



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0766

Town Barn, Dragons Green Road, Shipley, West Sussex,

DESCRIPTION:

Erection of 1no. self-build dwelling and conversion of existing barn to form home office. Construction of associated driveway.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/19/2307	Notification for the change of use of the existing barn to provide a wedding venue for use by the Sussex Produce Company	OBJECTION to Notification on 09.12.2019
DC/09/2155	Renewal of existing consent (DC/04/2051) for conversion of redundant barn to (2-bed) residential use	Application Permitted on 18.01.2010
DC/09/1514	Conversion of redundant barn to 1 residential dwelling as per previous consent DC/04/2051	Withdrawn Application on 19.10.2009
DC/04/2051	Conversion of barn into 1 residential dwelling	Application Permitted on 26.01.2005

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 4 - Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion
- Policy 7 - Strategic Policy: Economic Growth
- Policy 9 - Employment Development
- Policy 10 - Rural Economic Development
- Policy 11 - Tourism and Cultural Facilities
- Policy 12 - Strategic Policy: Vitality and Viability of Existing Retail Centres
- Policy 13 - Town Centre Uses
- Policy 14 - Shop Fronts and Advertisements
- Policy 15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision
- Policy 16 - Strategic Policy: Meeting Local Housing Needs
- Policy 17 - Exceptions Housing Schemes
- Policy 18 - Retirement Housing and Specialist Care
- Policy 19 - Park Homes and Residential Caravan Sites
- Policy 20 - Rural Workers Accommodation
- Policy 21 - Strategic Policy: Gypsy and Traveller Sites Allocations
- Policy 22 - Gypsy and Traveller Sites
- Policy 23 - Strategic Policy: Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation
- Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
- Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
- Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection

- Policy 27 - Settlement Coalescence
- Policy 28 - Replacement Dwellings and House Extensions in the Countryside
- Policy 29 - Equestrian Development
- Policy 30 - Protected Landscapes
- 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 39 - Strategic Policy: Infrastructure Provision
- Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
- Policy 41 - Parking
- Policy 42 - Strategic Policy: Inclusive Communities
- Policy 43 - Community Facilities, Leisure and Recreation

Shipley Parish Neighbourhood Plan (SPNP) 2019 - 2031:

- Policy Ship HD1 – New Housing Development
- Policy Ship HD3 - High Quality Design

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 1.7-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.

Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19):

- 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 10: Flooding
- 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 27: Inclusive Communities, Health and Wellbeing

Policy 32: Conversion of Agricultural and Rural Buildings to Commercial, Community and Residential Uses
Strategic Policy 37: Housing Provision
Strategic Policy 38: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Policy 39: Affordable Housing
Policy 40: Improving Housing Standards in the District
Policy 41: Rural Exception Homes
Policy 46: Ancillary Accommodation

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD (2017)
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2017)

Parish Design Statement:

Planning Advice Notes:

Facilitating Appropriate Development
Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

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:

HDC Arboricultural Officer: Comment [Summary]

No significant arboricultural concerns. Lack of engineering detail/control of potential impact on trees adjacent to the access could be garnered by condition (standard landscape and arboricultural method statement) as deemed necessary.

Ecology Consultant: No Objection

No ecological objection subject to attached conditions.

Southern Water: Comment

PlaceServices (Landscape): Objection

Objection [Summary]: 11/06/2026

We judge that the proposed development will result in adverse effects to both landscape character and visual amenity, although these are limited to the site itself and Dragons Green Lane. The proposals would have an adverse impact on the landscape character, qualities and visual resource of the site

Objection [Summary]: 02/07/2206

Whilst the additional information is welcomed, our previous concerns regarding the principle of development remain extant.

WSCC Highways: No Objection [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.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:

Representations:

6 letters of Objection have been received from 3 addresses, objecting to the application.

- Objections coalesced around inefficient use of space; not in line with social and economic community objectives; isolated development; large development; no countryside use associated; field identified as important to character of the parish; inaccessible by public transport.

7 letters for Support have been received from 5 addresses, supporting the application.

- Support coalesced around appropriate size and design; development would prevent further development; well considered proposal; contribution to housing stock; minimal impact on the neighbouring amenity; sympathetic to environment; supporting the economy.

