



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/25/0780

Greenacres, Saucelands Lane, Shipley, West Sussex, RH13 8PU

DESCRIPTION:

Demolition of existing buildings. Erection of four barn style detached dwellings with associated garages utilising existing access together with landscaping

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/20/0168 Outline Application for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of 4no. dwellings with associated parking and amenity space, with all matters reserved except for access. Application Refused on 23.03.2020

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The application site comprises a commercial site with a number of Class E(g)/B8 use buildings positioned within it, located on the southern side of Saucelands Lane, Shipley. The site is not located within any defined built-up area boundaries and is therefore considered to be located in the countryside.

The buildings are single storey in nature and consists of a mixture of designs and external materials, including brick, blockwork, timber cladding and metal sheeting to the external walls and tiles, metal sheeting and corrugated fibre cement to the roofs. Some of the buildings are dilapidated. The site is accessed via an existing access from Saucelands Lane which runs south to a large area of hardstanding with the existing buildings positioned around. There is a Public Right of Way (PROW) located to the west of the site which runs from north to south. The surrounding area is considered to be rural in nature with only sporadic development present within the vicinity. The closest built-up area boundary is that of West Chiltington which is located approximately 3.9km (as the crow flies) away from the site to the south-west. The application site measures approximately 0.66ha.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing buildings on site and the erection of four dwellings, with units 1, 2 and 3 having detached double car ports incorporating a bike and refuse store. Unit 4 would have an integral double garage and bike and refuse store.

The hardstanding would consist of loose gravel chippings for all units, with the dwellings sharing a material palette of half hipped roofs in natural red colour clay tiles. Unit 3 and 4 would be 4 bedroomed L-shaped dwellings and unit 1 and 2 would be 3 bedrooms.

No alterations would occur to the private access from the main road, although a timber fence will be installed between the PROW and the access.

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 7 - Strategic Policy: Economic Growth
Policy 9 - Employment Development
Policy 10 - Rural Economic Development
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 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles
Policy 34 - Cultural and Heritage Assets
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

Shipley Parish Neighbourhood plan 2019-2031

HD2: Housing Mix

HD3: High quality design

Shipley Parish Design Statement

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

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

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

Consultations:

WSCC Highways: Note contradictions in the application in regards to visibility splays with request to outline and clarify the visibility splays and access.

PRoW officer: Holding objection. Public footpath 2807 runs within the red line boundary along the western side of the proposed demolition and development site. Further engagement requested from the applicant.

Southern Water: Comment in relation to planting and sewers, surface water drainage, demolition of existing water supply facilities, foul drainage and proposed SuDS details.

Natural England: No objection, subject to conditions.

Environmental Health: Objection: -

The land would have potential to be contaminated and further information would be required.

The rainwater harvesting system would need to be maintained throughout its use and information is required on likely contaminants, detail on water treatment, sampling and testing regime, detail on the continuity of supply during dry periods extending beyond 35 days, record keeping of water samples. A CEMP plan would be required as a condition

Abriculture officer: No objection: -

The site is in a rural location accessed via a 160m long driveway that is bounded by a line of hedgerow oak trees along its entire length. These trees provide important visual separation within the landscape and a delineation to the adjacent PROW that skirts the western boundary. These trees should be protected from development harm both by robust fencing as indicated within the submissions and by pre-planned non-invasive methods of utility installation as required.

The remaining trees of landscape significance/merit are all located to the boundaries of the site. Within the layout context they can be reasonably accommodated without undue physical harm or significant future pressures for lopping/felling from the change of site use.

Naturespace Officer: No objection subject to mitigations. The further survey and mitigation map plan shows that the application could be successfully mitigated against as part of a natural England license. As such, no objection subject to the development receiving this license, which can be done post permission by way of condition

Representations:

One representation has been received, objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Design
- Highway Access and Parking

- Loss of General Amenity
- Overdevelopment
- Privacy Light and Noise
- Trees and Landscaping
- Drainage concerns
- Concern for setting precedent for future development in this location.

Two representations have been received supporting the application on the following grounds:

- Current application site would result in increased traffic however the current site is derelict and the development would be in keeping with local properties.

