



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0079

Land at 520564 133496, Brook Lane, Faygate, West Sussex,

DESCRIPTION:

Erection of 2no. 4 bed dwellings with associated parking and landscaping.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

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 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 35 - Strategic Policy: Climate Change
Policy 36 - Strategic Policy: Appropriate Energy Use
Policy 37 - Sustainable Construction
Policy 38 - Strategic Policy: Flooding

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old, the most important policies for the determination of this application must be considered as to whether they are 'out of date' (NPPF paragraph 11d).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 year. 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 6: Climate Change
Strategic Policy 7: Appropriate Energy Use
Strategic Policy 8: Sustainable Design and Construction
Strategic Policy 9: Water Neutrality
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 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
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

Planning Advice Notes:

Shaping Development in Horsham District (SDPAN)

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:

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

HDC Arboricultural: No Objections. The proposed built form of the two dwellings does not appear to give rise to any unacceptable arboricultural impacts when viewed from the public domain, nor does it encroach upon trees of notable merit or landscape value. As such, no significant arboricultural concerns are raised to the scheme, subject to the tree protection measures set out within the submitted Tree Protection Plan being secured by condition and implemented in full throughout the construction phase of the development.

HDC Conservation: No Objection. The area of land on which the two dwellings will be sited are shown as an open field in the late nineteenth century and possibly pasture for Clyst Hayes or Parson's Farm on the north side of the railway. In any case it has little historic interest in its own right. The historic functional and visual connection with Clyst Hayes has been diluted over the previous decades and am satisfied it contributes little to an understanding and appreciation of the special interest of the listed building and its setting. The proposed development will not result in harm to the setting of the listed building.

HDC Drainage: The Drainage information provided is too vague. Without the support of Drainage Strategy Report, which communicates an understanding of the drainage hierarchy and the sites constraints (including and not limited to greenfield runoff rates, infiltration potential/ permeability of soils and winter groundwater levels), HDC Drainage are unable to properly assess the drainage strategy and do not recommend drainage is resolved at the discharge of conditions stage.

HDC Environmental Health: Comment. The development site is within 100m of both the railway lane and the A264 dual carriageway road. It's likely that noise from these sources will be quite high at the development site. An Environmental Noise Survey should be provided to ensure the application is properly deter-mined with respect to noise in accordance with requirements of the NPPF.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

Ecology Consultant: No Objection. There is sufficient ecological information available for determination of this application. We have no objections on ecological matters excluding Great Crested Newt as we have been instructed to leave comments on this European Protected Species to the NatureSpace Partnership.

Network Rail: Due to the close proximity of the proposed development to Network Rail's land and the operational railway, Network Rail requests the applicant / developer engages Network Rail's Asset Protection and Optimisation (ASPRO) team prior to works commencing. This will allow our ASPRO team to review the details of the proposal to ensure that the works can be completed without any risk to the operational railway.

Southern Water: Comment that the Site is not within Southern Water's Wastewater Services Area. Southern Water can facilitate water supply to service the proposed development.

Thames Water: No Comment.

WSCC Highways: No Objection. 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.

Representations:
None received.

Parish Comments:
Colgate Parish Council seek clarification as to whether the access onto the A264 is suitable for the additional traffic that will be leaving the lane onto the dual carriageway, and whether listed building consent is required given the close proximity to the listed building.

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

This application is for the erection of 2no. 4 bed dwellings with associated parking and landscaping at Brook Lane, Faygate, West Sussex. The development site is within the curtilage of Clyst Hayes, a Grade II Listed Building (indexed 1980) described by Historic England as "C17 timber-framed building with plaster infilling, ground floor rebuilt in painted brick. Horsham slab roof. Casement windows. Two storeys. Two windows". Currently the use of the land appears to be for parking / storing vehicles for a small car dealership business (Ideal Cars Sussex) as well as being kept as a garden area for Clyst Hayes. The site is bounded by railway line to the north / north west and the A264 to the south. The site is accessed via Brook Lane from the south, a small lane which serves Clyst Hayes before turning to a foot track which runs to the railway line with a public footpath crossing with whistle board.

