



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0938

South View, Dorking Road, Kingsfold, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 3SA

DESCRIPTION:

Permission in Principle for the demolition of the existing outbuilding and erection of a single storey dwellinghouse.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

No relevant planning history

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The application site is within the garden land of the dwelling South View, sited west of Dorking Road. The site is outside of any designated built-up area boundary, with the nearest built-up area boundary, the medium classified village of Warnham, being located 2.2km to the southwest. Kingsfold, an unclassified settlement, is located 0.6km to the north and Horsham, the classified main town, is located 2.5km to the southeast. The site is therefore located within the countryside in policy terms.

The site is not in a Conservation Area and there are no further heritage constraints in the locality. Boundary treatment around the site consists of mature hedging and trees on the east and west boundaries, South View to the north and an agricultural field to the south. The surrounding area consists of sporadic residential, commercial and industrial development, with a mixture of enclosed agricultural fields and open countryside. Dorking Road, the A24, is sited immediately on the site's eastern boundary.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The application seeks Permission in Principle for the demolition of an existing redundant outbuilding, measuring approximately 21sqm, and the erection of a single dwelling. The indicative plans submitted suggest that the proposed dwelling would be sited to the south of South View, with the dwelling's garden and access will be via the existing access serving this dwelling, onto Dorking Road.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):

Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development

Policy 2 - Strategic Policy: Strategic Development

Policy 3 - Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy

Policy 4 - Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion

Policy 15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision

Policy 16 - Strategic Policy: Meeting Local Housing Needs

Policy 17 - Exceptions Housing Schemes
Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection
Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles
Policy 35 - Strategic Policy: Climate Change
Policy 36 - Strategic Policy: Appropriate Energy Use
Policy 37 - Sustainable Construction
Policy 38 - Strategic Policy: Flooding
Policy 39 - Strategic Policy: Infrastructure Provision
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking

Warnham Neighbourhood Development Plan 2017-2031

Policy W1: Built- Up Area Boundary
Policy W5: Design of Residential Development
Policy W9: Parking Standards for new Residential Development

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 year. 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 6: Climate Change
Strategic Policy 7: Appropriate Energy Use
Strategic Policy 8: Sustainable Design and Construction
Strategic Policy 9: Water Neutrality
Strategic Policy 10: Flooding
Strategic Policy 11: Environmental Protection
Strategic Policy 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Strategic Policy 14: Countryside Protection
Strategic Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Strategic Policy 19: Development Quality
Strategic Policy 20: Development Principles
Strategic Policy 23: Infrastructure Provision
Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport
Policy 25: Parking
Strategic Policy 37: Housing Provision
Strategic Policy 38: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Policy 39: Affordable Housing
Policy 40: Improving Housing Standards in the District
Policy 41: Rural Exception Homes

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD (2017)

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2017)

Warnham Parish Design Statement**Planning Advice Notes:**

Shaping Development in Horsham District

Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS RESPONSES

Where consultation responses have been summarised, it should be noted that Officers have had consideration of the full comments received, which are available to view on the public file at www.horsham.gov.uk

Consultations:**INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS****HDC Arboricultural officer:** Advice

No significant Arboricultural concerns are raised in principle, subject to the final design and layout. The site contains a small number of internal trees of limited landscape value that would not constrain development. The principal Arboricultural feature is the belt of native deciduous trees along the eastern boundary, which provides screening from the adjacent trunk road and makes a significant contribution to the semi-rural landscape. The proposed access and dwelling should be designed to avoid harm to these trees, taking account of their root protection areas and future growth.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES**Ecology Consultant:** Holding Objection/More Information required

No ecological information has been submitted and there is therefore insufficient information to determine the application. Further survey work relating to bats and reptiles is required. As the existing outbuilding is proposed to be demolished, a Preliminary Roost Assessment for bats is necessary. If any trees are to be removed, a Ground Level Tree Assessment will also be required to assess potential impacts on roosting bats. In addition, a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal should be undertaken to assess impacts on reptiles and other protected and Priority species, including common amphibians and hedgehogs, particularly where hedgerow removal is proposed.