Parish Comments:

Support the development and would request parking is considered in the decision making process

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 identified 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.

Paragraph 83 of the National Planning policy framework outlines that to promote sustainable 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.

In this countryside location, the proposal is also considered against Policy 26 which seeks to protect the countryside against inappropriate development unless it is considered essential and appropriate in scale; whilst also meeting one of four criteria. These criteria include: 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 application site is located outside of any built-up area boundary and is not essential to its countryside location, the proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policies 1, 3, 4 and 26 of the HDPF.

The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply (1 year at the time of writing). In recognition of this, the Council published a 'Facilitating Appropriate Development' (FAD) Document in October 2022. The FAD recognises that the Council is likely to receive applications outside of defined BUABs and on unallocated sites (such as this proposal) as it is unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. The documents states that given this position and the principles behind HDPF Policy 4, it will consider positively applications that meet *all* of the criteria:

- The site adjoins the existing settlement edge as defined by the BUAB;
- The level of expansion is appropriate to the scale and function of the settlement the proposal relates to;
- The proposal demonstrates that it meets local housing needs or will assist the retention and enhancement of community facilities and services;
- The impact of the development individually or cumulatively does not prejudice comprehensive long-term development; and
- The development is contained within an existing defensible boundary and the landscape character features are maintained and enhanced.

The proposed scheme would not meet all of the above criteria as it would not adjoin an existing settlement edge (defined by a BUAB). The FAD document would not therefore lend any support to the proposed scheme.

The application site is located approximately 3.9km away (as the crow flies) from the closest built-up area boundary of West Chiltington located to the south-west. As such, it is considered that there is a clear separation and a significant difference in character when comparing the application site and its immediate surrounds, which is considered to be very rural in nature. The application site would not be well related to the nearest defined settlement of West Chiltington, the other closest settlement areas or the District centre of Horsham to the north-east, with future occupiers of the dwellings likely to be highly dependent on the use of private vehicle in order to access services and facilities.

It is considered that the scheme would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchical approach of concentrating development within the main settlements as set out in the HDPF. The proposal for 4no new dwellings on the site is not considered to be essential to its countryside location and consequently represents an inappropriate, unsustainable and unacceptable form of development in this location. Additionally, the site has not been allocated for housing within a 'made' Neighbourhood Plan and has therefore, at present not been deemed to be appropriate for housing at a local level.

In addition to the above, as the site is currently in a commercial/employment use, consideration must be given to Policy 9 of the HDPF which relates to Employment Development. This policy states that - 'Redevelopment of employment sites and premises outside Key Employment Areas, must demonstrate that the site/premises is no longer needed and/or viable for employment use'. No evidence of an attempt at marketing the viable buildings has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority, with no explanation of the commercial use within the site not being viable in its current use. Whilst it is acknowledged that some of the smaller buildings are in a poor state of repair, this has been the case since previous applications, where it was highlighted in 2020 that the buildings were not being maintained. The site is considered to provide valuable business accommodation and employment in a rural area and the proposal would result in the loss of much needed employment land within the District. Given the lack of justification provided in this regard, the application is therefore considered to also be contrary to Policy 9 of the of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015)

Design and Appearance:

Policies 25, 32 and 33 of the HDPF promote development which is of high quality design and is sympathetic to the distinctiveness of the dwelling and surroundings. Development should protect, conserve and enhance the landscape character, taking account of the natural environment, landscape and landform pattern to which it forms a part. As no plans or details have been submitted pertaining to design, scale or appearance of the dwellings, and as permission is not sought for these matters at this stage, no consideration is given to this aspect.

Whilst it is noted that the layout and form would be of a greater density than what is in the area, the previous officer's report outlined that the proposed dwellings would not be greatly disproportionate to some of the existing dwellings within the vicinity in terms of footprint. The previous application was for an outline of the dwellings, and did not include the level of details that have been submitted as part of this application.

