



# Planning Statement

Erection of new dwelling

**51 The Fieldings, Southwater**

prepared by

**WPS Planning**

Planning Statement  
51 The Fieldings



Prepared by:	Doug Wright
Date:	January 2026
Project Number:	195/2025



## Contents

<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3.0 PLANNING HISTORY OF THE SITE</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4.0 THE PROPOSAL</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>5.0 PLANNING POLICY</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>6.0 PLANNING ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>7.0 CONCLUSION</b>	<b>9</b>





## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Planning Statement supports a revised full planning application for the erection of a new detached dwelling within the residential curtilage associated with 51 The Fieldings, Southwater.
- 1.2 The proposal is submitted following refusal of application DC/25/1400 (Delegated Report/Decision dated November 2025).
- 1.3 The delegated report confirms that the principle of development was acceptable and that the design/appearance and materials were considered acceptable in character/visual terms.
- 1.4 The application was refused for two specific reasons.
- The first reason related to residential amenity under HDPF Policy 33. The refused scheme was considered, due to its scale, height and siting, to be overbearing and to create a poor relationship with neighbouring properties, resulting in unacceptable harm to the amenities of 51 The Fieldings.
  - The second reason related to parking and turning under HDPF Policy 41. The refused scheme was considered to suffer from a shortfall of parking spaces and a lack of on-site turning, failing to meet anticipated user demand and resulting in poor amenity/environment.
- 1.5 This revised submission has been designed explicitly around those refusal reasons and the specific highway concerns set out by WSCC Highways in the delegated report, including access geometry, visibility and the ability to turn and exit in forward gear.

## **2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA**

- 2.1 The site consists of the main dwelling of 51 The Fieldings. The site lies at the western end of The Fieldings and is located to the south of Worthing Road. Neighbouring dwellings are located to the east, west and south of the site.
- 2.2 The site is located within the built-up area of Southwater.

## **3.0 PLANNING HISTORY**

- 3.1 The site has the following relevant planning history:
- DC/25/1400 – Erection of a two-storey detached dwelling – REFUSED

## **4.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 4.1 The revised scheme is for a 3-bedroom detached dwelling with a materially improved site arrangement. The updated proposal is shown on the updated site layout plan 195/2025/2.
- 4.2 proposed site layout 195-2025-2
- 4.3 The updated layout shows a widened access taken from Hurstside, a clear and functional forecourt arrangement, and three on-site parking spaces with manoeuvring/turning provision within the site so vehicles can enter and exit in a safe and convenient manner.
- 4.4 proposed site layout 195-2025-2
- 4.5 The revised scheme is also a less intensive form of development than the refused scheme, reducing from the previously assessed 4-bedroom dwelling to a 3-bedroom dwelling.

## 5.0 PLANNING POLICY

### National Planning Policy

- 5.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that this should run through both plan making and decision taking. In terms of the determination of planning applications this should mean the approval of developments that accord with the development plan without delay, and that where the development plan is silent or relevant policies are out of date, that permission be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, or policies of the NPPF indicate otherwise.
- 5.2 Sustainable development is seen within the NPPF as having three roles, namely an economic, social and environmental role which should be a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking.
- 5.3 The following sections within the NPPF (2024) are important factors in the assessment of the proposal:
- Section 5 – Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
  - Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
  - Section 11 – Making effective use of land
  - Section 12 – Achieving well-designed and beautiful places

### Local Plan

- 5.4 In terms of the local planning policy context for the Application Site, the adopted Development Plan for the Horsham District is composed of the following relevant documents:
- Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) – Adopted November 2015.
    - Policy 1 - Sustainable Development
    - Policy 2 – Strategic Development

- Policy 3 – Development Hierarchy
- Policy 4 – Settlement Expansion
- Policy 15 - Housing Provision
- Policy 32 – The Quality of New Development
- Policy 33 – Development Principles
- Policy 41 – Parking
  
- Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19)
  - Policy 1 - Sustainable Development
  - Policy 2 - Development Hierarchy
  - Policy 8 – Sustainable Design and Construction
  - Policy 15 – Settlement Coalescence
  - Policy 19 - Development Quality
  - Policy 20 – Development Principles
  - Policy 24 – Sustainable Transport
  - Policy 25 – Parking
  
- Southwater Neighbourhood Plan
  - Policy SNP2 – Proposals for residential development
  - Policy SNP10 – Residential Space Standards
  - Policy SNP14 – Car Parking
  - Policy SNP16 – Design

## 6.0 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

### Principle of development and planning balance

- 6.1 The Council previously accepted the principle of a new dwelling on this site within the built-up area of Southwater, subject to the detailed considerations that ultimately led to refusal. The site is located within an established residential context where the introduction of an additional dwelling represents a logical form of small-scale windfall development, provided it is designed so as not to cause unacceptable impacts.
- 6.2 The delegated report confirms the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and therefore the presumption in favour of sustainable development under NPPF paragraph 11(d) applies. In that policy context, the delivery of an additional dwelling attracts positive weight. The planning balance therefore turns on whether the detailed matters that previously resulted in refusal have been resolved through the revised design and layout.
- 6.3 This revised submission should be assessed on its current merits. It is specifically conceived as a response to the two refusal reasons, with the revised plans prepared to remove the functional and amenity harms previously identified.

