment.

Moving on from the initial heritage context, it is acknowledged that the scheme has removed some elements previously identified as harmful. However, the proposal still includes large box dormers within the roofscape. These would be uncharacteristic additions within the Sompting Conservation Area and would be visible from the public realm. Their scale, form and bulk would introduce an overly muscular and top-heavy addition to the building, disrupting the traditional roof form and diminishing the aesthetic contribution the former public house currently makes to West Street and the wider conservation area.

The Gardeners Arms derives part of its positive contribution from its established proportions, comparatively simple roofscape and traditional late nineteenth-century character. The proposed box dormers would appear as assertive and poorly integrated roof additions rather than subordinate alterations. In views from West Street and the surrounding public realm they would compete with, rather than respect, the existing building form. This would erode the character and appearance of the conservation area and would also affect the wider historic setting within which nearby listed buildings are experienced. The harm would not arise from the principle of residential conversion, but from the detailed form of the roof alterations now proposed. In relation to paragraph 207 of the NPPF, the applicant has identified that the site lies within the Sompting Conservation Area and has provided some contextual information on the building, the conservation area and the previous reason for refusal. However, the submitted information does not provide a sufficiently clear or proportionate assessment of the significance of the affected heritage assets, the contribution made by the existing roof form, or the impact of the proposed box dormers on the conservation area and wider setting of listed buildings. Paragraph 207 is therefore only partly satisfied, and the information submitted does not adequately justify the harmful roof additions.

In addition to the physical impact of the proposed roof alterations, the public house use itself has heritage relevance within this modest linear settlement. The Gardeners Arms has historically provided a community focus within West Street and has contributed to the social cohesion and lived character of the conservation area. Its function as a meeting place and local amenity forms part of the way in which the settlement is experienced, supporting not only social activity but also the practical attractiveness of occupation within the surrounding historic building stock. The permanent loss of the public house would therefore remove an important community focus and, in the Council's view, would risk weakening the amenity base that supports the ongoing viability and sustained occupation of other buildings within the conservation area, including listed buildings. This social and functional dimension should form part of the assessment of significance and impact, particularly where the proposal would result in the loss of the last public house serving the historic village core.

The application would result in the loss of the public house use, which forms part of the social, communal and functional significance of this modest linear settlement, and would thereby remove an important community focus within the Sompting Conservation Area. In addition, the proposed large box dormers would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area and would cause less than substantial harm to its significance, as well as harm to the wider setting of listed buildings. The harm arising from both the loss of the community function and the harmful roof alterations has not been clearly and convincingly justified and is not considered to be outweighed on the basis of the information submitted. The proposal therefore conflicts with section 16 of the NPPF, the statutory duty under section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and Adur Local Plan Policies 15, 16 and 17.

[Note – the Heritage Consultant’s comments were made with reference to the originally submitted plans which showed roof alterations. While the plans have been amended to remove those alterations, his comments on the social and community function of the public house within the Conservation Area remain relevant.]

Surface Water Drainage Consultant: No objection

Southern Water: No objection.

Adur District Conservation Advisory Group: Approve

Sompting Parish Council: Support

Representations

40 objections:

- A robust viability assessment has not been carried out
- There is no verifiable financial evidence
- Lacks key financial information and fails to reference the last three years of audited trading accounts, which are essential to any credible viability analysis
- Three separate operators took on the pub between 2022-25 which indicates that there is an ongoing market for the facility
- Marketing evidence is flawed, incomplete, and potentially invalid.
- The freehold was only marketed from June 2024, not continuously since 2022. Several offers were made on the pub but rejected, demonstrating that the premises were both marketable and saleable as a public house
- From 19 October 2022 to June 2024, the property was marketed only as a free-of-tie lease with full maintenance obligations. Genuine offers emerged only once the freehold was marketed, all at the asking price, with the only accepted offer being above asking price
- Had the sellers accepted the offer made by the third prospective purchaser in May 2025— who intended to retain the premises as a pub—the village would still have its pub

- Last pub in the village
- Loss of community facility
- Pub hosted quiz nights, darts, cribbage, raffles and music events which are not available anywhere else locally
- No easily accessible alternatives within walking distance
- Contrary to Policy 33 of the Local Plan and NPPF
- Removes long established pedestrian route by enclosing front of pub with a wall
- New homes in Sompting should increase demand
- Pub is heart and soul of the village
- Since pub has shut it is less easy for elderly to socialise
- The Viability Assessment claims the population is too small to sustain the pub yet also states that there are 1,800 residents within 800 metres and a parish population of 9,000.
- Inconsistencies, combined with the complete absence of financial evidence capable of demonstrating non-viability, significantly undermine the credibility of the Viability Assessment
- Loss of pub reduces footfall for other businesses in the village
- Application for pub to be an Asset of Community Value has been submitted

