

From: Phil Rowe

Sent: 24 February 2026 15:31

To: 'Hannah.Darley' [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: DC/26/0041 Spring Acres West End Lane Henfield West Sussex - Permission in Principle for the erection of up to 9no. self-build dwellings - update request

Importance: High

Hi Hannah,

Further to your email below and our agreed extension of time until 2nd March I have desperately been trying to get hold of you and left several voicemails.

Can you please call me at your earliest convenience.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Kind regards

Phil Rowe, BA Hons, BTP (Planning)
PROwe Planning Solutions

[REDACTED]

Melton Lodge,
Rusper Road,
Newdigate,
Surrey. RH5 5BX

Patron of Racehorse Sanctuary Charity – please give generously where you can:

<https://www.theracehorsesanctuary.org/support-us/donate/>

From: Hannah.Darley [REDACTED]

Sent: 10 February 2026 16:26

To: Phil Rowe [REDACTED]

Subject: DC/26/0041 Spring Acres West End Lane Henfield West Sussex - Permission in Principle for the erection of up to 9no. self-build dwellings - update request

Hi Phil,

As it looks like you are away in the run up to the determination I think it would be best to have an EOT so we can discuss the application when you get back.

Would you be agreeable to the 2nd march?

Thanks and kind regards,

Hannah Darley
Senior Planning Officer



Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton

Horsham District Council will only accept service of documents by email if they are sent to legal@horsham.gov.uk. Any documents sent to individual email addresses will not be accepted under any circumstances.

Communications received after 5pm will be regarded as being served on the next working day.

Please contact us in advance if your email, including any attachments, is going to exceed 30MB.

From: Phil Rowe [redacted]
Sent: 06 February 2026 09:27
To: Hannah.Darley [redacted]; Guy.Everest
[redacted]

Subject: RE: DC/26/0041 Spring Acres West End Lane Henfield West Sussex - Permission in Principle for the erection of up to 9no. self-build dwellings - update request

Importance: High

Hannah,

Further to my email below and voicemail today I'm keen to discuss your thoughts on this application. I note that attached Landscape Architect "*There may be capacity for a reduced number of dwellings occupying a smaller section of the proposed field, while still remaining consistent with the ribbon development pattern to the south of West End Lane*" response that indicates support for a lesser number of dwellings; having spoken to the client that is something we would be agreeable to but I need your feedback.

I'm away 7 – 14 February; I note that the Determination Deadline is Mon 16 Feb 2026. Happy to agree short extension of time if it would allow for productive dialogue on the application.

I'm in the office all day today if you are able to give me a call and will be keeping an eye on emails whilst on leave.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Kind regards

Phil Rowe, BA Hons, BTP (Planning)
PROwe Planning Solutions

[REDACTED]

Melton Lodge,
Rusper Road,
Newdigate,
Surrey. RH5 5BX

Patron of Racehorse Sanctuary Charity – please give generously where you can:
<https://www.theracehorsesanctuary.org/support-us/donate/>

From: Phil Rowe

Sent: 27 January 2026 17:43

To: Hannah.Darley [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: DC/26/0041 Spring Acres West End Lane Henfield West Sussex - Permission in Principle for the erection of up to 9no. self-build dwellings - update request

Importance: High

Hi Hannah,

Keen to have a sensible dialogue with you in respect of this application. Please give me a call, prior to any decision, to discuss once you have had chance to digest the force behind the application.

I have been waiting in the wings for some time to start submitting Permission in Principle applications to Horsham (*something I regularly successfully do at other Councils who are well behind with Housing Land Supply*).

Now that Water Neutrality is no longer an issue and with the precedents I have included with the submission **the time is right.**

Decisions that are being allowed for housing development inconsistent with spatial strategy are **now regular; they are not 'rogue' decisions** [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Further attached allowed decision summarised below relying on lack of Self build housing (despite Chichester having 5 year HLS).

I appreciate that permitting this application will mean being brave and standing up to inevitable Parish Council and local objection.

It is clear from regular allowed appeals that tough decisions need to be made to have a realistic chance of meeting housing need.

Let's get Britain building and kick start the economy – the submitted scheme is available now, can be built out quickly and would be a welcome significant boost towards housing. It will engage trades and trickle down / multiplier effect spending – i.e. sustainable economic development.