Parish Comments:

Parish Council: Objection

The view from Members is that this is a speculative development of the type the Parish Council is currently trying to prevent in other areas of the Parish. The application is using the presence & possible conversion of the barn (which is unlisted but was granted unimplemented planning permission in 2020 for conversion into a 2-bed dwelling) to gain permission for a new substantial dwelling on a green field site in open countryside.

The site lies 1 mile north of the unclassified settlement of Dragons Green and 2 miles south of Southwater, is outside of and does not adjoin any settlement boundary, there is no evidence given that the proposed dwelling is essential to its location, it is situated in one of the most peaceful & unspoilt areas of the Parish, in an isolated and what is in a very beautiful field in open countryside containing several mature oak trees which was until very recently used for grazing.

The application conflicts with Policies 2,3,4,& 26 of the current Horsham District Planning Framework.

It also conflicts with the objectives of the Shipley Neighbourhood Plan in particular (a) Policies HD1 - the siting of new Housing Development, and (b) HD2 Housing Mix - which states the need to rebalance the mix with an emphasis on the local need for smaller and more affordable homes, which this application for a substantial 4-bedroom house does not fulfil.

The stated objective of the NHP is to maintain the rural setting of the Parish which 'should be reflected in any future development proposals'

Access to the site is off an unlit, narrow & winding single carriageway country lane, there is no public transport in the vicinity, and the occupants would be wholly reliant on private car transport to meet their daily needs.

There would be very limited, if any, enhancements of community facilities & services from this application if allowed.

To site a substantial dwelling in that field with a driveway across it would be in complete conflict with the Parish objectives, which are to preserve the remaining most rural and attractive areas of countryside in the Parish.

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

The application seek permission for the erection of 1no. self-build dwelling and conversion of existing barn to form home office; construction of associated driveway at Town Barn, Dragons Green Road, Shipley. The application site is a spacious agricultural field with it and Town Barn located to the west of Dragons Green Road. Town Barn itself is located near to the southern boundary of the plot. The plot is located outside the built up area boundary and will be assessed using countryside policy contexts.

Town Barn itself has previously had permission for residential conversions under applications DC/04/2051 (Conversion of barn into 1 residential dwelling) and DC/09/2155 (Renewal of existing consent (DC/04/2051) for conversion of redundant barn to (2-bed) residential use). It is noted that these were both approved and related to the conversion of Town Barn itself. This proposal is for the conversion of Town Barn to form a home office as an auxiliary building associated with a larger dwelling which is to be sited to the north east of Town Barn.

Principle of Development:

Section 5, Paragraph 84 of the NPPF (December 2024) states that “[p]lanning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:

- a) there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;
- b) the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;
- c) the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;
- d) the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential building; or
- e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it:
 - i. is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and
 - ii. would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of

Policy 1 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) states that the council will take positive approach to development proposals, aligning with the National Planning Policy Framework's emphasis on sustainable development. It collaborates proactively with applicants to find solutions that enable project approval and enhance economic, social, and environmental conditions. Planning applications that comply with the Local Plan and relevant neighbourhood plans will be approved promptly unless material considerations suggest otherwise. If policies are absent or outdated, the Council will grant permission unless significant adverse impacts outweigh the benefits, or specific policies in the Framework restrict development.

Policy 2 of the HDPF sets out the main growth strategy, focusing development in the main settlements. The HDPF outlines that the proposed settlement hierarchy is the most sustainable approach to delivering housing; where new development is focused in the larger settlements of Horsham, Southwater and Billingshurst; and limited new development is directed elsewhere, and 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.

Policy 4 of the HDPF refers to the expansion of settlements outside the built-up area, and states that such development is only 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.

Policy 26 of the HDPF requires development in the countryside be of a scale that is appropriate to its countryside character and location and not lead, either individually or cumulatively, to a significant increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside. It also needs to be essential to its countryside location and to meet one of the following criteria:

- Support the needs of agriculture or forestry;
- Enable the extraction of minerals or the disposal of waste;
- Provide for quiet informal recreational use; or
- Enable the sustainable development of rural areas.

