Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0781
3 Station Road, Billingshurst, West Sussex, RH14 9RF

DESCRIPTION:

Erection of a new dwelling.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/25/1946	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 1 no Detached 3 bed dwelling and 1 no pair of Semi-detached 3 bed dwellings with parking and facilities.	Application Refused on 09.03.2026

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

3 Station Road is a detached two storey dwelling located to the northern side of Station Road as the road curves southwards. It lies within the built-up boundary of the small town of Billingshurst. The site lies within a residential area. The existing dwelling is located at the eastern end of the plot on a north/south orientation, with the rear garden running parallel to Station Road. A public footpath runs along the western boundary from Station Road to the centre of the town. The application site is not located within a Conservation Area.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The application seeks planning permission to erect a new dwelling within the curtilage of the existing dwelling, 3 Station Road. There would be 2 bedrooms. The proposed dwelling would be 1.5 storeys, with access and parking provided to the front of the existing dwellinghouse. The proposal has been redesigned following the previous refusal (DC/25/1946), with a reduction in built form and the retention of the existing dwelling.

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 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 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking

The Billingshurst Parish Neighbourhood Plan (2019-2031):
Policy BILL 1: Billingshurst Built-Up Area Boundary
Policy BILL 2: Housing Design and Character
Policy BILL 14: Residential Parking Provision
Billingshurst Parish Design Statement

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 4: Horsham Town
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

The Local Plan is currently at examination, where the Inspector's letter dated 30.10.2026 concludes that the plan is sound, subject to the proposed main modifications and the limited number of further changes discussed within the letter. The final report from the Inspector is anticipated to be received in January 2027, where changes to the draft Schedule of Main Modifications will need to be published for consultation. Given this letter and the status of the Local Plan, the policies contained within the Horsham District Local Plan 2023-2040 (HDLP) are considered to be of significant weight.

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 Arboriculture: Comment

There are various validation discrepancies in terms of giving a clear description of what is proposed in terms of parking and amenity area associated with the proposal. In any event, to make a fair assessment of impact on the key arboricultural features (previously detailed in respect of application DC/25/1946) a measured tree survey, AIA and site specific AMS would be fundamentals that are required.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

Ecology Consultant: Further information required/Temporary holding objection

Unfortunately, no information has been submitted in relation to ecology. Are not satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination of the application and recommend that further information relating to bats is required to make this proposal acceptable prior to determination.

It appears from the Tree Protection Plan and the Application Form that there are trees on site which will be removed. As this may impact roosting bats, a Ground Level Tree Assessment needs to be undertaken to assess any likely impact to roosting bats in accordance with the 4th Ed. Bat Surveys for Professional Ecological Bat Conservation Trust (Collins ed.. 2023) and inform any mitigation measures which may be required.

The site lies approximately 5.1km east of The Mens Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (MAGIC maps) and is therefore within the 6.5km Key Conservation Area for this SAC. Within this area all impacts must be assessed as habitats within this zone are considered critical for sustaining the

populations of bats within the SACs (Sussex Bat Special Area of Conservation Planning and Landscape Scale Enhancement Protocol).

Government Standing Advice for bats says you should ask for a survey if "*the development site includes or is close to trees*". We highlight that these assessments can be undertaken at any time of the year. To fully assess the impacts of the proposal the LPA needs ecological information for the site, particularly for bats and protected species and habitats.

Southern Water: Comment

Insufficient Information provided:

WSCC Highways: Comment

The site is accessed via an existing shared dropped crossing. The proposed plans indicate that no alteration to the existing access arrangement is proposed. The existing access will provide vehicular access to the proposed dwelling. Visibility at the existing access appears sufficient for the anticipated road speeds in this location. The proposal is not anticipated to result in a material intensification of use of the existing access.

The proposed plans indicate that four parking spaces will be provided on site for the proposed development. The WSCC parking demand calculator expects that this is sufficient provision for a development of this size and location.

The site is located within the centre of Billingshurst, within walking distance to a number of shops and services, including Billingshurst train station. Cycling is a viable option within the vicinity and secure and covered cycle storage should be provided for the proposed dwelling – details of this can be secured via condition.