Principle of Development:

Policy 2 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) sets out the main growth strategy, focusing development in the main settlements. The 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.

As the site is located outside of any defined built-up area boundary, Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF are of significant weight in the determination of the application. As stated within Policy 3 of the HDPF, development will be permitted within towns and villages that have defined built-up areas; with development in the countryside more strictly controlled through the provisions of Policy 4. This policy states that development outside of built up areas will only be supported where the site is allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan and adjoins a settlement edge.

Paragraph 83 of the NPPF states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.

Policy 84 of the NPPF states that planning 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:
 - is truly outstanding or innovative, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and 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.

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. It was concluded in the Braintree Judgement that a settlement would not necessarily exclude a cluster of dwellings. The application site is located within proximity to a small loose cluster of residential dwellings and other buildings, 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.

The application site comprises a single residential dwelling and related incidental curtilage. The site therefore represents previously developed land, albeit that it is located within the countryside in policy terms.

Policy 2 of the HDPF encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed provided that it is not of high environmental value. Paragraph 125 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlement for homes, proposals for which should be approved unless substantial harm would be caused.

Annex 2 of the NPPF defines previously developed “*land as land which has been lawfully developed and is or was occupied by a permanent structure and any fixed surface infrastructure associated with it, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed)*”. It also includes land comprising large area of fixed surface

infrastructure such as large areas of hardstanding which have been lawfully developed. Previously developed land excludes: land that is or was last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill; where provision for restoration has been made through development management procedures; land in built-up areas such as residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape.”

While the proposal would result in the redevelopment of previously developed land, the proposal would be located outside of a defined settlement, where the proposal would not be compliant with paragraph 125 of the NPPF. It is therefore considered that limited weight would be attributed to the redevelopment of previously developed land.

The proposed development would not accord with the spatial strategy as set out in Policies 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the HDPF and would therefore be unacceptable in principle. Whether there are other material considerations that would outweigh the conflict as identified, will be discussed in the Planning Balance and Conclusions section below.

Design and Appearance:

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting; establish a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit; optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development; and create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible.

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.

The proposal sees the erection of two, mirrored, four-bedroom dwellings. The dwellings themselves are detached three-storey dwellings (with accommodation in roof space) and are approx. 230m² with spacious gardens. The design of the dwellings are of a contemporary architectural style with gable ends along with a projecting front that is gable ended with bespoke catslide-esque roof. The material selection consists of a contrasting design of locally sourced brickwork for the ground floor with timber utilised for the first floor. Clay tile roofing with skylights and solar panels are also utilised. The dwellings are slightly staggered from each other on their plots to allow the dwellings to sit comfortably within their plots. The dwellings have a large shared driveway though each have their own gated access. A small

The design seeks to reflect rural material choices and that the pair of dwellings are of a design that is not considered to be of detriment to the surrounding area or heritage asset. Whilst the buildings are modern, it is considered they are of contemporary design and would satisfactorily integrate appropriately within the context of the site. It is considered that the proposal accords with the above policies.

Heritage and Archaeology:

Policy 34 of the HDPF seeks to conserve, sustain and protect the cultural and heritage assets that are within the district. It ensures that development within conservation areas is consistent with the special character of buildings and areas of which they are located within. Areas and buildings that fall under conservation, Listed Building designations or are approximate to them will be protected from inappropriate development which will harm the character and setting of the area / building.

The development site is within the larger plot of Clyst Hayes owing to the physical barrier of the railway line. As per the Conservation Officer, though there may be a tangible connection of the development site to Clyst Hayes itself, this has been diluted due to increased outbuildings and built form. In addition, there is a fair separation from the development site and to the Listed Building. Given this, it is not thought the development itself would unduly impact the special character of the Listed Building and the design and execution of two dwellings would likely not deprecate the experience and setting of the Listed Building.