Policy Ship HD1 supports new housing in Shipley, Coolham, Dragons Green and Brooks Green where proposals represent infill or redevelopment within existing built form, avoid extending settlements onto greenfield land, provide affordable housing, reflect the scale and density of surrounding development, and demonstrate a positive response to the Shipley Parish Design Guidance.

The proposed development is for of 1no. self-build dwelling and conversion of existing barn to form home office; construction of associated driveway at Town Barn, Dragons Green Road, Shipley. The application site is a spacious agricultural field with Town Barn located to the west of Dragons Green Road, near to the southern boundary of the plot.

The proposal is outside the built-up area boundary and would represent countryside development and would include the reuse of an unused barn for use as home office in line with paragraph 84(c) of the NPPF. The site itself is not allocated within any local or neighbourhood plan. Whilst the proposal would not be isolated in the truest sense of the word given the existing dwellings located in proximity to the site, the proposal is isolated in terms of access to service, approximately 1.3km away (as the crow flies) from the nearest built up area boundary of Southwater and 2.3km (as the crow flies) from built up area boundary of Barns Green. There is a public right of way system approximately 90m to the south of the site which allows access to Southwater using a combination of paths (path 1892; 2929; 1888; 1889). This connects the site to the closest built-up area boundary and exits at Shipley Road, Southwater. This distance is 1.7km. However, this is unlikely to constitute a desirable daily walking path when considering the length and terrain. In addition, as this terminates at Shipley Road, it requires an additional 1km walk to reach services within Southwater. Residents of any dwelling would be reliant on private vehicles to facilitate day to day living at the site.

The proposal is sited where there is very little development, save the barn which is located some 140m away from the proposed dwelling's intended positioning. Neighbouring dwelling are all in excess of 300m away from the site and as such the proposal would be considered to sit alone. The dwelling itself would be located roughly centrally within this agricultural field and would be a prominent development considering this and the lack of vegetation screening the development from the roadside. The proposal would result in a prominent dwelling appearing within an undeveloped section of land and would likely erode the image of an undeveloped countryside and would not sit in relation to any built form bar the barn.

The proposed dwelling would therefore be remote from day-to-day services, where the provision of market housing in this location, not linked to a rural use, would be contrary to Policy 26 of the HDPF and would not be in accordance with the overarching spatial strategy for development as set out in Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF. It is therefore considered to be contrary to the spatial strategy and principles of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Development Plan and Neighbourhood Plan.

Whilst the Design and Access statement mentions that Town Barn itself has had permission for residential conversions under applications DC/04/2051 (Conversion of barn into 1 residential dwelling) and DC/09/2155 (Renewal of existing consent (DC/04/2051) for conversion of redundant barn to (2-bed) residential use), these related to the conversion of Town Barn itself. These permissions were not enacted. This proposal is for the conversion of Town Barn to form a home office as an auxiliary building associated with a larger dwelling which is to be sited to the north east of Town Barn.

Though the barn had previously been granted permission to be converted into a residential use, there are a number of relevant and material matters which should be bourn in mind when drawing a comparison to the present application. First of all: the 2004 permission related solely to the use of that barn and its immediate curtilage, and would have resulted in the re-use of an otherwise redundant building. By contrast, the present application comprises a significantly larger curtilage, and seeks to establish a new dwelling sited centrally within the field. Furthermore, the planning framework has substantially and materially changed since 2004, both nationally and locally- this includes two local plans since, and the adoption of the NPPF and subsequent revisions. As this permission was never undertaken, and significant time has passed since, Officers are of the view that this does not represent a viable fallback to establish that the principle of the development is acceptable.

With the above in mind, the principle of the proposal is resisted. The appropriate degree of weight to be assigned to conflict with these policies is detailed further below.

Design and Appearance:

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF (December 2024) should ensure that development is high-quality, functional and enduring, creating visually attractive places through good architecture, layout and landscaping. They should respect and enhance local character and history while allowing for appropriate innovation, establish a strong sense of place, and make efficient use of land to support a suitable mix of uses and community infrastructure. Development should also deliver safe, inclusive and accessible environments that promote health and well-being, provide a high standard of amenity for all users, and avoid impacts that could undermine quality of life or community cohesion.

