DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DC/24/0668
Barn at Black Cherry Farm, Bashurst Hill, Itchingfield, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 0PB

DESCRIPTION:
Conversion of a disused agricultural building to a single dwelling house with associated residential curtilage

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

I/13/88	Erection of one agricultural dwelling (From old Planning History)	Application Permitted on 20.07.1988
I/14/63	House and garage Comment: See 'toat farm' (From old Planning History)	Application Refused on 12.07.1963
DC/10/0140	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a replacement 3 bed dwelling	Application Permitted on 09.07.2010
DC/15/1009	Variation of Condition 13 (Occupancy Restriction) attached to DC/10/0140 to allow occupation of the dwelling by persons employed or last employed in agriculture or equine use	Application Permitted on 01.07.20 site 15

SITE AND SURROUNDS
The building is located to the north-west of the Site, the building was previously used for agricultural purposes. The building is in a derelict state and all operations have ceased within the building. However, the site is an active farm with horned sheep. A few of the buildings on site are now used for equestrian purposes. However, the application building remains redundant.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION
Planning permission seeks the conversion of a disused agricultural building to a single dwelling house with associated residential curtilage. The dwelling would be a single storey, 4-bedroom dwelling with associated ensuites, kitchen/living room, and utility room.

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 15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision
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
Policy 41 - Parking

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 2.9 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.

Neighbourhood Plan:
Itchingfield Parish have produced a neighbourhood plan which have been subject to successful Examination but cannot proceed to Referendum because of the legal requirements in relation to Water Neutrality and the Habitat Regulations.

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 Tree Officer: No Objection - There are no trees of significant landscape merit that will foreseeably be impacted upon by the proposed development. The Ancient woodland to the NW has a reasonable buffer (50m+) to the proposed residential curtilage.

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 115), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Southern Water: Comment - There are no public foul and surface water sewers in the area to serve this development. The applicant is advised to examine alternative means of foul and surface water disposal. The Council’s Building Control officers or technical staff should be asked to comment on the adequacy of soakaways to dispose of surface water from the proposed development.

It is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.

West Sussex Fire and Rescue: Comment - Currently, the nearest hydrant is over 340 metres away from the proposed dwelling. The supply of water for firefighting for a domes□c premises should be within 150 metres. Evidence will also be required that Fire Service vehicle access meets with the requirements identified in Approved Document B Volume 1 2019 Edi□on: B5 Sec□on 13, including Table 13.1.

Great Crested Newt Officer: No Objection - The proposed development is not considered to be relevant to the District Licensing Scheme in this case and we consider there would be no likely impact on great crested newts or their habitats.

Natural England: No Objection, concur with the conclusion of your authority's HRA appropriate assessment insofar that adverse effects on the integrity of the Arun Valley Designated sites can be ruled out, as such no objections subject to the delivery, management and maintenance of measures identified in the water neutrality statement to achieve water neutrality. We note that the applicant has proposed the treatment of harvested rainwater to enable it to mitigate potable water use.

Parish Comments:
No Objection

Representations:
None received

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

Principle of Development:

The site is outside of any Built-Up-Area boundary and is therefore within a countryside location in policy terms. The proposal relates to the Conversion of a disused agricultural building to a single dwelling house with associated residential curtilage.

Section 38(6) of the Town and Country Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Policy 1 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) (2015) provides that the Council will work proactively with applicants to achieve development that secures socio-economic and environmental benefits. Reflecting the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within the NPPF the Council will grant permission for development that accords with the relevant policies of the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

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 The application site is not identified in the Local Plan and is not allocated within an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed development would not therefore accord with the spatial strategy expressed through Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF.

Paragraph 83 of the NPPF states that "to promote 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."

Paragraph 84 of the NPPF continues 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:
    - 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 close proximity to a number 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 80.

The HDPF does not contain any specific policies for the conversion of existing buildings within the countryside to dwelling, but Policy 10 of the HDPF does however, make reference to the conversion of buildings to residential in so far as stating *that "proposals for the conversion of rural buildings to business and commercial uses will be considered favourably over residential in the first instance"*. It has not been demonstrated that an alternative business or commercial use has been considered, and no justification has been provided to suggest this is not viable.

Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that a rural conversion policy has been subject of consultation as part of the Local Plan Review 2018. This draft policy outlines that *"outside of defined built-up areas and secondary settlements, conversion of agricultural, forestry or other rural buildings to...or up to 5 residential units will be supported where the following criteria are met: the proposals would not adversely affect the character, appearance or visual amenities and the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside of the wider area…; the proposed conversion is acceptable in its setting by virtue of its siting, form, scale and existing architectural merit, and it can be demonstrated it would lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting through the architecture, landscape design and materials; it can be demonstrated that every reasonable attempt has been made to secure a commercial use of the building in the first instance via active marketing for a minimum of 12 months…; the site is served by an existing metalled road or other suitable access to the local road network; the existing building is not so derelict as to require substantial reconstruction; the buildings have been in use for commercial purposes for at least 10 years and the current use can be proven to be no longer necessary, or would*

otherwise secure the future of an existing heritage asset; community uses will be considered favourably where it can be demonstrated that they will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities."

While this policy remains in draft form, and has not yet been subject of formal examination, it gives a general direction of upcoming policy. However, it is nonetheless of limited weight in the consideration of the current application. The thrust of planning policy is generally supportive of conversions of rural buildings, where this is subject to the proposed development meeting a number of criteria, including consideration of the sustainability of the site. The subject building is not considered to be of aesthetic merit and visual quality for the building to be retained or converted and there would be no enhancement of the site.

In this countryside location, the proposal is also considered against Policy 26 which seeks to protect the countryside against inappropriate development unless it is considered essential and appropriate in scale; whilst also meeting one of four criteria. These criteria include supporting the needs of agriculture or forestry; enabling the extraction of minerals or the disposal of waste; providing for quiet informal recreational use; or enabling the sustainable development of rural areas. The proposed development does not meet any of these criteria, nor is it considered to be essential to the countryside location and does not therefore comply with Policy 26 of the HDPF.

The site is not allocated for development in the HDPF or a made Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed development would therefore be in conflict with the spatial strategy for housing within the development plan as set out in Policies, 2, 3, and 4 of the HDPF. In addition, the proposal would not meet any of the exceptions as identified within Policy 26 of the HDPF. The proposal would not therefore provide a suitable location for housing with regard to the spatial strategy within the Development Plan.

Design and Appearance:

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.

The immediate surrounding area consists predominantly of low-density detached dwellings which benefit from generous gardens. The wider surroundings are characterised by a mix of residential development as well as farms contained within relatively large plots and open countryside. The immediate neighbouring properties accord with a certain development pattern where the dwellings are generally set back from the street frontage.

The proposed development entails conversion of an existing barn with minimal external alterations which would retain the existing character of the building, albeit the existing building is of limited design merit. The proposed curtilage would reflect existing site boundaries and hard landscaping and would not have any discernible impact on the wider landscape, with the likely presence of new domestic paraphernalia on the site largely screened from the public realm. The proposal would therefore have a largely neutral visual impact.

Trees and Landscaping:

Policy 33 of the HDPF states that development should presume in favour of the retention of existing important landscape and natural features, including trees. Development must relate sympathetically to the local landscape and justify and mitigate against any losses that may occur through the development.

Policy 31 of the HDPF outlines that development will be supported where it can demonstrate that it maintains or enhances the existing network of green infrastructure. Proposals that would result in the loss of existing green infrastructure will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that new opportunities will be provided that mitigates or compensates for this loss and ensures that the ecosystem services of the area are retained.

Following consultation with the Council's Arboricultural Officer, no objections have been raised, there are no trees of significant landscape merit that will foreseeably be impacted upon by the proposed development. The Ancient woodland to the NW has a reasonable buffer (50m+) to the proposed residential curtilage.

Impact on Neighbouring 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 nature of the proposed external alterations and the siting of the building in relation to adjoining properties and land is such that there would be no unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity.

The proposed dwelling would be surrounded by equestrian / agricultural land and there is clear potential for related activities to impact on future occupants by way of noise and disturbance. The northern elevation of the proposed dwelling would front an outbuilding which adjoins but is outside of the application site. The proximity would significantly obscure light and outlook to north facing window openings, which relate to bedrooms and secondary window openings to a sizeable lounge area, and also creates potential for odour and nuisance from use of the adjoining structure.