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 (in line with TR6 paragraph 4), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:

Representations:

8 letters of Objection have been received from 5 addresses, objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Inconsistent plans - plan show two-storey building with two bedrooms upstairs and no bathroom, not single storey but rather 1.5 storeys
- Distance – plan shows building to be less than 2.5 metres from existing house – no outline of garden space for existing house or new house
- Flood risk – Environment Agency has this property under potential flood risk
- No drainage or surface water information
- Development will disturb the roots of the trees and biodiversity in the surrounding trees
- Parking – not sufficient parking or turning for proposed dwelling and existing dwelling
- Driveway access and ownership only extends to No.3 Station Road
- Primary school located close to the site
- Station Road very busy – cause significant issue during construction
- Removal of existing wall have impact on character and appearance along street scene
- Protected trees and ecology

Parish Comments:

Billingshurst Parish Council: Objection

- Due to the continued nature of concern for the access and road safety of the site.
- The application's proposed site plan does not include any red line area. The red line is only shown in the location plan and contains land that is not in the ownership of the applicant. The land

included in the red plan, but not within their ownership is the sole access to the site. From previous representation on application DC/25/1946, it is confirmed that the owner of the land gives access only for one property.
- Were permission given for this application, the additional traffic generated by 2 additional cars, would put added pressure onto Station Road, on a dangerous corner, just 100m from a primary school entrance.
- Whilst the new plan shows the proposal being outside of the RPA of the oak, this places the dwelling in the centre of the existing garden. It is a clear case of overdevelopment for the sake of shoehorning in an additional dwelling. It would leave the existing dwelling with little to no external space. The plans show no detail of how the remaining garden is to be split between the two properties.
- The submitted planning statement, titled "Change of use from residential to veterinary practice; 1 Woodcot, New Road" gives no detail on the layout of the garden, the future ownership of land around each dwelling, or the impact of the new dwelling being so close to the existing house.

Member Comments: Objection

Due to access, lack of parking and overdevelopment.

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 Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) sets out a spatial strategy which directs growth in the district in accordance with an identified settlement hierarchy, reflected in defined settlement boundaries. This is reflected by Policy 3 of the HDPF, which states that development will be permitted within towns and villages which have defined built-up areas, and that any infilling and redevelopment will be required to demonstrate that it is of an appropriate nature and scale to maintain characteristics and function of the settlement in accordance with the settlement hierarchy.

Policy 2 of the Horsham District Local Plan (HDLP) sets out the development hierarchy, focusing development within defined built-up area boundaries. Development will be permitted in secondary settlements provided that it falls entirely within the secondary settlement boundary and meets the required criteria.

The site would fall within the built-up area boundary of Billingshurst, which is classified as a larger settlement. Billingshurst benefits from a larger number of facilities and services. The proposal would involve the erection of 1no dwellinghouse. The principle of development is considered acceptable.

Design and Appearance:

Policy 32 of the HDPF states that good design is a key element in sustainable development and seeks to ensure that development promotes a high standard of urban design, architecture, and landscape. Policy 33 of the HDPF states that development proposals should make efficient use of land, integrate effectively with the character of the surrounding area, use high quality and appropriate materials, retain

landscaping where feasible (and mitigate loss if necessary) and ensure no conflict with the character of the surrounding town or landscape.

Policy 19 of the HDLP states development must achieve high-quality, sustainable and inclusive design that responds positively to its local context, respects landscape and townscape character, and makes efficient use of land.

***It is noted that there are inconsistencies with the submitted plans. For example; the planning statement refers to the proposed dwelling as single storey, however the proposed elevation plans show this as 1.5 storeys. The proposed floor plans also do not show a bathroom and appear to show two bedrooms on the first floor. These inconsistencies are acknowledged, and the application has been assessed based on a proposed 1.5 storey dwelling that would contain a bathroom and bedroom within the habitable roof space, rather than 2 bedrooms.**

The application follows the refusal of planning permission under DC/25/1946, which sought the demolition of the existing dwelling and redevelopment of the site to provide three dwellings. The application was refused on the grounds of unacceptable harm to neighbouring residential amenity, harm to protected trees through encroachment into Root Protection Areas, and insufficient ecological information in respect of bats. The Planning Statement acknowledges the previous refusal and states that the key revisions to the proposed scheme, include a reduction in number of dwellings to one, retention of the existing dwelling on site, transition from two-storey to 1.5 storey, and a revised layout, which responds to the arboricultural and neighbouring amenity considerations. The Planning Statement argues that the proposed scheme addresses the previous reasons for refusal and is a materially improved scheme.