Policy 32 and 33 of the HDPF seeks to ensure that development promotes a high standard and quality of design in order to enhance and protect locally distinctive characters. The policies also seek to ensure that the scale, massing and appearance of development relates sympathetically with the built surroundings, landscape, open spaces and routes within and adjoining the site, including any impact on the skyline and important views.

Policy Ship HD3 sets out that developments within Shipley Parish should respond positively to local design characteristics and should be of sizing and scaling that respects the character of the locality, using materials that are typical to the area. The Parish Design Statement also informs on the typical styling cues and elements found throughout the parish.

The proposal sees the erection of a large, 4-bedroom dwelling designed in a traditional architectural style, situated centrally within a wider agricultural field, approximately 160m north west of the entrance to the site off Dragons Green Road. The dwellings main massing is within its two story 'H' shaped footprint with a single-story side element which serves as the living room. This itself has a tall roof to allow a vaulted ceiling. The front elevation is of a traditional style with Georgian bar style windows. The rear continues this traditional style however includes full height windows and a rear balcony to serve the master bedroom. The dwelling itself is finished in buff facing brickwork with clay tile roofing with windows in a dark grey aluminium/composite materials. The proposals traditional style and material choice is considered to integrate itself within the character of the area and would not be considered in design terms to be in contrast to the built character of the wider vicinity.

The main dwelling would occupy a total 268m². It would be considered that this is a large dwelling and would be overt considering the surrounding contexts where there is a lack of vegetation screening the proposals. However, given the size of curtilage, it is considered that the plot could accommodate the large built form.

The proposal also sees the introduction of a home office sited close to the road of Dragons Green Road. This is housed within the existing barn on site. The proposal sees the introduction of several windows and doors all contained to the front (south) and rear (north) elevations, making use of the existing openings plus additional windows. The scale of the building however is questioned given the use as just as home office with a footprint of 95m² with no indicative floor plan for the space provided. As indicated within the block plan, the barn itself appears to have a somewhat *exaggerated* redline which extends outwards to the south of the barn which raises questions in regard to the exact purpose of the barn. This exaggerated redline is the same as that which was approved for the dwelling within Town Barn under previous application for a presumed garden, though its enlarged curtilage has not been justified on this proposal.

The larger dwelling would be accessed via a lengthy private driveway. The driveway would also serve the converted barn home office (barn currently sited) which is located close to the roadside.

Overall, in considering the design and appearance of the dwelling, it is thought the proposal responds to the policies laid out above. However, as discussed in further detail below, though the overall design of the building may well be considered to comply with local and national planning policies, the development as a whole, including its layout and context within this area, would result in adverse landscape harm.

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.

Given the proposal is relatively isolated, there is not considered to be an impact on the residential amenity owing to overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing.

Trees and Landscaping:

Policy 25 of the HDPF seeks that the natural environment and the local character of Horsham District including the landscape, the landforms and development pattern will be protected from inappropriate development. The policy aims to:

- Protects, conserves and enhances the landscape and townscape character, considering areas identified as being of landscape importance, the individual settlement characteristics, and maintains settlement separation.
- Maintain and enhances the Green Infrastructure Network and addresses any identified deficiencies in the District.
- Maintains and enhances the existing network of geological sites and biodiversity, including safeguarding existing designated sites and species, and ensures no net loss of wider biodiversity and provides net gains in biodiversity where possible.
- Conserve and where possible enhance the setting of the South Downs National Park

As above, the proposal is sited where there is very little development and would be considered to sit alone. The dwelling itself would be located roughly centrally within the agricultural field coupled with a lack of vegetation screening the development from the roadside, resulting in a prominent dwelling appearing within an undeveloped section of land and would erode the image of an undeveloped countryside and would not sit in relation to any built form, save for the barn. As per the Landscape Consultant's advice, given the proposal siting in relative isolation, the development of a large dwelling would result in degradation in landscape character and visual amenity. It is therefore considered that the proposal would be in conflict with the identified policy.