### Design and appearance

- 6.4 The delegated report concluded that the refused scheme's design and appearance were acceptable, with materials reflective of the surrounding area and screening provided by existing boundary treatment. The revised scheme continues to pursue a contextually appropriate residential design approach and does not introduce any new design harm when viewed in the street scene or within the wider residential setting.
- 6.5 The focus of the revised design work is therefore not to re-open matters of character that were not in dispute, but to ensure that the proposal now satisfactorily addresses the Council's concerns regarding neighbour relationship and site functionality.

**Refusal reason: residential amenity and relationship**

- 6.6 The Council refused DC/25/1400 because the dwelling, due to its scale, height and siting, would have an overbearing impact and create a poor relationship with neighbouring properties, resulting in unacceptable harm to the amenities of 51 The Fieldings under Policy 33.
- 6.7 The delegated report explained that the proposed dwelling was in very close proximity to the host dwelling and noted an approximate separation of 1.8m. It concluded that the two-storey form in that relationship created a cramped arrangement and an unacceptable overbearing impact, and that mitigation through blank elevations and high-level windows was not sufficient to overcome the fundamental issue created by the overall scale and siting relationship.
- 6.8 This revised submission has therefore been prepared expressly to avoid repeating the relationship that led to refusal. The revised scheme addresses the issue in a more fundamental way than the earlier attempt at mitigation. The revised proposal is now presented as a less intensive form of development and a more proportionate dwelling typology for the site. The refused scheme was assessed as a four-bedroom dwelling; the revised proposal is a three-bedroom dwelling. This reduction in internal accommodation assists in supporting a reduced “presence” and a more appropriate fit for a constrained plot, ensuring the development reads as a balanced form of infill rather than an overly assertive insertion.
- 6.9 The revised scheme also benefits from a re-planned site arrangement which provides a clearer hierarchy between built form, curtilage space and the functional areas associated with access and parking. The revised layout strategy is a critical element of the resubmission because the previous refusal was not based on internal layout or window positions alone, but on the combined effect of scale, height and siting. The revised proposal is therefore advanced on the basis that it now provides a materially improved overall relationship to neighbouring residential amenity, in particular by avoiding the “cramped” perception and overbearing effect identified previously.

- 6.10 On that basis, the revised submission is presented as overcoming the previous Policy 33 objection and providing a form of development that is appropriately scaled and planned to protect neighbouring living conditions, consistent with the aims of HDPF Policy 33.

**Refusal reason: parking provision, turning and highway functionality**

- 6.11 Refusal reason two stated that due to the shortfall of parking spaces and lack of on-site turning, the refused scheme would fail to provide an adequate level of on-site parking provision to meet anticipated user demand, resulting in poor amenity/environment under Policy 41.
- 6.12 The delegated report also recorded WSCC Highways' substantive concerns, including the need to demonstrate a safe and functional access arrangement, parking provision to an appropriate standard, and evidence that vehicles can manoeuvre within the site so that they can exit safely (and, where required, in forward gear).
- 6.13 The revised submission addresses those concerns in a direct and measurable way. The updated site layout provides three off-street parking spaces and a widened access arrangement, improving the practicality and legibility of vehicle movement within the site. Importantly, the resubmission is supported by the Proposed Site Parking and Turning Plan (Drawing 195/2025/6). This plan demonstrates, through the tracked movements shown, that vehicles can enter the site, manoeuvre within the forecourt area and leave the site in a controlled manner. It specifically evidences the ability for a private car to enter and to leave in forward gear, directly addressing the Council's previous concern that the earlier scheme failed to demonstrate on-site turning and functional day-to-day operation.
- 6.14 The revised parking offer is also proportionate and robust given the revised proposal is now for a three-bedroom dwelling. In combination, the provision of three spaces, the widened access, and the demonstrated manoeuvring/turning arrangement respond to the identified deficiencies of the refused scheme and remove the basis for refusal reason two. The proposal is therefore considered to

accord with the intent and requirements of HDPF Policy 41.

### **Water neutrality and habitats considerations**

- 6.15 The delegated report for the refused scheme addressed water neutrality and the Habitats Regulations position at that time. It recorded that the Council's approach had been updated following Natural England's withdrawal of the 2021 position statement, and that officers were satisfied (through the Council's assessment approach) that the proposal would not result in an adverse effect on integrity.
- 6.16 For the avoidance of doubt in this revised submission, a water neutrality requirement is no longer triggered in the way it previously was under the former Natural England 2021 position statement, as that position has been removed.
- 6.17 Accordingly, water neutrality is not advanced as an outstanding barrier to determination of this revised application, and the proposal can be considered on its planning merits, with the primary focus remaining on the matters that previously led to refusal (amenity and highways/parking/turning).