The location of the dwelling would be on a bend on Station Road. As the existing boundary wall and hedging would remain, the frontage would be partially hidden from the approach to the bend, however, due to the height of the building, sitting at 5.4m tall, the front elevation and the dormers would be visible above the boundary wall and from public vantage points. The proposed dwelling would be 1.5 storeys, with dormer windows in the roof space to provide space for a bedroom and bathroom. It is noted that the Planning Statement refers to the building as single storey, however, the plans submitted show a first floor with dormers, so the proposed dwelling would be 1.5 storeys rather than single storey. The proposed design would be simple, using brick, clay tiles and white upvc, and makes limited reference to the surrounding development, through dormers which are not found in the immediate vicinity.

It is acknowledged that the scheme has been designed to address the previous reasons for refusal, regarding overlooking for neighbours to the rear and overdevelopment. However, the existing dwelling, 3 Station Road, is now the most impacted from the development. The low-form profile is acknowledged, and the Planning Statement states that the proposed dwelling will remain subordinate to the existing. However, the building would be an independent dwelling, with separate access and parking, not ancillary accommodation used in association with 3 Station Road.

It is considered that the proposed design would be simple and have a low-profile form. While the design would have limited reference for the surrounding development, it is not considered that the design would be wholly unacceptable. Of greater concern is the location of the dwelling in relation to the existing dwelling on site, and perception of the dwelling from vantage points along Station Road, where it would appear out of place, in close proximity to the existing dwelling, squeezed into the part of the site outside of the root protection area. It is considered that the dwelling would not be sympathetic to the build pattern of the surroundings and the location would be overbearing to the existing dwelling, sitting at 5.4m tall, and in direct sight lines from habitable windows. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF.

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, for example trees, hedges, banks, and watercourses. 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 states that where felling of protected trees is necessary, replacement planting with a suitable species would be required.

Policy 17 of the HDLP states that development will be supported where it maintains and enhances green and blue infrastructure, biodiversity, and ecological networks. Development proposals are expected to protect and enhance habitats, trees and protected species, deliver biodiversity net gain, and avoid or appropriately mitigate harm to sites and features of nature conservation importance.

The proposed development is located close to three mature trees, a Horse chestnut on public open space immediately to the west, an oak tree at the eastern extremity of the site and an ash tree within the current rear amenity/garden space of the property. The ash and oak tree are subject of Tree Preservation Orders (ref: TPO/1354 and TPO/0256). Despite the TPOs and high amenity value trees on site, the application is not supported by a tree survey, AIA or method statement.

The previous planning application (DC/25/1946) was refused due to the development resulting in the carrying out of building and engineering operations that would threaten the health and stability of TPO trees which would be detrimental to the visual amenity and wider surrounding area, contrary to Policies 31 and 33 of the HDPF. No supporting information has been provided regarding the trees on site as part of this application. The Planning Statement states that the proposal has been designed with full regard to the presence of protected trees, with the dwelling located outside of root protection areas, the existing trees of amenity value retained, and appropriate protection measures incorporated during construction.

However, two of the trees on the site are not mentioned, within the lack of reports. These are two trees that Ecology had previously raised concerns that there was roost potential for bats (T1 and T2), as these were going to be removed. While the Planning Statement confirms that there are no trees being removed as part of the proposal, there is no information about these specific trees and the roost potential, even though these formed part of the previous application, and remain on site.

In the absence of information, it is considered that it has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, that there is sufficient information to confirm that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on the trees on site, contrary to Policies 31 and 33 of the HDPF.

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.

Policy 19 of the HDLP requires development to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers through high-quality design and layout. Development proposals should avoid unacceptable impacts such as overlooking, loss of privacy, overbearing effects, overshadowing, noise, odour, vibration and light pollution, whilst creating safe, accessible and attractive places to live.

Policy P3 of the NPPF states that development proposals should provide healthy living conditions for occupiers and users in terms of adequate access to light and avoiding exposure to levels of air, noise, artificial light or other sources of pollution which could have an unacceptable adverse effect on health and the quality of life. Development proposals should not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, or unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water, soil or other forms of pollution on or beyond the site. Adverse impacts of this nature should be avoided where possible, or else mitigated to an acceptable degree.