Ecology:

Policy 31 of the HDPF promotes development that protects and enhances green infrastructure and biodiversity. It supports projects that maintain ecological networks, create new habitats, and improve existing biodiversity. Loss of green infrastructure must be mitigated or compensated, and protected trees must be replaced if felled. The policy prioritizes safeguarding designated nature sites and

habitats, and requires rigorous assessment and mitigation for developments impacting sensitive areas like the Arun Valley SPA and the Mens SAC.

The application is supported by a detailed Preliminary Ecological Assessment (PEA). The Ecology Consultant had no objections to the proposal subject to conditions being implemented. The Ecologist identified the PEA should be secured by a condition of any consent and implemented in full along with conditions for a biodiversity gain plan and lighting as necessary.

It is considered that subject to the mitigation and enhancement measures, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on habits or protected species in accordance with Policy 31 of the HDPF.

Highways Impacts:

Policy 40 of HDPF promote development that provides safe and adequate access, suitable for all users. Policy 40 focuses on supporting development of a sustainable and integrated transport system that supports sustainable transport travel to access jobs, homes, and services. It encourages development that aligns with existing transport infrastructure, reduces carbon emissions, and looks to reduce travel distances and conflicts. Development will be supported where public transport access is improved, routes for cyclists and pedestrians are well implemented and ensures safe highways use for all transport modes.

Policy 41 seeks to find the right balance between ensuring that adequate parking is provided and that it is suitably located and does not conflict with other uses. It should be of good urban design and be appropriate to ensure highway safety. Development which involves the loss of existing parking spaces will only be allowed if suitable alternative provision has been secured elsewhere the need for the development overrides the loss of parking and where necessary measures are in place to mitigate against the impact.

The proposal is considered to provide adequate parking. The site would be accessed via private driveway with there considered ample room for maneuverers on site to exit the site in forward gear. As per the LHA's assessment "[it is not] consider[ed] that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network".

The proposal accords with the above policies.

Water Neutrality:

A 2021 Position Statement from Natural England identified that it could not be concluded with the required degree of certainty that new development in the Sussex North Water Supply Zone would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites. As a consequence, and to comply with the legal duties set out in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (known as the Habitat Regulations), all new development since has been required to demonstrate water neutrality.

On 31st October 2025 Natural England formally withdrew the 2021 Position Statement, citing a package of measures that they were satisfied would safeguard the Arun Valley sites. Principal amongst these measures is a reduction in the Southern Water abstraction licence 'by March 2026'. However, given the licence change has not yet taken place Horsham District Council, as competent authority under the Habitats Regulations, cannot yet be certain that new development will not result in adverse impacts on the Arun Valley sites.

To ensure development can come forward as water neutral in the meantime, the Council has agreed with Natural England to use the significant water savings made by Southern Water in 2024/25 through their programme of leakage reduction (amongst other measures). This has generated some 3,240,000 litres per day of water savings that can now be attributed to new development without increasing water abstraction in the Arun Valley beyond baseline. These savings were previously to be used to launch the Sussex North Water Certification Scheme (SNWCS), however following the withdrawal statement SNWCS will no longer be launching. Natural England standing advice dated 10 November 2025 raises

no objection to using these savings to enable development to come forward. The standing advice clarifies that it functions as Natural England's formal response pursuant to Regulation 63(3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 to all relevant planning applications which seek to achieve water neutrality using the above Southern Water savings.

Officers have undertaken an Appropriate Assessment which demonstrates that the anticipated increase in mains water consumption from this development, alongside all other development granted since the 31st October 2025, will not exceed 3,240,000 litres per day.

Accordingly, Officers consider that the proposed development will not have an Adverse Effect on the Integrity of the Arun Valley Site, either alone or in combination with other plan and projects, thereby complying with Regulations 63 and 70 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, HDPF Policy 31, and paragraph 193 of the NPPF.

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) and that every planning permission granted for the development of land in England shall be deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that development must not be begun unless a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority and the planning authority has approved the Plan.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must show how the development will achieve the required minimum 10% BNG using the statutory biodiversity metric tool, and must demonstrate how the habitats will be managed and maintained for 30 years, starting from the date the development is completed. Off-site gains (on unregistered sites) and significant on-site enhancements will be secured over this period by way of a Legal Agreement.

