



PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

TO: Planning Committee

BY: Head of Development and Building Control

DATE: 12th May 2026

DEVELOPMENT: Permission in Principle for the demolition of existing stables building and erection of a single dwelling on the footprint.

SITE: Winstons Farm, Muttons Lane, Ashington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 3AL

WARD: West Chiltington, Thakeham and Ashington

APPLICATION: DC/25/2104

APPLICANT: **Name:** Mr and Mrs James Thorns **Address:** Winstons Farm, Muttons Lane, Ashington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 3AL

REASON FOR INCLUSION ON THE AGENDA: More than eight persons in different households have made written representations within the consultation period raising material planning considerations that are inconsistent with the recommendation of the Head of Development and Building Control.

RECOMMENDATION: To refuse planning permission

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

1.1 To consider the planning application.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

1.2 The application seeks Permission in Principle for 1no. dwelling on land at Winstons Farm (formerly known as Jinkes Farm) near Sullington. The proposed site plan indicates the existing stables building on the site will be demolished and replaced with the proposed dwelling, which is to be on the same footprint as the demolished stables. The proposed dwelling would be accessed via the existing access gate onto Muttons Lane.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

1.3 The application site is a parcel of land within Winstons Farm (formerly known as Jinkes Farm), east of Muttons Lane. The site is 40m southwest of Jinkes Farmhouse, a Grade II listed building. The site is outside of any designated built-up area boundary, with the nearest built-up area boundary (Storrington and Sullington) being 0.21km away to the west. The site is therefore located within the countryside in policy terms. An existing access runs 50m east from Muttons Lane to the northwest corner of the application site which is at the northwest

corner of an open field. A Public Right of Way (2621) runs parallel on the northern boundary of the site. Boundary treatment around the field consists of mature hedging and trees, with trees to the western site frontage and southern boundary protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The surrounding area consists of sporadic residential development, with a mixture of enclosed agricultural fields and open countryside.

2. INTRODUCTION

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The following Policies are considered to be relevant to the assessment of this application:

2.2 National Planning Policy Framework

2.3 Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF 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 15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision
Policy 16 - Strategic Policy: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Policy 17 - Exceptions Housing Schemes
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 39 - Strategic Policy: Infrastructure Provision
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking

2.4 Ashington Neighbourhood Plan (2019-2031):

Policy ASH1: Overall Spatial Strategy for Ashington
Policy ASH2: Increasing Walking in Ashington
Policy ASH3: Parking Provision

2.5 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 19: Development Quality
 Strategic Policy 20: Development Principles
 Policy 21: Heritage Assets and Managing Change within the Historic Environment
 Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport
 Policy 25: Parking
 Strategic Policy 37: Housing Provision
 Strategic Policy 38: Meeting Local Housing Needs
 Policy 40: Improving Housing Standards in the District
 Policy 41: Rural Exception Homes

- 2.6 **Supplementary Planning Guidance:**
 Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD (2017)
 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2017)

- 2.7 **Supplementary Planning Guidance:**
 Shaping Development in Horsham District (SDPAN)
 Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

2.8 **PLANNING HISTORY AND RELEVANT APPLICATIONS**

DC/17/0250	Erection of stable with storage room using existing access	Application Permitted on 03.04.2017
DC/18/0267	Erection of a two storey dwelling	Application Refused on 11.04.2018
DC/20/1382	Prior notification for the erection of a secured building to store agricultural equipment, tractor and digger.	Prior Approval Required and PERMITTED on 17.09.2020
DC/20/1612	Relocation of existing detached garage.	Application Permitted on 29.10.2020
DC/25/0003	Permission in Principle for demolition of existing stables building and erection of a single dwelling on the footprint	Application Refused on 12.03.2025. Appeal dismissed on 22.09.25.

3. OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1 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.

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

- 3.2 **HDC Arboricultural Officer:** Advice
 The site retains several mature perimeter oak trees, some protected by a Tree Preservation Order, and any new residential access will require detailed design and careful implementation to avoid harming their root systems. The oak tree formerly protected by TPO 0818, located by the roadside near the west gable of the stables, was not present when permission DC/17/0250 was approved. As a result, there are no tree constraints preventing a new dwelling from being positioned on the existing building's footprint.
- 3.3 **HDC Conservation:** Comment
 The comments would remain the same as those made regarding DC/25/0003, albeit without the request relating to the removal of the indicative images.

