



Statement of Case

Land at 40 Newland Road
Upper Beeding
West Sussex BN44 3JJ

On Behalf of

Mr Simon Stringer

LPA Reference DC/25/2072

Prepared by
David Campion MRICS

July 2026

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2	BACKGROUND	4
3	THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	5
4	THE DECISION NOTICE	5
5	GROUND OF APPEAL.....	6
6	SUMMARY	9

Documents forming the Appellant's case and itemised within the appeal form

- 1) 2257 101 Rev A Location Plan
- 2) 2257 102 Rev A Existing Site Floor Plan
- 3) 2257 103 Rev A Existing Site Roof Plan
- 4) 2257 104 Rev A Proposed Site Floor Plan
- 5) 2257 105 Rev A Proposed Site Roof Plan
- 6) 2257 106 Rev A Existing Elevations
- 7) 2257 107 Rev A Proposed North and East Elevations
- 8) 2257 108 Rev A Proposed South and Looking East Elevations

The Application Form

The Decision Notice DC/2025/2072

The Officer Report DC/2025/2072

Pre-application advice PE/25/0018

Design and Access Statement

This Appeal Statement of Case

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Statement of Case relates to a planning appeal pursuant to the decision by Horsham District Council (HDC) to refuse an application for the construction of a single-storey dwelling house on a plot adjoining 40 Newland Road, Upper Beeding, West Sussex.
- 1.2 The application was refused on 12th February 2026.
- 1.3 The appeal is made on behalf of Mr Simon Stringer.
- 1.4 This Statement of Case sets out the background to the application and details the grounds on which the appeal is made.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Appeal Site

- 2.1.1 The appeal site is a plot of land immediately adjoining No 40 Newland Road. No 40 is currently being re-furnished to provide open market rental accommodation. Both No 40 and the appeal site are owned freehold by the appellant.
- 2.1.2 The appeal site lies to the south and east of No 40 within the built-up area of Upper Beeding. The Appellant does not disagree with the Council's site assessment described in the Officer report as *"the surrounding area of the western end of Newland Road (which 40 Newland Road is akin to) primarily consists of semi-detached and stepped bungalows finished with brick and cladding. The character of Manor Road of which the property sits on the corner is a street with a mixed architectural style though there is cohesion between dwellings"*. To that I would add that the residential area is not within a Conservation Area or covered by any special designation. The surrounding dwellings are not of any architectural merit or worthy of protection.
- 2.1.3 A copy of the Decision Notice and Officers Report for DC/25/2072 accompany the appeal documentation.

2.2 Planning Policy

2.2.1 The Development Plan for the site comprises the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) and the Upper Beeding Parish Neighbourhood Plan. Material considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Government's stated objective of providing 1.5 million homes during the lifetime of the current Parliament.

2.2.2 Details of all relevant policies are summarised within the Officer report, wherein they are itemised as:

- Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19):
- Strategic Policy 1: Sustainable Development
- Strategic Policy 2: Development Hierarchy
- Strategic Policy 4: Horsham Town
- 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 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
- Strategic Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
- Policy 18: Local Green Space
- Strategic Policy 19: Development Quality
- Strategic Policy 20: Development Principles
- Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport
- Policy 25: Parking
- Strategic Policy 37: Housing Provision
- Strategic Policy 38: Meeting Local Housing Needs
- Policy 40: Improving Housing Standards in the District
- Supplementary Planning Guidance:
- Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD (2017)
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2017)

3 THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 3.1 The application refused under reference DC/25/2072 proposed the construction of a single 1 x bedroom chalet adjoining No 40.
- 3.2 The application site is located within the built up area of Upper Beeding which is described in the Upper Beeding Parish Neighbourhood Plan as the largest settlement in the Parish. It is located next to Bramber village where its High Street connects to The Street in Bramber offering a wide range of shops and community facilities.
- 3.3 The appeal site is within a residential area in a sustainable location.
- 3.4 During the determination process, there were no public objections. Of the two statutory consultations, the Parish Council objected for the single reason that the dwelling would “provide a serious obstruction and affect the visibility at this junction” yet the Highway Authority “did not consider that the proposal for 1 dwelling would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in ‘severe’ cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network”.

4 THE DECISION NOTICE

- 4.1 The planning application was refused by Horsham District Council for the following reasons:
1. The proposed development would be of a scale, siting, layout and design that would result in the loss of the open character of the area and would fail to respect the build pattern and prevailing character of the locality. The proposal would fail to relate sympathetically to the townscape character and visual amenity of the street scene, and would therefore be contrary to Policies 25, 32, and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
 2. The proposed development, due to its siting and extent, would have an unacceptable overbearing impact on the adjoining neighbouring property of 40 Newland Road and consequently result in an unacceptable loss of light. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policy 33 of the

