

The Planning Inspectorate
c/o QUADIENT
69 Buckingham Avenue
Slough
SL1 4PN

Our ref: DC/26/0035
Your ref: 6009593
Contact: 01403 215 429
Email: Bethan.Tinning@horsham.gov.uk
Date: 23.06.2026

Dear Sir/Madam,

6009593 – Land East of Spring Gardens, Washington, West Sussex, RH20 3BP

Following the submission of the appeal against the refusal of the erection of 1no. detached two-storey dwelling and associated landscaping and relocation of existing stable, the Local Planning Authority would refer the Inspector to the Delegated Report, and would like to reiterate the reason for refusal as follows:

Refusal Reason 1: -

The development would be located beyond a defined built-up area on a site not allocated within the Development Plan and would not be essential to this countryside location. The development would therefore be contrary to the overarching spatial strategy and hierarchy approach of concentrating development within defined settlements and advocating a planned approach to settlement expansion, contrary to policies 1, 2, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015). Notwithstanding the absence of a five-year land housing supply, and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) at paragraph 11(d), it is not considered that there are any material considerations in this instance which would outweigh harm arising from conflict with Local and Neighbourhood Plan policies in these regards.

The Appellant's Appeal Statement contests that the proposed erection of a dwellinghouse would be acceptable in this location. The site is 1.5 miles to the north-west of Washington and 1 mile away from Ashington. The Appellant contends that the proposal would be acceptable having regard to Ashington's classification under Policy 3 of the HDPF as a 'medium village', providing a moderate level of services and facilities. As explained in the Delegated Report, the location would not represent sustainable development. Future occupiers would likely be reliant on private cars to get to nearby settlements, and this would conflict with policy.

While it is also acknowledged that the land is previously developed, with a stable block and hardstanding lawfully developed on site; both the NPPF and Policy 2 of the HDPF direct previously developed land to within settlements. Furthermore, while the site may fall within the definition of previously developed land, this does not in itself indicate that it is suitable for residential development. In this case, the site does not form a logical infill and remains outside a defined settlement boundary, such that redevelopment would conflict with the spatial strategy and development plan.

As detailed in the Shaping Development in Horsham District Document (September 2025), applications will only be considered positively, if they 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 delivery of one market dwelling would provide limited socio-economic benefits, the site is neither adjacent to nor well-related to an existing settlement edge. As such, the proposal would not benefit from the provisions of the Shaping Development in Horsham District document and would not represent an appropriate location for new housing development.

Case Studies

The Appellant's Appeal Statement refers to a number of case studies, demonstrating proposals within the Horsham District where planning permission was granted for the creation of new dwellings in the countryside. The Council's Delegated Report also refers to several relevant appeal decisions for similar sites to the application site. It is well established that appeal decisions are highly fact-specific, and the weight afforded to them depends on the degree of similarity in site context and planning circumstances. The following discussion addresses the applications and appeal decisions referred to by the Appellant in their Appeal Statement.

1. Chanctonview, Spring Gardens (DC/22/0867)

This site is north-west of the appeal site on Spring Gardens. The application for one dwellinghouse was permitted and the Appellant notes that due to the proximity of this site to the appeal site, that the same assessment and justification should be applied. However, the site circumstances were different, and each application is assessed based on its own merits. The Officer's Delegated Report highlighted that the site represented previously developed land, as defined at Annex 2 to the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), being land contained within the curtilage of Chanctonview as a permanent structure. The site was located outside the built-up area boundary, but it was considered that the neighbourhood plan supported reusing previously developed land in this case. In relation to this appeal, while the site is previously developed land, it is not within residential use and as highlighted above, the proposal conflicts with the NPPF and Policy 2 of the HDPF in directing previously developed land to within settlements. The unsustainable location of the dwelling would be of greater weight in the overall planning balance.

2. Land at Thornhill Stables (DC/24/1486)

Furthermore, the Land at Thornhill Stables appeal (DC/24/1486 - APP/Z3825/W/25/3361339) allowed the construction of a detached barn style two-storey dwelling outside the built-up area boundary. The Inspector acknowledged that the location would not be suitable when assessed against the relevant HDPF and NP policies, with the site lacking close proximity to a wide range of essential services and facilities. However, the Inspector concluded that the adverse impacts of granting permission would not outweigh the benefits of a dwellinghouse. In the case of this appeal, it is considered the site circumstances are materially different. While the Thornhill Stable Inspector afforded weight to the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the conclusion arose from the planning balance having regard to the particular characteristics of that site and proposal. In contrast, the appeal proposal would not have

comparable site specific factors that would outweigh the identified policy conflict. As such, this appeal decision does not set a precedent to justify a similar conclusion in the current case.