Previous Comments under DC/25/0003:

The proposed replacement dwelling is acceptable in principle. Any replacement should reflect the historic character of the former Winstons Farm holding.

3.4 **HDC Environmental Health:** Comment

Commercial and agricultural sites can carry significant contamination risks due to past uses, construction methods, and the storage of machinery, fuels, or chemicals. Potentially hazardous materials may also be present within made ground, yards, or hard standings. In line with Planning Practice Guidance, a preliminary risk assessment, including a site walkover, is required to demonstrate that any contamination can be identified, managed, and the site made safe and suitable for development.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

3.5 **Southern Water:** Comment

Insufficient Information provided. Construction of the development shall not commence until details of the proposed means of foul/surface water drainage disposal have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Southern Water.

3.6 **WSCC Highways:** Advice

There are no visibility concerns at the existing access onto Muttons Lane. Collision data over the past five years shows no recorded incidents in the vicinity, indicating the access operates safely and the proposal would not worsen any safety issues. At Technical Details Consent stage, the LHA will require information on the scale of the dwelling, the proposed access arrangements, and sufficient on-site parking and turning space, along with secure, covered cycle storage to support sustainable travel. As noted, the LHA's comments are limited at the PIP stage. In principle, the LHA raises no objection, subject to adequate details being provided at the Technical Details stage.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

3.7 Representations:

8 letters of Objection have been received from 8 addresses, objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Outside the built-up area
- Inappropriate development given the site sits adjacent to a listed building
- Inappropriate and disproportionate scale and design
- Removal of water neutrality requirements has no impact on this proposal
- Stables constructed solely to enable and justify a residential dwelling on the site
- Intrusive and out of keeping with character of local landscape
- Muttons Lane, a single-track road, cannot cope with the increase in traffic, nor construction traffic
- Increase in vehicular safety concerns
- Wrong classification of land – identified as grey belt
- No livestock kept on the land or in the stables
- Erode the established character and appearance of the locality
- Dangerous precedent for speculative development

3.8 8 letters for Support have been received from 8 addresses, supporting the application on the following grounds:

- Existing building is looking aged
- Benefits from an existing access and would not impact amenities
- Site could accommodate more than one dwelling
- Enhance the site, whilst respecting the locality
- No impact on neighbours

- Allow the owners to downsize
- Owners have contributed to local causes and local businesses
- No detrimental effect to the area or environment
- Appropriate development for the site
- Good quality sustainable design

A further 5 representation letters were received supporting the proposal from addresses located outside of the district.

3.9 Parish Comments:

Ashington Parish Council: Objection

- Development in countryside outside of the built-up area
- Not allocated within the made Ashington Neighbourhood Plan
- Not essential to a countryside location
- Overdevelopment of the site
- The council considers that the site is neither grey belt land nor previously development land
- Proposed footprint larger than the existing
- Out of keeping with the surrounding area/location

3.10 Member Comments:

None received

4. HOW THE PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION WILL PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS

- 4.1 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.
- 4.2 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.

5. HOW THE PROPOSAL WILL HELP TO REDUCE CRIME AND DISORDER

- 5.1 It is not considered that the development would be likely to have any significant impact on crime and disorder.

6. PLANNING ASSESSMENTS

Background:

- 6.1 This application is a resubmission of DC/25/0003, with the previous application being refused under delegated powers on 12 March 2025 for two reasons:

1. *The development would enable a residential use 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. There are no material considerations which outweigh this harm, and the proposal represents unsustainable development contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Policy ASH1 of made Ashington Neighbourhood Plan (2021), and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

2. *The applicant has not provided the necessary legal undertaking to secure the mitigations to avoid adverse effects on the integrity of the interest features of the Arun Valley SPA, SAC, and Ramsar site. In the absence of the mechanism to secure the necessary mitigations, the Local Planning Authority is unable to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority habitats and species). The proposal is therefore contrary Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Paragraphs 193 and 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).*