5 **GROUNDS OF APPEAL**

- 5.1 Whilst not disagreeing with the Officer report on matters of fact, the Appellant does not agree with the Council's opinion that the development is unacceptable by reason of scale, siting, layout, design, overbearing and loss of light. Nor does the Appellant agree that the proposal harms the character and amenity of the locality and neighbouring properties.
- 5.2 These reasons place weight on conflict with Policies 25, 32, and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015). There is no discussion in the Officer report of Policy 25 which primarily deals with the natural environment, landscape character, landform and development pattern plus protected landscapes and habitats. In this regard, it is emphasised that this development is proposed within a large built-up area within the settlement of Upper Beeding: the site is not within a Conservation Area and the development will have no impact on the Natural Landscape.
- 5.3 The principle policy objection to the proposal relies on Policies 32 and 33 which seek to ensure that development promotes a high standard and quality of design in order to enhance and protect locally distinctive characters. That objective is also found in the Upper Beeding Parish Neighbourhood Plan.
- 5.4 However, the Local Plan is out of date at a time when the Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing supply. The most recent Annual Monitoring Report (dated December 2025) cites a 1.7 year housing land supply, which equates to a very significant shortfall of 5286 dwellings.
- 5.5 If Local Plan policies were strictly applied they would prevent the delivery of much needed housing in a District where there is no 5 year Housing Land Supply, hence the significance of the NPPF. The importance of providing new homes was confirmed by the Housing Minister, Angela Rayner, in an interview on the Radio 4 Today programme as recently as 24 July when she said that "1.5million homes is a difficult target; it was when I made the target, but I'm going to keep the target,

and I'm not going to be defeated".

- 5.6 The Officer report places significant weight on an appeal decision in 2015 which suggested that the development in question would "appear incongruous within the fairly uniform character of the street scene, particularly in terms of its design and position within the plot and would result in the loss of the open character of the area..." Neither the Inspector nor the Appellant will have knowledge of this appeal. However, an 11 year old decision which pre-dates the current NPPF and which was made when the Local Plan was not out of date, does not reflect today's housing needs, and is not a material planning consideration in this appeal.
- 5.7 Paragraph 11d of the NPPF applies and the titled balance in favour of sustainable development, with its presumption in favour of sustainable development, is therefore engaged. This includes the provision that permission should be granted unless adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
- 5.8 This proposal would deliver a modest, affordable one bedroom dwelling to meet an unmet local need on a infill plot within the settlement boundary. The principle of the development was addressed in the Council's pre-application advice which confirmed that developments should "take place in the most sustainable locations" and that "infill development is acceptable". In the context of a district with a significant housing land supply shortfall, the contribution of even a single dwelling should be given significant weight. The proposal represents a modest yet logical infill development to which no objection was forthcoming from local residents and the only objection, from the Parish Council, was not supported by the Highway Authority.
- 5.9 The benefit of securing a new dwelling in circumstances that are very different to those in 2015 needs to be examined against any harm that may outweigh the benefits. The harms identified by the Council in reason 1 of the refusal notice relate to the scale, siting, layout and design of the dwelling, the loss of the open character of the area, disrespect to the build pattern and prevailing character of the locality and a failure to relate sympathetically to the townscape character and visual amenity of the street scene. Reason 2 suggests overbearing and loss of light affecting No 40.

- 5.10 The Appellant feels that these harms are overstated. The dwelling sits well within the modest plot and makes effective use of the land in meeting the need for homes as required in Paragraph 124 of the NPPF. The size and scale of the dwelling are constrained by the size of the plot, but this does compromise the provision of an Architect designed, much-needed, energy efficient small house which accords with living space requirements and, contrary to the Officer report, does not need two car parking spaces.
- 5.11 It is argued in support of the appeal that the openness of the area is not compromised given the retention of the hard surfaced footway and two pieces of vegetation between the site and the public highway. The Appellant asks the Inspector to agree that, as the character of the area is mixed and not particularly distinctive, the townscape character would not be harmed by a single new dwelling on this infill plot.
- 5.12 The Council has produced no evidence to demonstrate appreciable loss of light following the construction of a bungalow. Nor does the Appellant accept that the development would be overbearing in relation to No 40. In any event, even if these were to be a factor, their harm is minimal and not significant in the context of building a sustainable dwelling on the site.
- 5.13 The Appellant's case is that the harms have been overstated and the merits of his proposal given insufficient weight. This development meets the 3 objectives for sustainable development set out in Paragraph 8 of the NPPF: Environmentally, the dwelling would be energy efficient and constructed from materials sourced locally wherever possible; Economically, the scheme would deliver economic benefits in terms of construction jobs and additional patronage of local services and businesses once the house is occupied; Socially, the scheme provides much needed market housing. In this context, the development is a logical and appropriate extension to the residential area.

6.1 SUMMARY

- 6.1 This appeal relates to a refused planning application to build a single one bedroom dwelling on a plot of land adjoining No 40 Newland Road, Upper Beeding.
- 6.2 The proposal would deliver much needed housing within the district on previously developed land, at a time when the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply.
- 6.3 For the reasons set out above, the Appellant's case is that the harms identified in the reasons for refusal are overstated and the merits of the proposal have not been given sufficient weight. The proposal therefore constitutes sustainable development and the Inspector is respectfully asked to allow this appeal.

Batcheller Monkhouse

July 2026