### **Other material considerations**

- 6.18 The delegated report noted no overriding arboricultural constraint, and any necessary tree protection or landscape retention can be addressed through appropriate conditions where required.
- 6.19 The revised proposal therefore does not introduce new technical constraints that would weigh against the grant of permission, and the assessment appropriately concentrates on the refusal issues which have now been materially addressed through the revised design and the submitted parking/turning evidence.

## 7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The refusal of DC/25/1400 was not based on the principle of development or on the acceptability of the site in locational terms. The delegated report confirms that the proposal was assessed as acceptable in principle, and that design/appearance and materials were acceptable in character/visual terms.
- 7.2 Permission was refused solely because the Council identified unacceptable harm in relation to neighbour amenity (Policy 33) and parking/turning/highway functionality (Policy 41).
- 7.3 This revised submission has been prepared explicitly to address those two matters and to allow the Council to grant planning permission on a revised and policy-compliant basis.

### **Refused vs revised comparison: Policy 33 (amenity / relationship)**

- 7.4 The refused scheme was rejected because, due to its scale, height and siting, the proposed dwelling would be overbearing and would create a poor relationship with neighbouring properties, resulting in unacceptable harm to the amenities of 51 The Fieldings. The delegated report identifies a particularly constrained relationship to the host dwelling, including an approximate separation distance of 1.8m, and concludes that attempted mitigation through window design alone could not overcome the fundamental issue created by the close two-storey relationship.
- 7.5 The revised proposal has been fundamentally reworked to avoid repeating that relationship-based harm. The new scheme is presented as a less intensive and more proportionate form of development in terms of accommodation and site planning, reducing from the previously assessed 4-bedroom dwelling to a 3-bedroom dwelling. This reduction is a material change because it supports a less assertive presence and enables a more balanced internal and external arrangement. Importantly, the revised site planning approach reorganises the plot so that the dwelling, access/parking, and external amenity areas operate as a

coherent layout rather than an overly tight two-storey insertion that results in a cramped and overbearing relationship.

- 7.6 On that basis, the revised submission is advanced as overcoming the previous Policy 33 reason for refusal. It now provides an improved relationship to neighbouring residential amenity and removes the previous cause of harm identified in the delegated report.

**Refused vs revised comparison: Policy 41 (parking, turning and highway functionality)**

- 7.7 The refused scheme was also rejected because of a shortfall of parking spaces and the lack of on-site turning, such that the Council concluded it would not provide an adequate level of on-site parking to meet anticipated user demand and would lead to poor amenity/environment within the locality. The delegated report records substantive WSCC Highways concerns which focused on demonstrating safe access/egress and the practical operation of parking and turning, including the ability to turn within the site and exit in forward gear.
- 7.8 The revised scheme directly resolves this objection in a clear and measurable way. The updated site layout (195/2025/2) provides a widened access from Hurstside and shows three off-street parking spaces within the site. The resubmission is also supported by the Proposed Site Parking and Turning Plan (195/2025/6), which demonstrates vehicle movements and confirms that a private car can enter the site, manoeuvre within the forecourt and leave the site in forward gear. This evidence goes to the heart of refusal reason two and removes the concern that the parking provision would be inadequate or function poorly in practice.
- 7.9 Taken together, the widened access arrangement, the provision of three spaces, and the demonstrated turning capability are considered to overcome the previous Policy 41 refusal reason and to provide a safe and functional arrangement consistent with the objectives of Policy 41.

### **Water neutrality and the current position**

- 7.10 The delegated report confirms that the Council's approach to water neutrality changed following Natural England's withdrawal of the 2021 position statement, and that officers concluded the proposal would not result in an adverse effect on integrity. For the avoidance of doubt in this revised submission, the former water neutrality position statement is no longer in place, and water neutrality is therefore not advanced as an outstanding constraint that should prevent determination of this revised application.
- 7.11 The primary focus remains on the two refusal matters which have been addressed through the revised design and the submitted parking/turning evidence.

### **Planning balance**

- 7.12 The delegated report confirms Horsham District Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and that the NPPF paragraph 11(d) tilted balance applies to housing proposals in the District.
- 7.13 In that context, the delivery of an additional dwelling attracts weight in favour of the development. When assessed against the revised proposals, the specific harms previously identified have now been materially addressed, such that there is no clear residual basis to withhold planning permission on the same grounds.

### **Final conclusion**

- 7.14 This revised resubmission is a materially improved and policy-responsive proposal. It is specifically designed to address and overcome the two refusal reasons by delivering an improved neighbour relationship under Policy 33 and a safe, functional access/parking/turning arrangement under Policy 41, supported by the widened access layout and the submitted parking and turning plan demonstrating exit in forward gear.
- 7.15 Therefore, it would be anticipated that the Council would be able to grant planning

Planning Statement  
51 The Fieldings



permission.