The Applicant has demonstrated that the development is exempt from the requirement to achieve a minimum 10% BNG by reason of:

- The development qualifies as 'self-build or custom housing' under Regulation 8 of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024

Conclusion and Planning Balance:

Planning permission is sought for the erection of one dwelling and the conversion of an existing barn into ancillary residential use. The site is not allocated for development with the HDPF or a made neighbourhood plan, owing to the site's location outside of the built-up area boundary, the principle of the development is resisted under Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework, paragraphs 2, 11, 12 and 47 of the NPPF, and Policy HD1 of the Shipley Neighbourhood Plan. Furthermore, the development would result in adverse harm to the character of the surrounding area. The proposal also therefore conflicts with Policies 25, 32, 33 of the HDPF

The Council's most recent Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) revealed that the Council does not currently benefit from a deliverable supply of housing sites 5-years. Therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development at paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged in this instance, meaning the 'tilted balance' applies to the assessment.

NPPF paragraph 11(d)(ii) states that where the policies most important for determining the application are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless 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.

NPPF paragraph 14 also states that 'in situations where the presumption (at paragraph 11d) applies to applications involving the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, provided the following apply:

- a) the neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan five years or less before the date on which the decision is made; and
- b) the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement...

As the Shipley Neighbourhood Plan is now over 5 years old, and the plan does not allocate sites for development, the plan is not afforded the 'protection' bestowed under paragraph 14 of the NPPF. Therefore, a diminished level of weight can only be attributed to the policies contained within the plan when assessing planning applications. However, the Neighbourhood Plan remains a component of the statutory Framework and part of the adopted Development Plan under Section 38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. While its housing supply policies are out-of-date, its conflict with the overarching settlement strategy and its purpose to protect the rural character of the parish still carry measurable weight in the planning balance

As above, the Shaping Development in Horsham District Planning Advice Note (SDPAN) was endorsed at Cabinet on 17 September 2025. The SDPAN recognises at 5.12 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.

The site is located in a countryside location, though not isolated in the truest sense, it is a relatively remote location that does not adjoin the settlement edge. Therefore, the proposal fails on the first criterion and therefore the development does not benefit from the provisions of the SDPAN.

In the context of the Council's current five-year housing land supply position, the provision of housing as a general principle is a matter of significant weight. However, because this proposal would provide one dwelling, it makes no meaningful contribution toward recovering this shortfall. As such, the weight attributable to this specific scheme's housing delivery is tempered to moderate weight.

Officers acknowledge that the development has been proposed as self- / custom-build dwellings. The Council recognises that there is a need to facilitate self-build projects within the District. However, there is a key difference between 'self-build' housing in terms of CIL and BNG exemption, and 'Self-build and Custom Housebuilding' as defined within the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 and the subsequent Housing and Planning Act 2016. The two, though similarly named, represent different housing products.

PPG 011 Self-build and Custom Housebuilding (Reference ID: 57-011-20210208) clarifies how the population of a self-build and custom housebuilding register in terms of plan making should be considered as part of a Council's local housing need:

'Assessment of local housing need as a whole should be conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance. Within this context, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups should be assessed including people wishing to self-build or custom-build their own homes.

Local planning authorities should use the demand data from the registers in their area, supported as necessary by additional data from secondary sources (as outlined in the housing and economic development needs guidance), to understand and consider future need for this type of housing in their area. Secondary sources can include data from building plot search websites, enquiries for building

plots recorded by local estate agents and surveys of local residents. Demand assessment tools can also be utilised.

Plan-makers will need to make reasonable assumptions using the data on their register to avoid double-counting households.'

PPG 025 Self-build and Custom Housebuilding (Reference ID: 57-025-20210508) clarifies house Council can increase the number of planning permissions which are suitable for self-build and custom housebuilding:

'Relevant authorities should consider how local planning policies may address identified requirements for self and custom housebuilding to ensure enough serviced plots with suitable permission come forward (for example, as a number of units required as part of certain allocated sites, or on certain types of site).