The application does not set out in any detail the nature of surrounding land uses and activities, but given the shear proximity of the site, and the northern boundary of the dwelling in particular, there is clear potential for conflict with the proposed residential use. In the absence of information to indicate otherwise it has not been demonstrated that future occupiers of the dwelling would not be adversely impacted upon by any activities being undertaken on the wider site by reason of noise, odour and general disturbance. The proposal would therefore create accommodation below the standard which the council would reasonably expect, contrary to Policy 32 of the HDPF and the NPPF.

Highways Impacts:

Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework states that transport access and ease of movement is a key factor in the performance of the local economy. The need for sustainable transport and safe access is vital to improve development across the district. Policy 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework states that development that involved the loss of existing parking spaces will only be allowed if suitable alternative provision has been secured elsewhere. Adequate parking facilities must be provided within the developments to meet the needs of the anticipated users.

The site is located off Bashurst Hill, a C-classified road subject to national speed limit in this location. A private access track, maintained as Public Footpath no. 1474, links the public highway to the application site. From inspection of WSCC mapping, there are no apparent visibility concerns with the existing point of access on to Bashurst Hill. In addition, the proposed development is not anticipated to give rise to a material intensification of use of this existing access point.

The plans demonstrate parking provision for three cars, which would be in accordance with WSCC Parking Standards for a dwelling of this size and location. On-site turning appears achievable, allowing vehicles to exit the in a forward gear. No details of cycle parking provision have been provided, although the LHA recognise the rural site location whereby cycling may not be a viable option for some. The LPA may wish to secure cycle parking provision if they deem it appropriate.

In 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 115), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Ecology

Policy 31 of the HDPF states that development will be supported where it demonstrates that it maintains or enhances the existing network of green infrastructure. Development proposals will be

required to contribute to the enhancement of existing biodiversity and should create and manage new habitats where appropriate.

It is not known whether the derelict stables would be a suitable place for Bats as no ecological assessment / information has been provided as part of the information. The Applicant has provided no ecology information and it has not therefore been demonstrated that the proposed development would have no adverse impact on protected species and its habitat, and to establish how the development will contribute to measurable Biodiversity Net Gain, contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Water Neutrality

The application site falls within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone as defined by Natural England which draws its water supply from groundwater abstraction at Hardham. Natural England has issued a Position Statement for applications within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone which states that it cannot be concluded with the required degree of certainty that new development in this zone would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites.

Natural England advises that plans and projects affecting sites where an existing adverse effect is known will be required to demonstrate, with sufficient certainty that they will not contribute further to an existing adverse effect. The received advice note advises that the matter of water neutrality should be addressed in assessments to agree and ensure that water use is offset for all new developments within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone.

The proposal falls within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone and would result in a greater level of water abstraction than the site presently generates. Natural England therefore require that the proposal demonstrates water neutrality or that it should be delayed awaiting an area-wide water neutrality strategy.

The Water Neutrality Statement outlines that the overall water demand can be reduced through the installation of water efficient fixtures and fittings and rainwater harvesting. The Statement outlines that the existing site currently consists of a barn, the water demand for which is 0 l/day. The proposed scheme will consist of converting this barn into a 4-bedroom dwelling, the water demand for which will be 314.60 l/day prior to any mitigation techniques being implemented. The overall water demand can be reduced by utilising methods listed in the sections above to reduce and re-use water for the proposed development. This results in the site becoming water neutral. The proposed development will use on average 314.60 l/day prior to any mitigation techniques. This water demand can be reduced to 254.65 l/day through the installation of water reducing appliances. Re-using the water through rainwater harvesting tanks can further reduce the water demand down to 0 l/day. The overall water demand will be reduced, and the site will become water neutral.

Overall, it is considered that the nature and scale of the proposed development would not result in a more intensive occupation/use of the dwelling/site necessitating a significant increased consumption of water (in comparison to the extant permissions) that would result in a significant impact on the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. The grant of planning permission would not therefore adversely affect the integrity of these sites or otherwise conflict with policy 31 of the HDPF, NPPF paragraph 180 and the Council's obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG):

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021). This requires that development must achieve at least 10% BNG on all habitats within the development site.

In the event the application is approved, it is a condition of the planning permission that a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan, including a Metric Tool calculation, be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This should show how the development will achieve BNG 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 and significant on-site enhancements will be secured over this period by way of a Legal Agreement.

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. The proposed development includes the following measures to build resilience to climate change and reduce carbon emissions.