3. Marlpost Meadows (DC/22/0495) and Cowfold Lodge (DC/22/2250)

The appeal statement also refers to a number of appeals for single dwellinghouses which were granted permission outside of the settlement boundary within the district, these are: Marlpost Meadows in Southwater (DC/22/0495 - APP/Z3825/W/22/3303603) and Cowfold Lodge in Cowfold (DC/22/2250 - APP/Z3825/W/23/3325926). In the case of the Marlpost Meadows appeal, the site was located closer to the built-up area of the nearest settlement (some 0.6km). The Inspector acknowledged that the proposal did represent conflict with the restrictive policies contained within the HDPF. In addition, the road and public footpath network weighed in favour of the Inspector's decision, noting that any increase in car use '*would be tempered by the short distance to the village centre*'. The Inspector for the Cowfold Lodge appeal acknowledged that the proposal would not be a sustainable location but highlighted there are opportunities for travel by other means than private car. In the case of this appeal, Cowfold Lodge was approximately 0.2km away from the edge of the settlement boundary, which is closer than the proposed development subject of this application, which is 0.8km from the edge of Ashington and 0.9km from the edge of Storrington, based on aerial measurements. These appeal cases are therefore not considered to be similar to that of the present application, in that the site is located further from the settlement edge and lacks safe and suitable public pedestrian routes to the settlement.

4. Wappingthorn Lodge (DC/23/0627)

The Wappingthorn Lodge application (DC/23/0627 - APP/Z3825/W/24/3341171) is materially different to the current appeal site, with Wappingthorn Lodge being a change of use of the site, with the stables, garage and a machinery store already on site just requiring extensions and alterations. The Inspector concluded that the proposed development would not provide a suitable location for housing but '*the proposal would make alternative use of existing buildings without harming the character and appearance of the area*'. There would be no changes to the building footprint, with the application a change of use rather than introducing new built form into the site. The presumption in favour of sustainable development applied in this case.

As such, the Wappingthorn Lodge is not comparable to the subject appeal site, as it would not involve the introduction of a new standalone dwelling in the countryside, but rather the reuse and adaptation of existing built form where other policies considerations apply. The degree of change proposed in that case was therefore considered significantly less harmful in spatial and policy terms than the current proposal.

5. Hunters Oak (DC/22/1775) and Horsham Golf Club (DC/23/1178)

The Appellant also references a further two appeal decisions for a more significant number of dwellings. These include Hunters Oak (DC/22/1775 - APP/Z3825/W/23/3323709) for 28 dwellings and Horsham Golf Club (DC/23/1178 - APP/Z3825/W/24/3355546) for 800 new homes and sports facilities. The Appellant refers to these as examples where the Planning Inspector states that the Horsham District Planning Policy Framework policies are out of date and therefore carry limited weight. In the case of the Hunter Oak appeal (DC/22/1775), the policy conflict was acknowledged but given limited weight. The emerging Local Plan policies were also given limited weight. The Inspector noted that the appeal site contained both residential and commercial/industrial uses and would deliver 28 dwellings adjacent to a built-up edge, making a modest contribution to the housing supply, and having very significant positive weight. The appeal, however, was dismissed due to the potential adverse effects of the development on designated areas and assets of particular importance.

In the case of the Horsham Golf Club appeal (DC/23/1178) the Inspector gave the delivery of 800 new homes very substantial weight and the identified policy conflict very limited weight. The Inspector acknowledged the conflict with the policy, but the benefit of the delivery of 800 homes (very substantial weight) and the provision of sports facilities (significant weight) as well as other material benefits, outweighed the identified policy conflict. This appeal decision is not comparable to the current appeal site, as it would deliver one market dwellinghouse and would have no other wider benefits, unlike the Horsham Golf Club appeal. It is the case in both the Hunters Oak and Horsham Golf Club appeal that the benefits of the delivery of a significant number of dwellings would significantly outweigh the identified policy conflict. It is considered that the appeal site would only deliver 1 market dwellinghouse and this would not deliver the same level of benefits as these appeal schemes.

As concluded within the Delegated Report, it is acknowledged that the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year deliverable supply of housing. However, the proposal would provide one market dwelling, with the Council considering this benefit limited given the negligible overall contribution to the supply. The benefits of the proposed single dwelling are acknowledged. However, the conflict with the development plan is given moderate weight and the site's unsustainable location is given significant weight, with these outweighing the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

Conclusion

The Council therefore remain of the view that the scheme as submitted would be contrary to the relevant policies of the Horsham District Planning Framework and NPPF. The Inspector is therefore respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal. However, should the Inspector be minded to approve the appeal, a List of Suggested Conditions is attached to this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Bethan Tinning
Planning Officer