- 6.2 A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate on 22 September 2025. The Inspector concluded that, in the absence of a legally secured mechanism to deliver the proposed water neutrality mitigation (which relied in part on rainwater harvesting from land outside the appeal site) it could not be established with certainty that the development would be water neutral. As the proposal was not water neutral, and therefore found to be in conflict with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 the Inspector concluded that the proposal was exempt from qualifying for Permission in Principle. The inspector did not therefore consider the matters of location, land use and amount any further, as these matters would not be determinative to the outcome of the appeal. The inspector did not therefore make a judgement on the merits of the first reason for refusal above.
- 6.3 Prior to this, it is noted that the stables were first granted permission in 2017 (ref: DC/17/0250), with the land previously having formed a paddock. A subsequent application to erect a two-storey dwelling on the footprint of the stables was then refused in 2018 (ref: DC/18/0267) due to the site being outside the defined built-up area and a dwelling in this location being considered an intrusive addition to the countryside. In particular, it was considered that the scale of the development would detract from the unaltered character of the rural location and the location of the development would not be in accordance with the development plan or a made neighbourhood plan. This decision was not appealed.

Current proposal:

- 6.4 Permission in Principle is again sought for the demolition of the existing stables building and erection of a single dwelling on the footprint. The Permission in Principle consent route is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for residential development, which separates the consideration of matters of “principle” for the proposed development, from the “technical details” of the development. As such, the Permission in Principle route has two stages: the first being the “Permission in Principle” stage (subject of this current application), which establishes whether the site is suitable in-principle; and the second being the “Technical Details consent” stage which is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. The scope of the Permission in Principle application (being the first stage) is limited to location, land use, and amount of development.

Location:

- 6.5 Policy 2 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) sets out the overarching growth strategy, focusing development within the District’s main settlements. Policy 3 seeks to retain the existing settlement pattern and ensure that development takes place in the most sustainable locations possible. Policy 4 supports limited settlement expansion outside built-

up area boundaries only where: the site is allocated in the Local Plan or a Neighbourhood Plan and adjoins an existing settlement edge; the scale of growth is appropriate to the settlement; the proposal meets identified local needs; and the development is contained within defensible boundaries that respect landscape character.

- 6.6 In this countryside location, Policy 26 is also engaged. Policy 26 seeks to protect the countryside against inappropriate development unless it is essential to its countryside location and meets one of the following criteria: supporting agriculture or forestry; enabling mineral extraction or waste disposal; providing for quiet informal recreation; or enabling the sustainable development of rural areas.
- 6.7 Policy ASH1 of the Ashington Neighbourhood Plan(ANP) states that new development in Ashington parish shall be focused within the built-up area boundary of Ashington village as identified on the Policies Map. ASH1(d) states that development proposals outside the built-up area boundary and the site allocations will not be permitted unless:
- i. they represent appropriate uses in the countryside, such as agriculture, forestry, horticulture, fishing and equestrian activities, tourism, essential utilities infrastructure and energy generation;*
 - ii. they are on previously developed land and accord with local and national policy for such development;*
 - iii. they relate to the retention of existing and appropriate provision of new commercial businesses.'*
- 6.8 The application site lies outside of the defined Built-Up Area Boundary on a site not allocated for development, and therefore in planning policy terms forms part of the countryside where new development is strictly controlled. Whilst the stables building constitutes previously developed land, local and national policy does not support a dwelling in the countryside in this instance. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with the spatial strategy of Policies 2, 3 and 4 of the HDPF, and Policy ASH1 of the Ashington Neighbourhood Plan.
- 6.9 Nationally, Paragraph 84 of the NPPF states that "planning 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 dwelling; or*
 - e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it:*
 - I. is truly outstanding or innovative, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and*
 - II. would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and would significantly enhance its immediate setting and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area."*
- 6.10 The term "isolated" is not defined within the National Planning Policy Framework, but case law has confirmed that it should be given its ordinary objective meaning of remote and far away from other places, buildings and people, and separate or remote from a settlement, services, and facilities. The application site is located within close proximity to residential dwellings, and given this spatial context is not considered to be "isolated" in its truest sense and does not therefore engage the considerations of paragraph 84.
- 6.11 In light of the Council being unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply (with a 1.7 year supply only), the Council has approved the Shaping Development in Horsham District Planning Advice Note (SDPAN). The SDPAN provides guidance on how to positively

assess residential development proposals coming forward outside of settlement boundaries, with Paragraph 5.12 of the SDPAN stating that the Council '*will consider positively applications that meet all of the criteria below:*