More widely, relevant authorities can play a key role in brokering and facilitating relationships to help bring suitable land forward. This can include:

- supporting Neighbourhood Planning groups where they choose to include self-build and custom build housing policies in their plans;*
- effective joint working across service delivery areas and with local delivery partners including Housing Associations, Arms Length Management Organisations and housing developers;*
- using their own land (if available and suitable) for self-build and custom housebuilding and marketing it to those on the register;*
- working with Homes England to unlock land and sites in wider public ownership to deliver self-build and custom build housing;*
- when engaging with developers and landowners who own sites that are suitable for housing, and encouraging them to consider self-build and custom housebuilding, and facilitating access to those on the register where the landowner is interested.*
- working with local partners, such as Housing Associations and third sector groups, to custom build affordable housing for veterans and other groups in acute housing need.'*

The site is not included on the Council's self-build register, and the applicant has not detailed how the proposal would meet an unmet need of self-/custom-building within the local area or indeed the District. Therefore, the proposal would not be considered to meet the definition of Self-/Custom-build housing as per the relevant acts and PPG as above. In the absence of this information, the Council does not consider that this claim has any meaningful benefit in favour of granting permission.

It is acknowledged that any development would bestow socio-economic benefits, such as the creation of temporary jobs during the construction phase in the short-term, and local expenditure and contribution to the local economy in the medium to long-term arising from increase occupancy. However, this is not a particularly unique benefit that would result from this development. Nonetheless, this benefit is afforded limited weight in the overall planning balance.

The proposal's ability to demonstrate an absence of adverse ecological harm and acceptable highways impact (among others) are neutral considerations that demonstrate general policy compliance rather than positive benefits weighing in favour of the scheme. No other discernible benefits would arise from the granting of this permission.

As per the preceding sections of this report, the granting of this permission would conflict with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the HDPF. This conflict with the development plan is afforded significant weight, as it would undermine the strategic process of allocating housing sites for development in appropriate locations, and the democratic process of selecting sites within Neighbourhood Plans. Furthermore, the resultant character harm is attributed significant weight.

While the Council's housing land supply shortfall triggers the presumption in favour of sustainable development under NPPF Paragraph 11(d), the tilted balance is not a green light for unsustainable development. In this case the site's failure to meet the location criteria of the SDPAN, and the adverse character harm results in clear harm to the settlement strategy and character of the local area. These

impacts combined significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of delivering one market dwelling when assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole. As such, the presumption is displaced, and the proposal is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Conditions:

1. The proposed dwelling would result in a new residential development in the countryside, in a location remote from everyday services and facilities, where future occupiers would be heavily reliant on private vehicle use. By reason of its isolated and prominent siting within an undeveloped agricultural field, the development would erode the rural character of the area and would not represent a form of development that is essential to a countryside location. The proposal fails to accord with the established spatial strategy for directing development to sustainable locations and is not supported by any site allocation within the development plan. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policies 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), and Policy Ship HD1 of the Shipley Neighbourhood Plan (2021).
2. The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its isolated and prominent position within an open agricultural field, would introduce an incongruous form of development that would detract from the rural character, landscape quality and visual amenity of the countryside. The scale and siting of the development, in an area with limited existing built neighbouring form and little natural screening, would result in harm to the character and appearance of the landscape and would fail to respect the prevailing development pattern. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policies 32, 33 and 25 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

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/26/0766

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

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location & Block plan	Existing	25581/P100 REV P1	12.05.2026
Block plan	Proposed	25581/P101 REV P1	12.05.2026
Block plan	Proposed	25581/P101	12.05.2026
Floor plan	Proposed dwelling ground and first	25581/P102	12.05.2026
Elevation plan	Proposed dwelling and roof	25581/P103	12.05.2026
Elevation plan	Proposed dwelling	25581/P104	12.05.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	Existing barn	25581/P105	12.05.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed barn	25881/P106	12.05.2026
Supporting Docs	Covering letter	25/179	12.05.2026
Supporting Statement	Preliminary Ecological Appraisal	NONE REV 1	12.05.2026
Supporting Statement	Energy and Sustainability	NONE	12.05.2026

	Statement		
Design & Access Statement		NONE	12.05.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial JBurrowes Date: 15/07/2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial RHERMITAGE Date: 29.07.2026