



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/25/1946

3 Station Road, Billingshurst, West Sussex, RH14 9RF

DESCRIPTION:

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.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

PE/25/0027	Demolition of 1no. house and replace with 4no. terraced houses	Pre-Application Given on 07.05.2025	Advice
------------	--	--	--------

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 or area at risk of flooding.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The application is submitted following pre-application advice (PE/25/0027) for 4no dwellinghouses. Taking this pre-application advice, the application seeks to demolish the existing two-storey dwelling and erect a total of 3 dwellings, comprised of 1no. detached 3-bed dwelling and 1 no. pair of semi-detached 3-bed dwellings with parking and facilities. There are 6 car parking spaces proposed. The proposed dwellings will be accessed via the existing vehicle access from Station Road. The semi-detached dwellings have a footprint of approximately 5.8m wide by 9m deep. At ground floor level the accommodation comprises a kitchen/diner to the front and a large living area to the rear. At first floor level there will be 2 bedrooms and a bathroom. The third bedroom is located in the roof space. The detached dwelling has a footprint of 5.9m wide by 9m deep.

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

Paragraph 33 of the NPPF requires that all development plans complete their reviews no later than 5 years from their adoption. Horsham District Council is currently in the process of reviewing its development plan however at this stage the emerging policies carry only limited weight in decision making. As the HDPF is now over 5 years old, the most important policies for the determination of this application must be considered as to whether they are 'out of date' (NPPF paragraph 11d). This includes, for applications involving the provision of housing, whether the Council can demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites (NPPF footnote 8).

The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, with the supply currently calculated as being 1.7 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.

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

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: Objection: -

The proposed development fails to comply with the minimum recommendations of the design standard for new development (BS5837: 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations) near an ash tree of recognised good public amenity value.

If re-development of the property on similar lines is to be accommodated on the plot, it needs to take account of existing rooting constraints on the ash tree and include an offset root protection area (RPA) within the site that is a realistic shape. All new development should be designed outside of the RPA and include an appropriate working space/buffer to ensure conservation of the rooting environment.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

Ecology Consultant: Are not satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination of this application and recommend that further information with regard to bats is provided prior to determination.

We note from the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Arun Ecology Ltd., November 2025) that Building B1 (residential building) has moderate bat roost potential and therefore requires two further bat emergence surveys to be undertaken between May and August.

We note from the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Arun Ecology Ltd., November 2025) that Buildings B2 and B3 (both wooden storage sheds) have negligible bat roost potential and therefore agree that no further surveys are required for these buildings and bats.

We also note that Trees T1 (Leyland Cypress) and T2 (Tulip tree) will be removed and have Potential Roost Features for individual bats (PRFs-I). We therefore highlight that appropriate compensation will be required in advance of works to avoid loss of roost resource (Reason and Wray (2023) *UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines: a guide to impact assessment, mitigation and compensation for developments affecting bats. Version 1.1.* Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management). We also highlight that a non-licensed Precautionary Working Method Statement will be required, which includes inspection of any affected trees by endoscope on the day and felling under the supervision of a licensed bat ecologist, as required in Table 6.3 of 4th Ed. Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists Bat Conservation Trust (Collins ed., 2023).

Southern Water: Standard Response

WSSC Highways: The LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Representations:

12 letters of Objection have been received from 9 addresses, objecting to the application on the following grounds: -

- Insufficient foul drainage info
- Impact on flooding and surface water
- Amenity harm – noise, loss of privacy for neighbours
- Concerns with parking provision. Shortfall of parking, risk of overspill
- Unsafe access via a shared drive on a blind bend
- Overlooking concerns for neighbouring properties due to three storey design
- Overdevelopment – harm to character of historic cottages
- Felling trees resulting in loss of wildlife
- TPO trees on site, protected trees affected, risk of root damage
- Ownership certificate incorrect, applicant does not own driveway or rights of way
- Legal right of way over the shared driveway unclear
- Construction traffic unsafe and disruptive
- Site close to two large school with heavy pedestrian use
- Children and families walk along Station Road – safety concern
- Two nearby schools mean children use the footpath – extra vehicle movements unsafe

Parish Comments:

Object, due to the sighting of these dwellings on the corner of a busy road within a few hundred yards of a primary school. The dwellings have no right of access from the owner over the track featured within the red line site plan. The building of three storey dwellings on this site will overlook the neighbouring properties in Cleve Way. There are secondary concerns regarding the size of the proposed dwellings' gardens, and lack of turning space for the multiple parking spaces.