The representations received on the application, raising a number of concerns, are acknowledged and noted. These concerns include inconsistency in plans, amenity impacts, highways and parking impacts as well as construction traffic being unsafe and disruptive.

The proposed dwelling would be located 2.3m from the existing dwelling, 3 Station Road. While the reason for the close proximity is acknowledged, to ensure the development is outside of the root protection areas (RPA) of the high amenity value trees, it is considered that a 2.3m distance would create a poor relationship between the proposed development and existing dwelling. The elevation

facing towards the existing dwelling would be a completely blank elevation, and existing occupants would look out of their ground floor windows onto a brick wall and first floor windows onto the roof of the building. Again, while it is acknowledged that the proposed dwelling would be 1.5 storeys, it would have an overall height of 5.4m, which would reach the first floor windows of the existing dwelling, which includes habitable bedrooms. The 5.4m height immediately in front of the rear first-floor windows would have an overbearing impact on occupants. Combined with the lack of distance, at 2.3m, residents of 3 Station Road, would experience a dominant and oppressive outlook from both ground floor and first floor rear-facing windows, owing to the limited separation distance and the scale of the proposed dwelling. It is also considered that the proposed dwelling would be shaded by the existing dwelling, which sits at a greater height. It is considered that the proposed relationship between the dwellings would be harmful and unacceptable.

While the proposed dwelling would be separate and independent, it would be viewed in connection with the existing dwelling due to its close proximity. The submitted plans do not clearly demonstrate how residential amenity space would be divided between the existing and proposed dwellings. Nevertheless, based on the red line on the site plan, it appears that the proposed dwelling would occupy a substantial proportion of the existing dwelling's garden area, resulting in a reduced area of private amenity space available to residents.

Furthermore, the two proposed parking spaces would result in the loss of the existing front amenity area, while the siting of the proposed dwelling immediately to the rear would leave little to no meaningful private amenity space associated with the existing dwelling. As a consequence, the existing dwelling would be left without an adequate level of private outdoor space for reasonable enjoyment of occupiers. It is therefore considered that the proposal would create an overbearing relationship and result in an unacceptable living environment for the occupants of 3 Station Road through the substantial loss of residential amenity space and the overbearing relationship created by the proximity of the proposed dwelling.

Highways Impacts:

Policy 40 of the HDPF deals with sustainable transport and seeks new developments to provide safe and suitable access for all vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists, horses riders, public transport, and the delivery of goods. Policy 41 which relates to parking requires adequate parking and facilities to be provided within developments to meet the needs of anticipated users.

Policy 24 of the HDLP states that development will be supported where it minimises the need for travel and prioritises sustainable transport options, including walking, cycling, wheeling, public transport and home working. Development must also provide adequate, safe and well-designed parking facilities that balance user needs, highway safety, residential amenity and good urban design, as per Policy 25.

Policy BILL 14 states that for all new residential developments, including redevelopments where there is an increase in the number of bedrooms in a property, the minimum number of car parking spaces to be provided should be in accordance with the West Sussex Residential Parking Demand Calculator, unless it can be demonstrated that alternative provision would be appropriate on a specific site.

The site is accessed via an existing shared dropped crossing. The proposed plans indicate no alteration to the existing access arrangement, and visibility at the existing access appears sufficient for the anticipated road speeds in the location. WSCC Highways confirmed that the proposal is not anticipated to result in a material intensification of use of the existing access. Four parking spaces are provided for the site and the WSCC Parking Demand Calculator expects that this is sufficient provision for a development of this size and location. The site is also located within the centre of Billingshurst, in a sustainable location, within walking distance to a number of shops and services, including Billingshurst train station. Cycling is also a viable option within the vicinity. While the concerns raised regarding parking are acknowledged, it is considered that there is sufficient parking provision for the development and due to the location of the development, alternative sustainable transport methods are available.

The Local Highways Authority does not consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network.

There are no reasons to take a different view and there are considered to be 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, and development proposals will be required to contribute to the enhancement of existing biodiversity and should create and manage new habitats where appropriate.

Policy 17 of the HDLP states that development will be supported where it maintains and enhances green and blue infrastructure, biodiversity, and ecological networks. Development proposals are expected to protect and enhance habitats, trees and protected species, deliver biodiversity net gain, and avoid or appropriately mitigate harm to sites and features of nature conservation importance.