The proposal currently before the Authority does not seek to specifically address the requirements of HDPF Policies 35, 36 and 37, though, it is accepted that these measures could be dealt with by way of appropriately worded condition, such as the use of cycle parking/electric vehicle charging apparatus, and opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. These measures, collectively, would be considered sufficient to establish compliance with the requirements of HDPF Policies 35, 36 and 37.

Conclusion

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 relevant policies for the determination of this application must be considered as to whether they are 'out of date' (NPPF paragraph 11d).

Recent appeal decisions at Rascals Farm, Shipley Road (APP/Z3825/W/20/3257700) and Land South of Newhouse Farm, Crawley Road (APP/Z3825/W/21/3266503) have considered the local housing need of the District, where it has been determined that the Council does not currently benefit from a 5-year housing land supply. Given this conclusion, the tilted balance contained in paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged.

Paragraph 11(d) states that where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or 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.

The proposed development would not accord with the spatial strategy as set out in Policies 2, 3,4 and 26 of the HDPF, however as concluded within the recent appeal decisions, these policies are not fully compliant with the NPPF. In addition, given the housing shortfall the conflict with these policies must be afforded a reduced weight. The proposed development would contribute to the identified housing need of the District, and given the identified need, the benefits arising from this would be of significant weight in the planning balance. However, it is recognised that the proposal would contribute only 1no. dwelling to the housing supply and would therefore make only a small and limited contribution in this regard.

Since these recent appeal decisions however, there have been further appeal decisions for single dwellings located outside the built-up area boundaries, and these have been dismissed for reasons of conflict with the spatial strategy. In considering these appeals, the Planning Inspector made specific reference to the lack of the Council's 5-year housing supply and acknowledged that the proposals would make effective use of previously developed land, contribute to housing in the District and could make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area as small sized sites are often built out relatively quickly. In both these appeal decisions the Planning Inspector concluded in the planning balance that while some economic advantages would arise from the construction of the proposed dwelling, the benefits would be limited by the modest scale of the development for a single dwelling.

Whilst the current housing shortfall is a material consideration of significant weight, the proposed development would be located at a significant distance from the nearest settlements, where future occupiers would be heavily reliant upon private vehicles to meet their day-to-day needs. The application site is therefore considered to be in an inappropriate location in this regard and would be contrary to the Council's spatial strategy and the aims of the NPPF. The proposal would not represent sustainable development and the benefits of providing 1no. additional dwelling would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits arising from the modest contribution of 1no dwelling to the Council's housing supply. It is not therefore considered that the benefits of the scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the conflict with the spatial strategy when read as a whole, and particularly when assessed against Policies 31, 32, and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

The proposed development seeks planning permission for 1no. dwelling located on land distanced from the nearest built-up area and within a countryside location. The proposed development would therefore conflict with the spatial strategy for housing within the development plan as set out in Policies, 2, 3, and 4 of the HDPF. In addition, the proposal would not meet any of the exceptions as identified within Policy 26 of the HDPF. The proposal would not therefore provide a suitable location for housing regarding the spatial strategy within the Development Plan. While recognised that the proposed development would contribute to the identified housing need, the benefit of 1no. dwelling to the Council's housing land supply would be limited when considered in the planning balance and would not outweigh the conflict identified with Policies 2, 3, 4, and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Given that the benefits of the development would be minimal and taking into account concerns relating to the potential impact from surrounding agricultural and equestrian activities, and given the lack of assessment in respect of bats, the adverse impacts identified would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies when taken as a whole. Therefore, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies 1, 3, 4, 26, 31, 32, and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

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), and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that future occupiers of the dwelling would not be adversely impacted upon by any activities taking place on surrounding land by reason of noise, odour and general disturbance. The proposal would therefore create accommodation below the standard which the council would reasonably expect, contrary to Policy 32 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3 Insufficient information has been submitted to establish the protection of the ecological and biodiversity interests of the site and whether suitable mitigations or enhancements are

necessary and achievable, contrary to Policy 31 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/24/0668

(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
Supporting Statement	Water Neutrality	C3044	21.05.2024
Location plan		KCC3603/01	30.04.2024
Block plan		KCC3603/02	30.04.2024
Elevation & Floor plan	Existing	KCC3603/03	30.04.2024
Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed	KCC3603/04	30.04.2024
Supporting Statement	Planning	KCC3603 SS	30.04.2024

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Shazia Penne Date: 30.07.2024

Authorising Officer sign/initial Guy Everest Date: 30.07.2024