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.

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 demolition of 1no. house and the replacement with 1no. detached dwelling and 1no. semi-detached dwelling, in total 3no. houses. 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.

The proposed dwellings would have 3 bedrooms each, with the third bedroom located within loft space, with dormers on the detached dwelling, and rooflights in the semi-detached dwellings for sufficient head height and natural light. The proposed dwellings would meet the requirements of National Space Standards with good sized bedrooms. The proposal would create an area of private amenity space for each dwelling. The rear amenity space for the two dwellings to the south-east of the site would have limited amenity space due to the configuration of the site. The amenity space for the pair of semi-detached dwellings would be 110m² and 155m², compared to 266m² for the detached dwelling. This is a significant difference and while not ideal, it is considered that there is still an adequate level of amenity space provided for each dwelling.

The location of the dwellings would be on a bend on Station Road. The frontages would face the road and would be visible from the approach to the bend. The design of the dwellings is simple, taking inspiration from the surrounding development. The materials of the existing house comprise brickwork and timber cladding, the proposed dwellings would have brickwork from the ground to first floor and plain vertical tiles on the top half. The roof tiles would be plain roof tiles in smooth grey. A porch canopy is proposed over each front door to provide visual interest to the front elevation. Bin storage would be located to the side of each dwelling, and cycle parking in the rear garden. Each garden would be divided by 1800mm hit-and-miss timber fence.

The proposed development would take design cues from the wider locality, utilising features, forms and materials that would reinforce the character and visual amenity of the area. The design and appearance of the proposed dwellings are considered to be sufficiently reflective of the existing built form of the surrounding area, with terraced dwellings to the rear of the site. Whilst the density of the development is greater than the existing, this is considered to sufficiently reflect that of the adjacent development to the north. It is acknowledged that the site relates more strongly to development along Station Road, which is characterised by a less dense nature of development, and that the proposed development would result in a more prominent and dominant built form than currently exists on the site. It is though considered, on balance, that the development would have identifiable features found in the locality and would be appropriately in keeping with the immediate surroundings, in accordance with the above policies.

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.

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). The application is supported by a tree survey and AIA and method statement, with the calculated minimum root protection area (RPA) for the ash tree within the development area.

As originally submitted there were concerns that the root protection areas (RPAs) had not been correctly identified, and that the tree rooting should be plotted as an off-set further into the site (to take account of the existing constraint to the tree root growth due to the engineering specifications of the Station Road highway to the south). An updated plan was subsequently received, which included an off-set RPA for the protected ash tree which would extend partly beneath the footprint of the nearest new building. This relationship between the tree, the required RPA and the proposed building is contrary to the requirement for new design to accord with the minimum requirements of the BS5837 design standard, and does not accord with the local plan policy requirement to take due account of the trees of merit in creating sustainable new development.

The trees retain a good public amenity value and are of fair condition for its species and age. The ash tree in particular is recognised as being of high public visual amenity, due to it being a mature tree situated relatively close to the main thoroughfare of Station Road. The proposed development would place protected trees at risk through encroachment into the Root Protection Area (RPAs), building within the RPA of the tree would result in future pressure on the tree and harm to the health of the trees, which are considered of high public amenity value. The smaller internal trees to be removed do not possess the same level of public amenity value however they still have some and any space for mitigation planting is limited.

The proximity of the retained trees to the proposed dwellings and garden area could create foreseeable long-term conflict through overshadowing, potentially creating a poor-quality environment for future occupiers. This could give rise to pressure for inappropriate pruning or felling, which would diminish their stature, health and contribution to public amenity over time. The cumulative impacts would likely lead to the decline or loss of trees that make a significant positive contribution to the character and appearance of the locality and have a negative impact on future occupiers of the dwellings.

Furthermore, it had not been demonstrated as part of the application, that there is an overriding need for a new dwelling footprint within the RPA of the trees and this has not been sufficiently justified. Building within the RPA of the tree would result in future pressure on the tree and cause harm to the health of the trees, which are considered to be of high public amenity value. The proposed development therefore fails to comply with the minimum recommendations of the design standard for new development and would be contrary to Policy 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.

The representations received on the application and raising a number of concerns are acknowledged and noted. These concerns include amenity impacts, such as noise and overlooking and construction traffic being unsafe and disruptive.