The site lies approximately 5.1km east of The Mens Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and is therefore within the 6.5km Key Conservation Area for this SAC. There are approximately 52 records of bats within 2km of the site, including Serotine, Noctule and Brown Long-eared Bat (SBISx – accessed under licence). The site lies approximately 7.9km northeast of Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar site.

The previous application (DC/25/1946) was refused due to the insufficient ecological information submitted, specifically the absence of bat emergence surveys for the existing dwelling identified as having moderate roost potential. This application is not accompanied by any ecological information. The Planning Statement however, details that due to the existing dwelling being retained in full, the proposal removes any direct impact on potential bat roosts, eliminating the need for bat emergence surveys. However, there is no submitted evidence to demonstrate this.

The Ecology Consultant raised a holding objection, confirming that Government Standing Advice for bats advises that a survey should be asked for if the development site includes or is close to trees, which is a requirement that the application site meets.

In the absence of information confirming that the trees would not have bat roost potential, and the proposed dwelling would not result in any impacts to the surrounding ecology, it is considered that the proposal cannot be viewed favourably.

Other Matters:

<u>Climate Change</u>:

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 Policy CC2 of the NPPF that local plans and decisions seek to reduce the impact of development on climate change.

If the application were approved conditions could be imposed to secure the following, which would ensure compliance with the above policies: -

- Requirement to provide full fibre broadband site connectivity
- Dedicated refuse and recycling storage capacity
- Opportunities for biodiversity gain
- Cycle parking facilities
- Electric vehicle charging points

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG):

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

(Exemptions) Regulations 2024) and that every planning permission granted for the development of land in England shall be deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that development must not be begun unless a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority and the planning authority has approved the Plan.

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

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

- The development site area is less than 0.2 hectares qualifying as exempt, under Regulation 4 of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024

Conclusions:

The proposed development would result in the provision of one dwelling within the defined built-up area of Billingshurst where the principal of development is considered acceptable. However, the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the existing dwellinghouse, as well as insufficient information provided regarding ecology on site and the mature trees of high amenity value. The proposal therefore raises conflict with Policies 31 and 33 of the HDPF and Policies 17 and 19 of the HDLP.

It is recognised that the Council are currently unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing supply, where the proposal would contribute to the identified housing need and have some limited economic, social, and environmental benefits. These are considered to be material considerations of weight in the planning balance. However, the overall weight given to these benefits is tempered by the modest nature of the development, which would deliver a net gain of 2 dwellings on the site.

In this case it is considered that the adverse effects of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case, the proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and the material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that the application should be decided otherwise. It is therefore recommended that the application be refused.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

Horsham District Council has adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule which took effect on 1st October 2017.

It is considered that this development constitutes CIL liable development.

Use Description	Proposed	Existing	Net Gain
Residential	63.9		63.9
		Total Gain	
		Total Demolition	

Please note that the above figures will be reviewed by the CIL Team prior to issuing a CIL Liability Notice and may therefore change.

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.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reasons for Refusal:

1. It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the proposed development would not result in the carrying out of building and engineering operations likely to threaten the health and stability of trees within the site, including trees subject of a Tree Preservation Orders, which would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the site and wider surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 31 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

2. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the development would not have an adverse impact on protected species and its habitat (in respect of bats), contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The development, by reason of its contrived siting on a constrained site and proximity to existing dwelling on site, would create a poor relationship and constitute overdevelopment. The development would, in particular, result in unacceptable harm to the amenities of the neighbouring property of 3 Station Road, contrary to Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy P3 of the NPPF.

4. The development, by reason of its design and appearance, would not be sympathetic to the surroundings and the location, appearing overbearing to the existing dwelling, and out of place along the street scene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

POSITIVE AND PROACTIVE STATEMENT

Statement pursuant to Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received, in order to be able to, where possible, grant permission.

Plans list for: DC/26/0781
(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
Site plan	Proposed Site Layout	115/2026/2	03.07.2026
Location & Site plan	Site and Location Plan	115/2026/1	05.05.2026
Plans	Tree Protection Plan	115/2026-4	05.05.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed Elevations and Floor Plan	115/2026/3	05.05.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Bethan Tinning Date: 18.11.2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial Tamara Dale Date: 23.11.2026