The wider area consists of individually designed detached dwellings set back from the access road, with the area being of a rural appearance. The scale, form and design would be acceptable, with materials and roof form giving a barn-like appearance to the dwellings that would be anticipated to be present within the wider to the wider area. The roofs would be half hipped with conservation style handmade clay tiles, and the exterior materials to the walls would be a mixture of horizontal timber cladding and vertical cladding and a brick base. The openings within the dwellings would be tall and wide, reflecting an agricultural use. The heights of the dwellings would be largely modest, with plot number 4 being in an L shaped configuration to add some variety to the development. Given the enclosed nature of the development, and reasonably modest scale of the dwellings, the proposed development would not be considered to result in harm to the wider landscape. Each of the dwellings would have a garage, with 3 of the dwellings having detached garages with bin stores incorporated into them.

The development would therefore be in accordance with Policies 25, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Arboricultural Impacts:

Policy 31 of the HDPF states that proposals that would result in the loss of existing green infrastructure will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that new opportunities will be provided that mitigates or compensates for this loss, and ensures that the ecosystem services of the area are retained. In addition,

Policy 33 outlines that development proposals should presume in favour of the retention of existing important landscape and natural features. Development must relate sympathetically to the local landscape and justify and mitigate against any losses that may occur through the development.

No Objections have been raised by the Arboricultural Officer and it is noted that the row of hedgerow and trees are considered visually important such that it would be sought for these to be retained as part of the development. No objection in light of 31 and 33 of the HDPF.

Residential Amenity:

Policy 33 of the HDPF states that permission will be granted for development that does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of the occupiers/users of nearby properties and land.

The dwellings (plot 1 and 2) would have some degree of mutual overlooking, however this would not be an extent such that would warrant a refusal given the sufficient distance between the dwellings. All the four dwellings are an acceptable distance from one another such that they would not result in an unacceptable relationship in respect of obtrusive appearance, overlooking or lack of light and privacy. The residential amenity space for the dwellings are modest but not unacceptable and in terms of layout, and the dwellings could be appropriately accommodated on the site without adversely impacting

on the privacy and amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties such that there are no objections in light of Policy 33 of the HDPF.

Highways Impacts:

Policies 40 and 41 of the HDPF states that development should provide safe and adequate access and parking, suitable for all users.

The proposed dwellings would be served by the existing access located to the north from Saucelands Lane which serves the site. The dwellings would be set a considerable distance away from the access point, approximately 150m away and that each dwelling would be served by vehicular parking areas. Plot s1, 2 and 3 would have a detached double car port and plot 4 would be integral.

West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) as the Local Highway Authority have commented that there appears to be inconsistent information provided with regards to the visibility splays at the access point but do not indicate that there would be a 'severe' impact on the operation of the Highway network as a result of the proposal. It is considered that this information could be clarified as part of a pre-commencement condition if the application were otherwise recommended for approval.

Public Rights of Way have been consulted as part of the development, noting that Public Footpath 2807 runs within the red line boundary along the western side of the proposed demolition and development site. Since this objection an amended red line boundary was submitted to exclude the PRow from curtilage. Given that there would be no development within the PRow such that there would be no obstruction of it, or interruption to its use, there would be no conflict raised with the policies 40 and 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) subject to the inclusion of condition to request further details.

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.

Circular 06/2005 identifies that the presence of protected species is a material consideration when considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat. Therefore, it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed application, is established before planning permission is granted. Information on biodiversity impacts and opportunities should inform all stages of development, and an ecological survey is usually necessary where the type and location of development are such that the impact on biodiversity may be significant and existing information is lacking or inadequate.

The application is accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal which makes a series of findings and recommendations. These include that buildings to be demolished are potentially suitable to support roosting bats, with it therefore recommended that further surveys are undertaken to determine the presence or absence of bats. There is no evidence that these surveys have been undertaken and it cannot therefore be concluded that the development would not impact on roosting bats. As set out above, it would not be possible to overcome this omission by way of condition.

As part of the application process further information has been provided in respect of Great Crested Newts, including a mitigation strategy. This submission is considered sufficient to ensure no adverse impacts would arise, and if necessary conditions could ensure that this is the case.

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 applicant has submitted a dedicated Water Neutrality Statement outlining the overall occupancy of the development based on the number of cumulative bedrooms. This would be 10.66 people based on 2 x 3 bedroom dwellings and 2 x 4 bedroom dwellings (2.47 and 2.86 respectively).