- *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.'*

- 6.12 In this case, the site does not adjoin an existing settlement edge, with the nearest settlement edge some 200m to the west across two open fields. The proposal in this regard does not comply with the SDPAN.
- 6.13 Whilst compliance with the SDPAN is not determinative, given it is guidance only, the document does seek to identify sustainable development. In this case the application site is on Muttons Lane, which is a narrow rural lane with no footway, two fields away from the edge of Storrington and Sullington. As a result, a dwelling in this location would be remote from services and facilities, and would be reliant on the use of a private car for all journeys. The location of this site is not therefore considered sustainably located to be able to offer non-car transport options for future residents, and is contrary to the Councils spatial strategy for housing
- 6.14 The proposed development would therefore be in conflict with Policies 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the HDPF and Policy ASH1 of the ANP. In addition, the proposal would not meet any of the exceptions as identified within Policy 26 of the HDPF and would not comply with the criteria for support set out in the SDPAN. The proposal would not therefore provide a suitable location for housing with regard to the spatial strategy within the Development Plan.

Land Use:

- 6.15 The development site would be located to the south of a residential dwelling known as Jinkes Farm and a Grade II listed building. The wider land to the north, east and south appears to be utilised for a mixture of private residential and agricultural purposes.
- 6.16 As outlined above, residential development within the countryside location, on a site not allocated for development within the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan, would be contrary to the overarching spatial strategy expressed through Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF and Policy ASH1 of the Ashington ANP. The provision of residential dwellings on the site is therefore considered to result in inappropriate development within an unsustainable location, with the proposed land use not considered appropriate for these reasons.

Amount:

- 6.17 Policies 25, 32, and 33 of the HDPF promote development that protects, conserves, and enhances the landscape character from inappropriate development. Proposal should take into account landscape characteristics, with development seeking to provide an attractive, functional and accessible environment that complements the locally distinctive character of the district. Buildings should contribute to a sense of place, and should be of a scale, massing, and appearance that is of a high standard or design and layout which relates sympathetically to the landscape and built surroundings.
- 6.18 The proposed development would introduce 1 no dwelling onto the site. While indicative plans have not been submitted to illustrate the scale, design and form of the proposed dwelling,

the Block Plan suggests that the dwelling would cover the existing footprint of the stable building. The application site has been subject of an earlier application relating to the development of the site for 1no. two storey dwelling. In considering this previous application, concerns were raised regarding the development located outside the built-up area boundary and the dwelling appearing as an intrusive addition and a scale or massing that would detract from the unaltered character of the rural location.

- 6.19 The two nearest residential dwellings are Winstons Farm (formerly Jinkes Farm) and Woods Cottage are approximately 62m and 54m away from the footprint of the proposed building. Winstons Farm building is also a Grade II listed building, so any new residential development would need to be considerate of the heritage and historical context of the surrounding site. Due to the sufficient distance and the boundary treatment, it is considered that there would be limited impact on neighbouring properties. While acknowledged that the site is enclosed by vegetation which screens the existing building along the boundary with Mutts Lane and to the north and south, the application site would be located beyond the defined boundaries to the build development within the locality. A Public Right of Way (2621) runs parallel along the site's northern boundary, with direct views into the application site. The proposal to introduce a domestic building into this location would remove the agricultural character of the site and detract from the established rural setting. Therefore, it is considered that development of the nature proposed would not protect, conserve, or enhance the landscape character of the area, and would not reflect or maintain the settlement characteristics or built pattern of the surroundings.
- 6.20 For the reasons above, the development would formalise and urbanise the rural setting of the countryside location. The proposed development is therefore considered to detract from the informal character and sporadic build pattern of the rural locality, and would fail to protect, conserve, or enhance the characteristics of the landscape character area, and the setting of the designated heritage asset. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 25, 32, 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Other Matters:

Water Neutrality:

- 6.21 The previous application, DC/25/0003, was in part refused on grounds of water neutrality, as the applicant had not provided the necessary legal undertaking to secure the mitigations to avoid adverse effects on the integrity of the interest features of the Arun Valley SPA, SAC, and Ramsar site. This refusal reason was subsequently upheld at appeal.
- 6.22 Since the dismissal of the appeal, Natural England have formally withdrawn the 2021 Position Statement which introduced the requirement for all new development to achieve water neutrality, 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.
- 6.23 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.