The proposed dwellings would be located under 20m from the terraced dwellings to the rear. While these would be stepped forward from each other, there would still be a small distance between the rear elevations of the proposed dwellings and the neighbouring dwellings to the rear. Horsham District Council guidance on home extensions notes that the rear window to rear window distance between any habitable rooms should be at least 21m in situations where first floor windows of separate properties face each other. The proposed dwellings would be located at a maximum distance of 18m away from the rear of the neighbouring dwellings, and the detached dwelling would be approximately 17m away.

The cumulative impact of the separation distances together with the two-storey scale and the increased bulk across the site arising from the presence of three dwellings, is considered to result in a harmfully overbearing impact on neighbouring amenity.

The existing dwelling is orientated so the east and west (side) elevations provide key light and outlook to habitable rooms. In contrast the layout of the proposed dwellings would create key aspects to the front and rear, with the first-floor openings creating in a material increase in overlooking of adjoining land and properties. This layout together with the limited separation between the proposed dwellings and the shared rear boundary would create significant potential for intrusive views to be created, with the resulting loss of privacy considered harmful and unacceptable. The first-floor windows relate to bedrooms where it would not be considered appropriate to require the openings be obscurely glazed / fixed shut; the identified harm to privacy could not therefore be overcome through condition.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity, contrary to Policy 33 of the HDPF.

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 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.*

It is noted that representations have raised concerns regarding parking provision and that the access is unsafe. These are acknowledged as is the site's location to nearby schools and walking routes. The site is accessed via an existing shared dropped crossing, which leads to 3 Station Road as well as 5 and 7-9 Station Road. There is no alteration proposed to the existing arrangements, and this will provide vehicular access to the proposed dwellings. The Local Highway Authority has advised that the visibility at the existing access appears sufficient for the anticipated road speeds and that the proposal would not result in a material intensification of use of the existing access. There are no reasons to take a different view, and no objections are raised in respect of the proposed access arrangements.

The development includes 6 on-site parking spaces to the eastern boundary with the WSCC Parking Demand Calculator setting out a minimum of 6.3 spaces for a development of this size and location. As such there would be a slight shortfall of on-site parking in an area where street parking is limited. While the shortfall of parking is acknowledged, there are parking restrictions along Station Road which

would prevent parking in locations where a safety hazard could result, with street parking available within the wider surrounding area. It is considered that the combination of these factors, and taking into account the nature of the shortfall, is such that the level of on-site parking would not result in any unacceptable impacts on the highway network, highway safety or neighbouring amenity. It is further noted that the site is within a sustainable location where alternative public modes of transport are available and where services and facilities are within walking distance.

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. 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.

The site lies approximately 4.7km 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 Preliminary Ecological Appraisal found that the existing building had moderate suitability for roosting bats, and therefore advised that two bat emergence surveys were required to determine the presence or likely absence of bats in addition to any mitigation required within the design and construction phase of the development to ensure it proceeds lawfully. It was also noted that Trees T1 (Leyland Cypress) and T2 (Tulip tree) which are to be removed have Potential Roost Features for individual bats (PRFs-I). It was therefore highlighted that appropriate compensation will be required in advance of works to avoid loss of roost resource.

The application is not though accompanied by any such further assessments, and it cannot therefore be determined with a sufficient degree that the proposal would not result in adverse harm to bats. This omission cannot be overcome through a condition requiring the further assessments, since impacts must be known at the point of determination.

Water Neutrality:

A 2021 Position Statement from Natural England identified that it could not be concluded with the required degree of certainty that new development in the Sussex North Water Supply Zone would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites. As a consequence, and to comply with the legal duties set out in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (known as the Habitat Regulations), all new development since has been required to demonstrate water neutrality.

On 31st October 2025 Natural England formally withdrew the 2021 Position Statement, citing a package of measures that they were satisfied would safeguard the Arun Valley sites. Principal amongst these measures is a reduction in the Southern Water abstraction licence 'by March 2026'. However, given the licence change has not yet taken place Horsham District Council, as competent authority under the Habitats Regulations, cannot yet be certain that new development will not result in adverse impacts on the Arun Valley sites.