Without further mitigation, the total development usage would be 1172.6 litres total per day. The Part G Calculator presented indicates a per day per person usage of 89.045 using efficient fixtures and fittings, would be 949.2 litres a day. The entire water consumption would be mitigated against using rainwater harvesting. Given that the whole development would use 949.2 litres per day and the rainwater yield would be 1209.4 per day, the yield is sufficient to meet the requirements of the development. A rainwater harvesting tank is required to be sized for a 35 day supply of water in the case of drought, such that the tank storage on site needs to be in excess of 33,222 litres in total. Individual tanks would be stored for the dwellings, with the three bedroom dwellings having a tank size in excess of 7,697.94025 and four bedroom dwellings would have a tank size in excess of 8,913.38. The applicant submitted proposed tank sizes of 7500litres but given the above calculations, the tanks would need to be larger than currently proposed.

Subject to the inclusion of conditions to secure further details in relation to tank size, location and method of connection to the dwellings, the proposal would result in a water neutral development, and there would be no clear or compelling evidence to suggest the nature and scale of the proposed development would result in a more intensive occupation of the site necessitating an increased consumption of water that would result in a significant impact on the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. The grant of planning permission would not therefore adversely affect the integrity of these sites or otherwise conflict with policy 31 of the HDPF, NPPF paragraph 194 and the Council's obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

Climate Change:

Policies 35, 36 and 37 require that development mitigates to the impacts of climate change through measures including improved energy efficiency, reducing flood risk, reducing water consumption, improving biodiversity and promoting sustainable transport modes. These policies reflect the requirements of Chapter 14 of the NPPF that local plans and decisions seek to reduce the impact of development on climate change. The proposed development would by way of condition include the following measures to build resilience to climate change and reduce carbon emissions:

- Requirement to provide full fibre broadband site connectivity
- Dedicated refuse and recycling storage capacity
- Opportunities for biodiversity gain
- Cycle parking facilities
- Electric vehicle charging points

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG):

Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021) mandates that every development must achieve at least a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) unless the development qualifies as exempt under the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024).

The submitted details indicate that 10% BNG can be achieved, with this including significant enhancement. Had the development been considered acceptable this would have needed to be secured by way of a Legal Agreement.

Conclusions:

It is considered that the proposal for the demolition of the existing commercial buildings and construction of 4no new dwellings would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchical approach of concentrating development within the main settlements as set out in the HDPF. The proposal for 4no new dwellings on the site is not considered to be essential to its countryside location and consequently represents an inappropriate, unsustainable and unacceptable form of development in this location.

The Facilitating Appropriate Development (FAD) document was endorsed at Full Council on 19 October 2022. The FAD recognises that the Council is likely to receive applications outside of defined BUABs and on unallocated sites (such as this proposal) as it is unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. Given this position and the principles behind HDPF Policy 4, it will consider positively applications that meet *all* of the criteria:

- The site adjoins the existing settlement edge as defined by the BUAB;
- The level of expansion is appropriate to the scale and function of the settlement the proposal relates to;
- The proposal demonstrates that it meets local housing needs or will assist the retention and enhancement of community facilities and services;
- The impact of the development individually or cumulatively does not prejudice comprehensive long-term development; and
- The development is contained within an existing defensible boundary and the landscape character features are maintained and enhanced.

While the current housing shortfall is a material consideration of significant weight and the contribution of four market dwellings would bestow socio-economic benefits in the form of housing delivery, the proposed development would not benefit from the provisions of the FAD as above.

The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, therefore for the purposes of decision making, the presumption in favour of sustainable development within Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF applies. 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 the Framework taken as a whole.

It is acknowledged that the proposal would make a contribution to the housing supply, where this would be afforded weight in the planning balance. While the Council are unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, where the development would make a modest contribution to the housing supply, it is considered that this benefit would not outweigh the conflict identified in respect of the countryside location of the development, the loss of commercial premises and the insufficient information in respect of protected species.