7 support:

- Locals want to preserve the pub but they never ate or drank there to support it
- Plans look to be an attractive and sympathetic use of the building
- Building is in a poor state and significant investment is required
- The drinking culture, especially of the young, has changed leaving establishments like the Gardeners in an even more precarious position
- Very refreshing to see this is not going to be converted into unsaleable flats as The Marquis had been
- I have watched the slow decline of a once popular well run establishment.
- The last 3 years have seen numerous landlords coming and going without presenting accounts

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 2, 3, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 26, 28, 33, 34, 36

Sompting Conservation Area Appraisal May 2024

Sustainable Energy SPD (August 2024)

WSSC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)

Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard (DCLG 2015)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The site lies outside of the built up area, within the Local Green Gap and the Conservation Area. Policy 10 of the Adur Local Plan states that *“Sompting village will not be expanded or intensified due to its linear and historic character, and countryside location within the Local Green Gap.”*

Policy 13 states:

“Outside of the Built Up Area Boundary (as shown on the Policies Map), development will only be permitted where the need for a countryside location is essential; it is for quiet informal recreation or the essential needs of agriculture or horticulture, flood management, or is otherwise consistent with this Local Plan (or subsequent DPDs). Improvements to green infrastructure, including enhanced pedestrian, cycle, and equestrian access (where appropriate), and better access for those with mobility difficulties will be supported. The extension of isolated groups of buildings or the consolidation of linear or sporadic development will not be permitted.”

In this case, the proposal is not extending development onto undeveloped land, or consolidating sporadic or linear development. It is seeking to convert an existing building into a single dwelling. The main considerations are therefore the viability of retaining the pub and the impact on the character of the Conservation Area.

Housing Delivery

In December 2024, the Government published an updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024). This reintroduced requirements for local planning authorities to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, regardless of the age of the adopted plan.

Paragraph 78 of the NPPF 2024 states:

Strategic policies should include a trajectory illustrating the expected rate of housing delivery over the plan period, and all plans should consider whether it is appropriate to set out the anticipated rate of development for specific sites. Local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies, or against their local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old. The supply of specific deliverable sites should in addition include a buffer (moved forward from later in the plan period) of:

a) 5% to ensure choice and competition in the market for land; or
b) 20% where there has been significant under delivery of housing over the previous three years, to improve the prospect of achieving the planned supply; or

c) From 1 July 2026, for the purposes of decision-making only, 20% where a local planning authority has a housing requirement adopted in the last five years examined against a previous version of this Framework, and whose annual average housing requirement is 80% or less of the most up to date local housing need figure calculated using the standard method set out in national planning practice guidance.

Paragraphs 11 to 14 of the NPPF set out how local authorities should respond in circumstances where they cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply.

The Adur Local Plan was adopted on 14th December 2017. Policy 3: Housing Provision makes provision for a minimum of 3,718 net additional homes in the period 2011 to 2032, equivalent to 177 dwellings per annum. As Adur District adopted its Local Plan more than 5 years ago the Five Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement uses a housing requirement based on the local housing need that is calculated by the standard methodology set out in the PPG. Updated data on national affordability ratio (dated 22nd May 2025) has subsequently resulted in a revised local housing need (LHN) figure based on the standard method calculation. The LHN figure has been amended to 549 dwellings per annum for Adur (previously it was 547 dwellings). In 2018, the Housing Delivery Test was introduced against which housing delivery is measured. If housing delivery is below 85% of the housing requirement over the previous three years, a 20% buffer must be applied. The sixth Housing Delivery Test 2023 (covering the monitoring periods 2020/21, 2021/22 and 2022/23), published December 2024, indicates that Adur delivered 81% of its requirement. As a consequence, the presumption in favour of sustainable development no longer applies; an Action Plan has been prepared, and in calculating the five-year housing land supply, a 20% buffer must be added. It must be noted that the HDT position has improved with the previous test result (December 2023) being 72%. At the time of publishing this Housing Land Supply Statement, the Government has not published the seventh Housing Delivery Test Result to cover the period 2021/22 to 2023/24. The 5 Year Housing Land Supply (5YRHLS) (2025-2030) position for Adur as at 01/04/2025 demonstrates that a total of 2,115 homes are deliverable within this period, equating to 3.2 years of housing land supply against the housing requirement figure (as set by the Standard Methodology figure) of 549 dwellings per annum plus a 20% buffer = 659 dwellings per annum.