Trees and Landscaping and Ecological Impact:

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.

Whilst the Arboriculture Officer noted some trees of higher landscape value surrounding the site, no arboricultural concerns were raised specifically related to the site or the development and recommended conditions be attached subject to the proposals acceptability. In addition, no ecological concerns are raised in respect of the development.

Residential Amenity:

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

The orientation of the proposed development and the resulting relationship with surrounding properties and land is such that no unacceptable impacts would arise from the additional built-form and level of activity on the site.

The site is approximately 10m from a railway line and is in close proximity to the A264. This is a busy dual carriageway route which will likely be a source of noise pollution and likely cause disturbance to the occupiers. In this location there is significant potential for noise disturbance both within the dwellings and within the related amenity space. The application is not though accompanied by a noise assessment and it is not apparent whether satisfactory living conditions would be provided, and whether mitigation is needed (to both building construction and garden landscaping / means of enclosure).

It has not therefore been demonstrated that future occupants of the development would not be adversely affected by noise from the neighbouring railway line and road traffic noise from the A264. In the absence of information to indicate otherwise, the development would create inadequate living conditions for future occupants, to the detriment of their residential amenity and contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Highways Impacts:

Policy 40 of HDPF promote development that provides safe and adequate access, suitable for all users. Policy 41 of the HDPF 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.

In consultation with the LHA (Local Highway Authority), it is considered that this proposal would not 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. The proposal allows a sufficient number of parking spaces and allows for suitable turning on site to exit in a forward gear. No conflict by the LHA has been identified exiting the site on to the dual carriageway A264. Cycling parking

facilities are provided though noted by the LHA that the site is not likely to facilitate the use of cycling as a means of transport to and from destinations given its relative isolated nature.

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.

Climate Change:

Policies 35, 36 and 37 require that development mitigates to the impacts of climate change through measures including improved energy efficiency, reducing flood risk, reducing water consumption, improving biodiversity and promoting sustainable transport modes. These policies reflect the requirements of Chapter 14 of the NPPF that local plans and decisions seek to reduce the impact of development on climate change.

If the application were approved conditions would be necessary to secure the following:

- Water consumption limited to 110litres per person per day
- Requirement to provide full fibre broadband site connectivity
- Refuse and recycling storage
- Cycle parking facilities
- Electric vehicle charging points

Subject to these conditions the application will suitable reduce the impact of the development on climate change in accordance with local and national policy.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG):

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

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

Conclusion:

As the site is not allocated for development within 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 contrary to Policies 1, 2, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework.

Housing Land Supply

The Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply and the presumption in favour of sustainable development at paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged in this instance.

NPPF paragraph 11(d)(ii) states that where there are no relevant development plan policies in place, the policies that are considered most important for the determination of applications (in this case, Policies 1, 2, 4 and 26 of the HDPF, owing to the lack of a five-year housing land supply) permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

Development Plan Policies

In circumstances where Paragraph 11(d) is engaged, NPPF Paragraph 225 (Annex 1) sets out that due weight can be given to the most important policies for determining an application according to their degree of consistency with policies in the Framework. However, the Framework does not prescribe the weight to be given to conflict with development plan policies. This is affected by the purpose of the policy and the circumstances of the case.

In this case the most important policies include those relating to the spatial development strategy as set out at HDPF Policies 1, 2, 3 and 4. Policy 1 reflects the Framework presumption in favour of sustainable development and is thus fully consistent with the NPPF. Policies 2, 3 and 4 set out how sustainable growth will be achieved, though as they seek to focus development within settlements and only allow expansion on allocated sites, they have a restrictive element. Nonetheless, they generally reflect the Framework preference for development to be well located in relation to services and facilities. Therefore, moderate weight is applied to these policies.

HDPF Policy 26 refers specifically to countryside protection outside built up area boundaries, requiring development to be essential to this location. Whilst again this reflects the Frameworks preference for development to be well located in relation to services and facilities, as the definition of built-up areas is based on out-of-date housing numbers, this policy is afforded moderate weight.