To ensure development can come forward as water neutral in the meantime, the Council has agreed with Natural England to use the significant water savings made by Southern Water in 2024/25 through their programme of leakage reduction (amongst other measures). This has generated some 3,240,000 litres per day of water savings that can now be attributed to new development without increasing water abstraction in the Arun Valley beyond baseline. These savings were previously to be used to launch the Sussex North Water Certification Scheme (SNWCS), however following the withdrawal statement SNWCS will no longer be launching. Natural England standing advice dated 10 November 2025 raises

no objection to using these savings to enable development to come forward. The standing advice clarifies that it functions as Natural England's formal response pursuant to Regulation 63(3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 to all relevant planning applications which seek to achieve water neutrality using the above Southern Water savings.

Officers have undertaken an Appropriate Assessment which demonstrates that the anticipated increase in mains water consumption from this development, alongside all other development granted since the 31st October 2025, will not exceed 3,240,000 litres per day.

Accordingly, Officers consider that the proposed development will not have an Adverse Effect on the Integrity of the Arun Valley Site, either alone or in combination with other plan and projects, thereby complying with Regulations 63 and 70 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, HDPF Policy 31, and paragraph 193 of the NPPF.

Climate Change:

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

If the application were approved conditions 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
- Water consumption limited to 110l (p/p/d)

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 submitted a Biodiversity Metric which demonstrates a -5.78% net loss. The proposal results in a deficit of 0.16 habitat units. The Biodiversity Net Gain Statement states that biodiversity units will be purchased through a third-party habitat bank, and these will be sought post-planning approval.

Conclusions and Planning Balance:

The proposed development would result in the provision of three dwellings 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 neighbouring amenity, would result in development

within the RPA of a mature tree subject of tree preservation order, and the impact on bats has not been fully established due to the absence of the required surveys. The proposal therefore raises conflicts with Policies 31 and 33 of the HDPF.

The Council is though currently unable to demonstrate a full 5-year housing land supply, and it is recognised that this forms a material consideration in decision making which triggers the application of the 'tilted balance' at Paragraph 11d of the NPPF. In accordance with Paragraph 11d, the Council is required to grant permission unless either (or both) of the following limbs apply:

- '(i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or*
- (ii) 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, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination'*

NPPF Paragraph 14 outlines the continued relevance of Neighbourhood Plans in situations where the presumption of favour or 'tilted balance' applies. Paragraph 14 states:

'in situations where the presumption (at paragraph 11d) applies to applications involving the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, provided the following apply:

- a) the neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan five years or less before the date on which the decision is made; and*
- b) the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement (see paragraphs 69-70).'*

In this instance, the Billingshurst Neighbourhood Plan was formally made on 23rd June 2021 and is therefore less than five years old. However, the Plan does not allocate any sites for housing, such that the above criteria (i.e. (a) and (b)) have not been met.

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. As a result, the presumption in favour of sustainable development at Paragraph 11(d)(ii) of the Framework does not apply. 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.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The development, due to the siting, layout and limited separation from the shared northern boundary, would appear overbearing and result in a harmful loss of privacy for occupants of neighbouring properties on Cleve Way. The amenity impacts of the development would be unacceptable and contrary to Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

2. The development, on the basis of the submitted information, would result in the carrying out of building and engineering operations likely to threaten the health and stability of a tree subject of a Tree Preservation Order 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).
3. 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.

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/25/1946

(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
Design & Access Statement		NONE	26.11.2025
Location & Block plan	proposed Block and Materials	SY1 REV B	10.12.2025
Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed for Semi	PL1 REV B	10.12.2025
Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed for Detached	PL2 REV B	10.12.2025
Tree plan	Protection	Sht- 3 REV 1	10.02.2025
Tree plan	Survey	Sht- 1	26.11.2025
Plans	BNG Baseline Habitat Plan	NONE	26.11.2025
Plans	BNG Proposed Habitat	NONE	26.11.2025
Supporting Statement	Preliminary Ecological Appraisal	C-NJA-075-001-001	26.11.2025
Supporting Statement	Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection	NONE	26.11.2025
Supporting Docs	BNG Conditions Assessment	NONE	26.11.2025
Supporting Docs	Cover Letter	NONE	26.11.2025
Supporting Statement	Energy and Sustainability	NONE	26.11.2025
Supporting Docs	Pre Application Advice Letter	NONE	26.11.2025
Supporting Docs	BNG Metric Calculation Tool	NONE	26.11.2025
Supporting Statement	BNG plan	NONE	08.01.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Bethan Tinning Date: 03.03.2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial Guy Everest Date: 09.03.2026