Given that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 Year Housing Land Supply of deliverable housing sites, this means that for decision taking, paragraph 11 d) of the NPPF applies which states:

‘where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- i. the application of policies in this 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 this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.’

The impacts are assessed below.

Viability of retaining pub/Principle of Loss of pub

Policy 33 of the Local Plan states that:

“The Council will protect, and support improvements to, social and community facilities. Development which would result in the loss of existing social or community facilities will only be permitted where:

- It can be demonstrated there is no demand for the facility within the area and the premises have been marketed for a reasonable period of time; or
- There is alternative provision available locally that is accessible, and at least equivalent in terms of quality; or
- The proposed development would provide an alternative social and community facility.”

The application is supported by a detailed Viability Assessment from a Licensed Property Valuer. It concludes that the pub is no longer viable.

There are concerns with the adequacy of the marketing information. The supporting statement explains that the property has been marketed for a lengthy period of almost 3 years. However, there seems to be some inconsistency in the information provided since the pub initially closed in August 2022 but reopened in January 2023 and remained open until the recent sale of the property in July 2025. This suggests that the marketing of both the leasehold and the freehold were successful. While the Statement suggests that the pub was operating at a loss no financial details were supplied.

The viability report confirms that 2 offers were received at the guide price but these were rejected due to lack of funds being produced. A third offer was rejected but no reason was given. A 4th offer (from the applicant) was initially rejected at the guide price but a subsequent higher offer was accepted.

There are suggestions from third parties that the third offer was from someone who wished to continue the use as a pub which contradicts the assertion in the planning agent's Planning Statement that there was "*no interest in operating the pub as a going concern.*"

It appears that the applicant has purchased the property with no intention of operating it as a pub despite the marketing information advising that "an incoming party will be required to demonstrate sufficient funds to sustain their business model."

There is no financial evidence of the trading accounts of the last few landlords so it is difficult to ascertain whether the pub is no longer viable.

It is noted that it was being run on a Tenancy At Will agreement. The most significant disadvantage of a such an agreement is that neither the tenant nor landlord has security regarding the occupation of the property. The tenant could suddenly find themselves without premises to conduct their business activities. As it offers less protection than a commercial lease it is not conducive to a long term investment in the premises as the tenant could be removed at short notice. They may not as inclined to invest in improvements to the pub as a result. There are suggestions in the objections received that the former tenant made a bid to buy the pub to continue its use.

Whilst marketed as a pub, the applicants and current owners have not made any attempt to run it as a pub and appear to have purchased the building with the intention to change its use.

Therefore, without further evidence the Council is not satisfied that it has been satisfactorily demonstrated that there is no demand for the facility within the area. The number of objections and request for it to be made an Asset of Community Value suggest that there is a local desire to retain this community facility, particularly as it is the last pub remaining in the village. While the Council has rejected the ACV request, this decision was made outside of the planning process and the requirements of policy 33 of the Adur Local Plan and paragraph 98c of the NPPF still apply and the planning authority needs to be satisfied that those policy requirements are met.

The applicant's agent has responded to Officer's concerns and provided further information. They have advised:

“Two offers were made for pub use but after due diligence neither party had sufficient funds to proceed. The third offer is also understood to have been with interest for pub use but requested proof of funds was not received in a timely manner and the matter was concluded. It was subsequently found the funds were abroad, which would have raised further queries and due diligence, which was never instigated.

The applicants' offer was higher than the asking price to offset the VAT. This is dealt with at point at 25.2 of the Viability Report. The purchaser did not wish to run The Gardeners Arms as a pub and completed form VAT 1614D, which is used when someone wants to disapply the option to levy VAT on buildings for conversion into dwellings. The seller, The Wellington Pub Company, which, in common with most large commercial landlords, had elected to charge VAT on rents. That meant that it was also required to charge VAT on a freehold disposal. For someone who wished to continue running it as a pub that would not have been a problem as it would have been a “going concern” transfer and the VAT could have been recovered. However, someone wishing to convert it into a private dwelling would not have been able to recover the VAT and the way round that is to disapply the option to levy VAT – effectively a cessation of the business.”