As per the preceding sections of this report, the granting of this permission would conflict with Policies 1, 2, 4 and 26 of the HDPF. Whilst the proposed would not support the spatial strategy for the District, these policies are not fully framework compliant. Furthermore, the issues associated with the Council's current five-year housing land supply situation result in moderate weight being applied to these policies in the overall planning balance.

Planning Balance

The proposal would provide for two market dwellings. As above, as the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, the provision of an additional dwelling towards this supply

is afforded *significant* weight. However, the Council considers that this benefit would be *limited* given the negligible overall contribution to the supply.

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

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

The current housing shortfall is a material consideration of significant weight, the site would be within a defensible boundary, and the contribution of two market dwelling would bestow socio-economic benefits in the form of housing delivery, the site is not adjacent to nor adjoining an existing settlement edge. The proposal would not benefit from the provisions of the FAD as above.

The site is accessed off the A264 Crawley Road. This does not have any footpaths or nearby appropriate crossing points and does not represent a desirable or realistic walking route to Horsham or elsewhere, with Horsham approximately 1km from the site. Travelling north from the site across the railway line to Wimland Road and similarly does not provide any improved routes for pedestrians. No bus stops are in the vicinity with only 1 identified service, a pub (The Frog and Nightgown), approximately 0.5km away. Whilst right of ways may be used to get to Horsham, this would be a long journey and would not be considered a feasible route for day to day living. As such, occupiers of the development would be reliant on private vehicles to serve their day-to-day needs.

The proposed dwellings 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.

There are also concerns that insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the development would provide an acceptable standard of accommodation for future occupants. In the absence of this information the development has potential to create a poor standard of living for future occupants.

The cumulative benefits from the provision of two dwellings (limited weight) and the socio-economic benefits (moderate weight) would be outweighed from the identified adverse impacts of the development. Namely the conflict with the development plan (moderate weight) and the site's unsustainable location and proposed living conditions (significant weight). This harm would demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Therefore, the proposal is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. The proposed development would be sited within an inappropriate location in the countryside, outside of a defined built-up area boundary, and on a site not allocated for housing development within the Horsham District Planning Framework, or a made Neighbourhood Plan. Furthermore,

the proposed development is not essential to its countryside location. 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 Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

2. It has not been demonstrated that future occupants of the development would not be adversely affected by noise from the neighbouring railway line and road traffic noise from the A264. In the absence of information to indicate otherwise, the development would create inadequate living conditions for future occupants, to the detriment of their residential amenity and contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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/26/0079

(The approved plans will form Condition 1 on the Decision Notice of all Permitted applications)

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

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location plan		1785_1.000	19.01.2026
Site plan	Existing	1785_1.002	19.01.2026
Site plan	Proposed	1785_3.000	19.01.2026
Plans	Contextual ground floor	1785_3.001	19.01.2026
Floor plan	Proposed Ground and first floor	1785_3.002	19.01.2026
Elevation plan	Proposed House 1	1785_3.003	19.01.2026
Elevation plan	Proposed House 2	1785_3.004	19.01.2026
Plans	Proposed North and East elevations	1785_3.006	19.01.2026
Plans	Proposed South and West	1785_3.007	19.01.2026
Plans	Proposed landscaping plan	1785_3.008	19.01.2026
Plans	Proposed drainage plan	1785_3.009	19.01.2026
Plans	Proposed rendered elevations South and East	1785_3.010	19.01.2026
Plans	Proposed rendered North and West elevations	1785_3.011	19.01.2026
Plans	Proposed rendered elevations house 1 and 2	1785_3.012	19.01.2026
Photos	Existing site photos	1785_1.001	19.01.2026
Photos	Local reference images	1785_3.005	19.01.2026
Tree plan	Constraints	NONE	19.01.2026
Tree plan	Protection	NONE	19.01.2026