As such, overall, the proposals would be contrary to Policies 2, 3, 4, 9, 26 and 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and the benefits of the scheme would not outweigh the harm and conflict as identified.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. 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. It has not been demonstrated that there are any material considerations of significant weight to justify a departure from this overarching spatial strategy. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policies 2, 3, 4, and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the existing commercial floorspace is no longer needed and/or viable for employment use, contrary to Policy 9 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
3. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would have no adverse impact on protected species and its habitat, and to establish how the development will contribute to measurable Biodiversity Net Gain, contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and paragraphs 193 and 194 of the NPPF.

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/25/0780

Schedule of plans/documents **not approved:**

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Supporting Statement	Landscape Appraisal	RCo556 / Landscape Appraisal/Study / Rev00 / Planning / 14-01-25	09.05.2025
Location plan		000_09 Rev A	18.08.2025
Site plan	Existing - Ground Floor	000_02	03.06.2025
Location plan	Location Plan	001_01	09.05.2025
Site plan	Existing Ground Floor Site Plan	001_02	09.05.2025
Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed Ground Floor Site Plan	100_01	09.05.2025
Site plan	Unit 1	100_01	09.05.2025
Elevation & Floor plan	Unit 2	100_02	09.05.2025
Elevation & Floor plan	Unit 3	100_03	09.05.2025
Layout plan	Proposed Ground Floor Plan Area 1	100_10 REV C	09.06.2025
Layout plan	Proposed Ground Floor Plan Area 2	100_11 REV C	09.06.2025
Elevation & Floor plan	Unit 4	100_04	09.05.2025

Layout plan	Areas - Existing & Proposed	000_10	09.05.2025
Block plan	Proposed	000_09	03.06.2025
Section plan	Proposed - BB	200_02	09.05.2025
Section plan	Proposed - AA	200_01	09.05.2025
Supporting Statement	Water Neutrality Report by cgs civils dated 5 December 2024	C3353 REV P	09.05.2025
Supporting Statement	Preliminary Ecological Appraisal	C-CHI-001-001-001 REV 001	09.05.2025
Plans	Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report by Arun Ecology dated February 2025	C-CHI-001-001-001	09.05.2025
Supporting Statement	Bat Emergence Survey Report by Arun Ecology dated February 2025	C-CHI-001-002-001	09.05.2025
Tree plan	Protection	TPP 06372 2025	09.05.2025
Supporting Statement	Transport	13516	09.05.2025
Layout plan	Soft Landscape	RCo555-01 REV 01	09.05.2025
Layout plan	Viewpoint Locations	RCo556 / Figure 01	09.05.2025
Photos	Viewpoint Aerial	RCo556 / Figure 02	09.05.2025
Photos	Site	RCo556 / Landscape Appraisal/Study / Appendix A/ Rev00 / 19-12-24	09.05.2025
Supporting Statement	Landscape Appraisal/Study by Ramsay & CO Landscape Architecture dated 14 January 2025	RCo556 / Landscape Appraisal/Study / Rev00 / Planning / 14-01-25	09.05.2025
Tree plan	BS:5837 Tree Protection Plan	GREENACRES TPP 06372 2025	09.05.2025
Supporting Statement	Heritage Report by Chiccroft Heritage Planning dated April 2025	NONE	09.05.2025
Supporting Statement	Transport Report by gta Civils & Transport dated January 2025	13516	09.05.2025
Plans	Soft Landscape Layout	RCo555-01 Revision 01	09.05.2025
Plans	Figure 01: Viewpoint Locations	RCo556 / Figure 01	09.05.2025
Supporting Statement	Energy & Sustainability Statement by Blew Burton Ltd dated 1 May 2025	NONE	09.05.2025
Supporting Statement	BS:5837 Arboricultural Report Arboricultural Survey, Impact Assessment & Method Statement by Duckworths Arboriculture Ltd dated January 2025	AIA/AMS 06372/2025	09.05.2025

Tree plan	BS:5837 Tree Constraints Plan	GREENACRES TCP 06372/2024	09.05.2025
Section plan	Existing Site Section CC	000_22	03.06.2025
Section plan	Existing Site Section BB	000_21	03.06.2025
Section plan	Existing Site Section AA	000_20	03.06.2025

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Hannah Darley Date: 19th August 2025

Authorising Officer sign/initial Tamara Dale Date: 19 August 2025