NatureSpace: Comments

As the application is for a permission in principle, there are no recommendations to make at this stage. However, as the development is within the amber impact risk zone for great crested newts, which indicates suitable habitat and a likelihood of great crested newt presence, would advise that the applicant submits an assessment of likely impact to GCN as a result of the development alongside any future applications. This assessment should also consider any necessary onsite mitigation in order to appropriately safeguard the species.

WSCC Highways: Advice

The indicative plans show the existing vehicular access would serve the site. Collision data for the past five years records four incidents in the vicinity, however, none were attributed to the site access or its operation. There is therefore no evidence that the access operates unsafely or that the proposal would worsen highway safety.

The indicative plans suggest the development would not result in a material increase in traffic movements. At Technical Details Consent stage, details should demonstrate adequate vehicle parking and turning in accordance with WSCC Parking Guidance, together with secure, covered cycle parking.

Given the limitations of a Permission in Principle application, the Local Highway Authority raises no objection in principle, subject to the submission of satisfactory technical details.

Southern Water: No Objection

Southern Water has no objections in principle to this proposal, but are unable to comment further until full details of the means of foul and surface water disposal are submitted for review.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:

Representations:

1 letter, providing a neutral response, has been received from 1 address, stating:

- Loss of natural habitat on the site due to the footprint of the dwelling
- Outside the bounds of the 'unclassified settlement' of Kingsfold
- A smaller footprint should be considered, currently little space for parking or garden area
- Possible overlooking and privacy issues if the design is revised to include dormer windows
- Viability of the scheme and impacts on South View is questioned, revised access should be considered
- Highway safety concerns relating to the speed limit and visibility of the A24, reduction of speed limit should be made. Walking or cycling is not an option given the lack of pavements
- No drainage details supplied
- Alterations to the electricity network required and may cause detrimental impacts to the amenity of the area

Parish Comments:

Warnham Parish Council: No Objection subject to comments

It is unclear from the application, whether the applicant is proposing the split the existing land parcel (Parish Online ref 34574716) into 2 parts or wishes to maintain Freehold rights to the proposed new property. The Parish Council suggest HDC seek clarification of the applicant's intention; it could be intended to rent out the property or if "Permission in Principle" is approved to then seek to sell the plot (with planning permission) to a builder to then register the change in the existing land parcel and the new plot area with Land Registry.

Member Comments:

None received

HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUALITY:

The application has been considered having regard to Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act 1998, which sets out a person's rights to the peaceful enjoyment of property and Article 8 of the same Act, which sets out their rights in respect to private and family life and for the home. Officers consider that the proposal would not be contrary to the provisions of the above Articles.

The application has also been considered in accordance with Horsham District Council's public sector equality duty, which seeks to prevent unlawful discrimination, to promote equality of opportunity and to foster good relations between people in a diverse community, in accordance with Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. In this case, the proposal is not anticipated to have any potential impact from an equality perspective.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

Permission in Principle is sought for the demolition of the existing outbuilding and erection of a single storey dwellinghouse. The Permission in Principle consent route is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for residential development, which separates the consideration of matters of "principle" for the proposed development, from the "technical details" of the development. As such, the

Permission in Principle route has two stages: the first being the "Permission in Principle" stage (subject of this current application), which establishes whether the site is suitable in-principle; and the second being the "Technical Details consent" stage which is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. The scope of the Permission in Principle application (being the first stage) is limited to location, land use, and amount of development.

Location

The proposal seeks permission in principle for 1 dwelling. The proposal would replace an existing domestic outbuilding, with an existing access from Dorking Road. The application site is located outside of a defined built-up area and is therefore within the countryside in policy terms. The site is not allocated for development within the Local Plan or within a made Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy 2 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) sets out the main growth strategy, focusing development in the main settlements. The HDPF outlines that the proposed settlement hierarchy is the most sustainable approach to delivering housing; where new development is focused in the larger settlements of Horsham, Southwater and Billingshurst; and limited new development is directed elsewhere, and only where it accords with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. Specifically, Policy 3 of the Horsham District Planning Framework seeks to retain the existing settlement pattern and ensure that development takes place in the most sustainable locations as possible.