This response raises concerns in that it confirms that the purchaser (the applicant) never had any intention of running the property as a pub and, by purchasing the property, they effectively prevented anyone else with an interest in keeping the pub open from having that opportunity.

While permission was granted to demolish and redevelop the Marquis of Granby PH in 2021, one of the main reasons for allowing the loss of that pub was the presence of the Gardeners Arms, just 0.1 mile away, meaning that there was alternative provision available to local residents within easy walking distance. Since then, the population of Sompting has increased and will continue to do so with the construction of over 460 homes just over 400m away to the west.

The lack of trading figures means that a complete viability assessment cannot be made and there is uncertainty around the offers received for the continued

use of the building as a pub, the receipt of which suggests there is interest in maintaining the pub use. There do not appear to have been any attempts to diversify the business, such as by adding a B&B or capitalising on its location close to the South Downs National Park. It also does not appear to have been marketed for other community uses. The request by residents to list the building as an ACV, while unsuccessful, nevertheless demonstrates a community desire to maintain the building as a pub.

It is therefore considered that the proposal is contrary to Policy 33 of the Local plan for the reasons that:

- It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated there is no demand for the facility within the area
- There is no alternative provision available locally within the village that is easily accessible
- The proposed use as a dwelling does not provide an alternative social and community facility.

Visual amenity, impact on Conservation Area and character of building

The proposal includes a number of internal and external alterations. These include the removal of the access ramp from the west side, removal of rear pergola and alterations to windows and doors on the west side, plus construction of low wall to the front. The roof extensions previously proposed have been removed in the current application. Overall, the external alterations are not considered to cause harm to the character and appearance of the building or the Conservation Area.

Internally, extensive alterations are proposed, including the removal of the bar and current staircases, as well as altering the building's plan form via the installation of new subdivisions. The Council's Archaeological Consultant has previously advised that no work should be carried out without there being an agreed scheme to record any historic features.

The Council's Heritage Consultant has advised that *"the application would result in the loss of the public house use, which forms part of the social, communal and functional significance of this modest linear settlement, and would thereby remove an important community focus within the Sompting Conservation Area."*

He has identified harm arising from the loss of the community function under Section 16 of the NPPF as it *"would risk weakening the amenity base that supports the ongoing viability and sustained occupation of other buildings within the conservation area, including listed buildings. This social and functional dimension should form part of the assessment of significance and impact, particularly where the proposal would result in the loss of the last public house serving the historic village core."*

It is therefore considered that the loss of the public house would have an adverse effect on the Conservation Area.

This heritage concern, and the concerns under Policy 33 set out in the previous section, are not considered to be outweighed by the paragraph 11d

of the NPPF with regard to the provision of new housing. The provision of a single dwelling (to replace a public house with flat above) would constitute only a modest benefit in housing terms and it is considered that the heritage concerns and concerns over the loss of an important community facility outweigh any modest benefits

Residential amenity

The change of use of the building does not have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties. The accommodation to be provided meets the Technical Housing Standards (total floor space 273m²) and the large area to the rear (formerly used as car parking) will become a garden, in excess of the Council's space standards.

Highways

There are no highways concerns with the proposal. There is space for the parking of 3 cars to the west side of the building. The existing car park at the rear is to be converted to private garden.

The enclosure of the area at the front of the pub with a wall does not affect the public highway.

BNG

The proposal comprises a change of use without a loss of habitat and is considered to be exempt from BNG requirements.

Flood Risk and Drainage

There are no surface water drainage concerns with the proposal. Southern Water has requested further information however, to be secured by condition if necessary.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

The modest benefit of a change of use to a single dwelling (to replace a public house with flat above) in housing terms is not considered to outweigh the harm caused by the loss of an important community facility within the Conservation Area. The proposal is contrary to Policies 16, 17 and 33 of the Adur Local Plan and the policies of the NPPF and the adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when considered against the Framework as a whole.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the following reason:

The proposal would result in the loss of an important community facility within Sompting Conservation Area and it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated

that it is no longer viable or that there is no demand for the facility within the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 16, 17 and 33 of the Adur Local Plan and Paragraph 98 and Section 16 of the NPPF.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? Y

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett

Date: 22 July 2026

Authorised by: Stephen Cantwell

Date: 22 July 2026