



Applications & Appeals Services
The Beehive, City Place, Gatwick, RH6 0PA
Tel: 01403 252231 email: njaltd@gmail.com

The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

NJA Ref: 25/281

10 September 2026

FINAL COMMENTS

Dear Sir/Madam

PINS Ref: 6013345
Appellants: Ms R. Licorish and Ms K. Thorn
Site: Land on Blackhouse Road, Blackhouse Road, Colgate, West
Sussex, RH13 6HS
Proposal: Erection of a single-storey self-build dwellinghouse

Thank you for your email of 7 September 2026. On behalf of the Appellants, please find the enclosed final comments in respect of the Council's Statement of Case and the third-party representations.

If you have any queries or require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely



Nikolas J. Antoniou
BSc HONS DIPTP MRTPI
Chartered Town Planner
For and on behalf of NJA Town Planning Ltd



Appeal Ref: 6013345

Appellants: Ms R. Licorish and Ms K. Thorn

**Site: Land on Blackhouse Road, Blackhouse Road, Colgate, West Sussex, RH13
6HS**

Proposal: Erection of a single-storey self-build dwellinghouse

APPELLANTS FINAL COMMENTS

Comments on the Local Authority's Statement

The Council accepts that the appeal site is not isolated in the ordinary sense, that Horsham can demonstrate only 1.7 years' housing land supply, and that the proposal would deliver a self-build home. Its case nevertheless treats the site's position outside a defined boundary as the key matter. That gives insufficient effect to the site-specific assessment in the Appellants' Statement of Case and Design and Access Statement. The appeal concerns one deliverable, single-storey dwelling in a contained parcel adjoining The Coach House and Colgate Lodge, within the established pattern of development along Blackhouse Road. Colgate lies about 0.4 miles away and is recognised in the emerging Local Plan as a Secondary Settlement because of its established community and range of facilities.

The August 2026 NPPF now applies to decision-making. Policies S3 and S5 replace the former paragraph 11(d) balance for development outside settlements. Policy S5(1)(j) supports development which addresses evidenced unmet need, expressly including housing where the authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply, where it is physically well-related to an existing settlement and its scale can be accommodated by available or proposed infrastructure. "Physically well-related" is not the same test as adjoining a defined boundary. The Council's reliance on the SDPAN's stricter settlement-edge criterion should therefore not be substituted for the wording of national policy. The linear built form on both sides of Blackhouse Road, the adjoining dwellings, the short connection to Colgate and the emerging recognition of Colgate as a settlement together provide a clear physical relationship. A single dwelling is plainly modest in scale, and the Council identifies no infrastructure-capacity objection.

The absence of a footway and lighting along Blackhouse Road is acknowledged, but it does not establish that the proposal is unacceptable. Policy TR3 of the August 2026 NPPF requires transport opportunities to be considered in context and recognises that rural opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport will vary. The proposal is one dwelling, not significant development. It would use an existing access; the Highway Authority found no evidence that it operates unsafely, recorded no injury accidents, and raised no objection subject to visibility and parking conditions. Colgate's facilities and bus stops, and the wider services of Horsham and Faygate, remain available. Some car use is likely, but the limited movements from one home do not amount to a substantiated significant adverse transport effect.

The Council's discussion of the Coolham and Horsham Golf Club decisions does not undermine the Appellants' case. They were not advanced as factually identical schemes, but demonstrate that conflict with an ageing settlement strategy is not conclusive, housing delivery must receive real weight during an acute shortfall, and accessibility is assessed in the round. Their different scale and pedestrian circumstances do not answer the evidence that this is a small, contained and deliverable scheme. It would also meet identified self-build demand: the Statement of Case records 180 entries on the Council's register at 24 April 2026, including 128 district residents. That benefit is additional to general housing supply.

There is no separate design, landscape, amenity, ecology or highway reason for refusal. The Council found the contemporary single-storey design, scale and materials sympathetic to Blackhouse Road. The dwelling has a footprint of about 135 square metres, sits centrally within a spacious plot, and leaves most of the site undeveloped. Established boundaries and a shallow roof limit visibility. The Arboricultural Officer raised no objection, residential separation is about 45 metres, and remaining matters can be secured by the suggested conditions. This also satisfies Policy N4 of the August 2026 NPPF: the scheme is limited in scale, sensitively located and designed, and is not major development. The Council identifies no special quality of the High Weald National Landscape that would be harmed and landscape impact is not a reason for refusal.

Accordingly, the proposal falls to be considered positively under Policies S3 and S5(1)(j) of the August 2026 NPPF and the proposal would not amount to the creation of an isolated home within the countryside (NPPF Policy HO11).. The severe housing shortfall, the provision of a self-build home, the site's physical relationship with Colgate and adjoining development, and the absence of identified design, landscape, amenity, ecology, infrastructure or highway harm are not substantially outweighed by conflict with the older settlement-boundary strategy. The appeal should therefore be allowed.

3rd Party Comments

The objection from Pepperpot Cottage refers to the High Weald designation and nearby light-industrial uses. The designation is fully recognised, but it is not a prohibition on development. Under Policy N4 the question is the effect of this proposal and given its limited single storey form, contained position and retained landscaping would prevent harm and the house would sit comfortably next to neighbouring properties. .

The Garden Corner representation relies on the refusal of a different earlier proposal on another site and suggests special treatment because the landowner may be a councillor. Each case must be determined on its own planning merits and land ownership is not a planning consideration. Notwithstanding this, no evidence of improper process is provided. This appeal must be considered against the August 2026 NPPF, the 1.7-year supply, self-build demand and its particular evidence; the earlier outcome cannot determine it.

For the reasons outlined above and in the Appellants' Statement of Case and Design and Access Statement, it is respectfully requested that the appeal be allowed.