List of Suggested Conditions

1. **Approved Plans**

2. **Standard Time Condition:** The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development shall commence until a drainage strategy detailing the proposed means of foul and surface water disposal has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure that the development is properly drained and to comply with Policy 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

4. **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development shall commence until a programme of archaeological monitoring during construction has been secured in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: This matter is fundamental as the site is of archaeological significance, and it is important that it is recorded before it is destroyed by development in accordance with Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

5. **Pre-Commencement Condition:** Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme of noise and vibration attenuation and ventilation sufficient to prevent overheating and maintain thermal comfort shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include acoustic performance details of the building facades and glazing and incorporate the recommendations detailed in the Anderson Acoustics, references 8891_001R_BP and dated 17th March 2026. The scheme shall achieve the habitable room standards as detailed in BS8233:2014 with no relaxation for exceptional circumstances and appropriate consideration of Lamax with suitable measures to ensure the thermal comfort of occupiers. Any mechanical ventilation shall be designed and installed in accordance with the ANC Acoustics Ventilation and Overheating: Residential Design Guide 2020. All works must be carried out by suitably qualified person and the approved noise, vibration attenuation and ventilation measures shall thereafter be retained and maintained in working order for the duration of the use in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of amenity of future occupiers and to ensure the use of the site does not have a harmful environmental effect and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

6. **Pre-Commencement (Slab Level) Condition:** Prior to any works above slab level, a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy for protected and Priority or threatened species, prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The content of the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy shall include the following:

- (a) Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed enhancement measures;
- (b) detailed designs or product descriptions to achieve stated objectives;
- (c) locations of proposed enhancement measures by appropriate maps and plans (where relevant);
- (d) persons responsible for implementing the enhancement measures; and
- (e) details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant).

The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

Reason: To enhance protected and Priority species & habitats and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under paragraph 187d of NPPF 2024 and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (as amended).

7. **Pre-Occupation Condition:** Prior to first use of the development hereby permitted, evidence prepared by a competent person shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the development has been carried out in accordance with the approved overheating assessment unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority in writing.

Reason: In the interests of amenity of future occupiers and to ensure the use of the site does not have a harmful environmental effect and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

8. **Pre-Occupation Condition:** Prior to the first occupation of each dwelling, the necessary in-building physical infrastructure and external site-wide infrastructure to enable superfast broadband speeds of 30 megabits per second through full fibre broadband connection shall be provided to the premises.

Reason: To ensure a sustainable development that meets the needs of future occupiers in accordance with Policy 37 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

9. **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the parking, turning and access facilities necessary to serve that dwelling have been implemented in accordance with the approved details as shown on the approved landscape plan [684-08, REV C, dated 19.03.2026] and shall be thereafter retained as such.

Reason: To ensure adequate parking, turning and access facilities are available to serve the development in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

10. **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until details for the provision for the storage of refuse and recycling facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These facilities shall be provided prior to occupation (or use) of the development hereby permitted and thereafter be retained for use at all times.

Reason: To ensure the adequate provision of recycling facilities in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

11. **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a scheme for the provision of electrical vehicle charging points has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be installed prior to first occupation of the development and shall thereafter remain as such.

Reason: To provide electric vehicle car charging space for the use in accordance with Policies 35 and 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and the WSCC Parking Standards (2019).

12. **Regulatory Condition:** All mitigation measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Ecology & Habitat Management Ltd., November 2025) as already submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the local planning authority prior to determination.

This may include the appointment of an appropriately competent person e.g. an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) to provide on-site ecological expertise during construction. The appointed person shall undertake all activities, and works shall be carried out, in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To conserve protected and Priority species and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (as amended).

13. **Regulatory Condition:** The dwelling hereby permitted shall meet the optional requirement of building regulation G2 to limit the water usage of the dwelling to no more than 110 litres per person per day. The subsequently installed water limiting measures shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: To limit water use in order to improve the sustainability of the development in accordance with Policy 37 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), and to avoid an adverse impact on the Arun Valley SACSPA and Ramsar sites in accordance with Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), and to allow the Local Planning Authority to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority habitats & species).

14. **Regulatory Condition:** The materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall strictly accord with those indicated on the application form and approved plans.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail in the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

15. **Regulatory Condition:** Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (and/or any Order revoking and/or re-enacting that Order) the dwelling hereby permitted shall not be enlarged under Class A, AA or B of Part 1 within Schedule 2 of the Order without express planning consent from the Local Planning Authority first being obtained.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and due to the constraints of the site in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

16. **Regulatory Condition:** No works for the implementation of the development hereby approved shall take place outside of 08:00 hours to 18:00 hours Mondays to Fridays and 08:00 hours to 13:00 hours on Saturdays nor at any time on Sundays, Bank or public Holidays

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of adjacent occupiers in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).