Allowed appeal Ref: APP/L3815/W/25/3361375 Decision date: 05 September 2025 at Jardine Nursery, Chalk Lane, Sidlesham, West Sussex PO20 7LW against the decision of Chichester District Council.

- The development proposed is a single self build dwelling.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single self build dwelling at Jardine Nursery, Chalk Lane, Sidlesham,

7. The main issues are: whether the site is suitably located for a new house having regard to the Council's spatial strategy.

10. Given the site's proximity to other structures and homes, it is not one which should be considered isolated and neither is this asserted by the Council. However, I see no strong reason why this should limit the weight given to the local plan policies since not all development in the countryside is necessarily isolated.

11. In conclusion on this main issue, the proposal would not adhere to the Council's spatial strategy for new development. **It would conflict with policies NE10 and S2 of the CLP summarised above.**

Character and Appearance

19. The properties on the southern side of Chalk Lane **vary in their appearance and scale and include two storey properties and buildings with varying roof forms. As a result there is little consistency in the character of this group of buildings.** The properties are also well spaced, limiting the appreciation of the character of the properties together. The proposed rear dormers would be modest in their scale and include shallow pitched roofs

above, reducing their prominence on the roof form. Given the context of the appeal site and the limited visibility which the back of the building would experience, the dormers would be acceptable in terms of their appearance. The proposed rooflights to the front roofslope would vary in their scale and alignment. Nonetheless they would be flush with the roofslope and would not detract from the main roof form or the wider character of the area.

20. In conclusion on this main issue, **the proposal would be acceptable in terms of its effects on the character and appearance of the area.** The proposal would comply with Policies P2 and NE2 of the CLP which together require good design which respects its context and landscape character.

28. The appellant alleges that there is a significant shortfall in the supply of self build plots in the District and the number of plots which have been granted planning permission for this purpose is far below the number of parties on the Council's self build register. The Council state that as of 30 October 2024 there were 90 applicants on Part 1 of the register, and a further 11 on Part 2 of that register. Details have not been provided by the Council of the number of plots granted with permission for this purpose, although the appellant refers to only a 'handful of possible relevant permissions' and states that none of those have either a condition or legal agreement to secure them for this purpose. **These assertions have not been contested by the Council and the shortfall in plots to meet the demand for self build would therefore appear to be substantial.**

29. The recently adopted CLP includes a policy relating specifically to custom and self build housing. Based on the information before me, this focuses on provision of plots on strategic scale housing sites of over 200 homes. It does not contain a requirement for delivery of self build plots on other residential development sites, although they would be encouraged. There is not substantive evidence before me of how effective those larger scale sites would be in meeting the immediate need for self build homes, or the likelihood of them otherwise becoming available on other windfall sites. Together this gives significant uncertainty as to how the demand and the requirements of the Act on the Council, would be met. While the proposal would contribute only one home to the unmet need, this would nonetheless make some tangible difference, particularly as the applicant has been on the Council's register since 2016. I return to the matter of weight attributed to this matter below.

Planning Balance

30. *It has been found that the proposal would conflict with the development plan through constituting development in the countryside which does not meet the criteria set out in the development plan. It is relevant, however, that the new home would be close to other homes along Chalk Lane and benefit from the same walking and cycling routes to services and facilities in the nearest settlements. As a result the proposal would not cause visual harm to the countryside nor result in development heavily reliant on private cars,* which are among the considerations of Policy NE10 set out in the supporting text.

31. Importantly, however, the proposal would provide a self build home which would contribute to the shortfall of such homes in the District. Given the uncertainty surrounding the level of that shortfall, how it will be

*addressed and any timescales for addressing the shortfall, I give **substantial weight** to the benefit of the proposal being self-build. I consider this amounts to a consideration of sufficient weight to make a decision other than in accordance with the spatial strategy of the development plan.*

32. The Council state that the adoption of the CLP results in it being able to demonstrate a five year land supply for housing. *Even if the provisions of paragraph 11d) of the Framework were not relevant to the appeal, I am satisfied that there are still material considerations here to warrant a decision other than in accordance with the plan. Even if paragraph 11d) were to be applicable, the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole and having regard to the key policies in the footnote given the site's location.*

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Kind regards

Phil Rowe, BA Hons, BTP (Planning)
PROwe Planning Solutions



Melton Lodge,
Rusper Road,
Newdigate,
Surrey. RH5 5BX