- 6.24 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.
- 6.25 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.

Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

- 6.26 Given the outline nature of this Permission in Principle application, detailed ecological information has not been submitted at this stage. Should the principle of development be supported, ecological survey work and appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures would be required at the Technical Details Consent stage to ensure compliance with Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), the NPPF (2024), and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).
- 6.27 The site also falls within the scope of the mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) regime. A minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity value will be required to be demonstrated at the Technical Details Consent stage, through submission of a habitat baseline assessment and Biodiversity Metric calculation in accordance with the Environment Act 2021 and the Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (General) Regulations 2024.
- 6.28 At this stage, it is considered that the site provides scope to deliver BNG through appropriate landscaping and habitat creation as part of any detailed design, and that the requirements of Policy 31 and national BNG legislation could reasonably be met.

Land contamination

- 6.29 The Council's Environmental Health team note that there may be issues with made ground and the use of the building that will require assessment. Agricultural buildings can be subject to significant contamination risks arising from their use, storage of machinery equipment fuels or other chemicals. Potentially hazardous materials may also be incorporated in made ground, yards and hard standing. There are concerns that potential odour or noise from the potential agricultural activity would result in the proposed dwelling being adversely impacted. The Council's Environmental Health team have therefore requested further information on these matters and a preliminary risk assessment including a site walkover to ensure that the site can be made safe and suitable for residential development. This matter can be suitably addressed at Technical Details stage.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

- 6.30 Horsham District Council has adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule which took effect on 1st October 2017.
- 6.31 It is considered that this development constitutes CIL liable development.
- 6.32 In the case of Permission in Principle applications the CIL charge will be calculated at the relevant Technical Details stage. Exemptions and/or reliefs may be applied for up until the commencement of a chargeable development. In the event that planning permission is granted, a CIL Liability Notice will be issued thereafter. CIL payments are payable on commencement of development.

Conclusions and Planning Balance:

- 6.33 Permission in Principle is sought to demolish the existing stable and erect a detached four-bedroom house in its place.
- 6.34 The application site is located on Mutton's Lane, which is a single-track rural road, which is unlit and does not benefit from a dedicated pedestrian footway. The surrounding roads, Newhouse Lane and Park Lane, are the same and all roads are subject to a 60mph speed limit. Even if traffic levels are low, it is unlikely that this would be an attractive walking or cycling option for future occupiers, particularly in the dark or in poor weather. It is unlikely that future occupiers would be able to use a bus service as the closest bus stop is 1.7km away, on Thakeham Road, Storrington, or 0.9km away sited on the A24. There are no Public Right of Ways leading to the settlement of Storrington and Sullington and as a result, future occupiers would be reliant on private vehicles to access everyday services, amenities and facilities. Whilst it is acknowledged that there are Public Right of Ways (footpaths 2621, 2612 and 2611), leading to the Built-Up Area of Ashington, this settlement is located approximately 1km away, in which these footpaths are informal across fields and is therefore not considered to be a viable or attractive route. The location of this site is not therefore considered sustainably located to be able to offer non-car transport options for future residents and is contrary to the Councils spatial strategy for housing.
- 6.35 It is acknowledged that one of the reasons for refusing the previous application (DC/25/0003), water neutrality, has now been overcome. However, as 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 in an unsustainable location remote from day-to-day services, the principle of the development continues to fail to accord with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy ASH1 of the Ashington Neighbourhood Plan.
- 6.36 The location of the proposal also does not accord with the guidance set out in the Shaping Development in Horsham District document (SDPAN), however as a guidance document this conflict attracts only limited weight against the application.
- 6.37 Whilst the contribution of one market dwelling would bestow socio-economic benefits in the form of housing delivery, the proposed development would result in adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the very limited benefits arising from the contribution of a single dwelling to the Council's housing supply. No other discernible benefits would arise from the granting of this permission in principle. In this context, when applying the 'tilted balance at paragraph 11d of the NPPF, the proposal is recommended for refusal.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 That Permission in Principle be refused for the following reason: -
1. The proposed development would be located within an unsustainable location in the countryside, 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, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy ASH1 of the Ashington Neighbourhood Plan. 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 which would outweigh harm arising from conflict with the above policies.

8. USE OF AI

- 8.1 This report has not been prepared with the support of artificial intelligence tools.