Policy 4 of the HDPF refers to the expansion of settlements outside the built-up area, and states that such development is only supported where: the site is allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan and adjoins an existing settlement edge; the level of expansion is appropriate to the scale and function of the settlement type; the development is demonstrated to meet the identified local housing needs; the impact of development individually or cumulatively does not prejudice comprehensive long term development; and the development is contained within an existing defensible boundary and the landscape and townscape character features are maintained and enhanced.

Policy W1 of the Warnham Neighbourhood Development Plan (W NDP) states new development shall be focused within the Built-up Area Boundary of Warnham village. Development proposals outside the Built-Up Area Boundary will not be permitted unless they conform to the policies of the HDPF. Development in visually intrusive locations will not be supported unless mitigated with appropriate landscape screening.

As the site is located outside of any defined built-up area boundary, Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF are of significant weight in the determination of the application. As stated within Policy 3 of the HDPF, development will be permitted within towns and villages that have defined built-up areas; with development in the countryside more strictly controlled through the provisions of Policy 4. This policy states that development outside of built up areas will only be supported where the site is allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan and adjoins a settlement edge.

The application site lies outside of the defined Built-Up Area Boundary on a site not allocated for development, and therefore in planning policy terms forms part of the countryside where new development is strictly controlled. In this countryside location, Policy 26 is also applicable. Policy 26 seeks to protect the countryside against inappropriate development unless it is essential to its countryside location and meets one of the following criteria: supporting agriculture or forestry; enabling mineral extraction or waste disposal; providing for quiet informal recreation; or enabling the sustainable development of rural areas.

Paragraph 83 of the NPPF states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.

Nationally, Paragraph 84 of the NPPF states that *"planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:*

- *there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;*
- *the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;*
- *the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;*
- *the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential dwelling; or*
- *the design is of exceptional quality, in that it:*
 - (i) *is truly outstanding or innovative, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and*
 - (ii) *would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and would significantly enhance its immediate setting and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area."*

The term "isolated" is not defined within the National Planning Policy Framework, but case law has confirmed that it should be given its ordinary objective meaning of remote and far away from other places, buildings and people, and separate or remote from a settlement, services, and facilities. There are other residential dwellings with the locality and so given this spatial context, it is not considered to be "isolated" in its truest sense and does not therefore engage the considerations of paragraph 84.

The proposed development would be in conflict with Policies 2, 3, 4 of the HDPF and W1 of the WNDP. Furthermore, it does not meet any of the exceptions as identified within Policy 26. As such, the location of proposed development is therefore unacceptable in principle. Whether there are any material considerations that would outweigh the conflict as identified, will be discussed in the Planning Balance and Conclusions section below.

Land Use:

In the context of the Permission in Principle application, the consideration of 'land use' is taken to relate to whether the proposed land use change to residential is acceptable.

The development site is located approximately 23 metres to the south of South View and 33 metres to the east of The Oaks. Given these separation distances, the residential land use would not result in any harm to the amenities of these properties, such as overlooking, privacy and overshadowing issues.

It is noted that the proposed dwelling would be in close proximity to the A24, approximately 15 metres and as such, the dwelling is likely to be exposed to high levels of noise from road traffic. Without an environmental noise survey being submitted to show that the amenity of future residents would not be negatively impacted by the road noise, the proposal is considered to represent an unacceptable location in terms of future amenity of occupiers of the dwelling, contrary to Policies 24 and 33 of the HDPF.

As outlined within this report, residential development within the countryside location, on a site not allocated for development within the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan, would be contrary to the overarching spatial strategy expressed through Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF and an W1 of WNDP. The provision of a residential dwelling on the site is therefore considered to result in inappropriate development within an unsustainable location, with the proposed land use not considered appropriate for these reasons. Whether there are any material considerations that would outweigh the conflict as identified, will be discussed in the Planning Balance and Conclusions section below..

Amount of Development:

Policies 25, 32, and 33 of the HDPF promote development that protects, conserves, and enhances the landscape character from inappropriate development. Proposals should take into account landscape characteristics, with development seeking to provide an attractive, functional and accessible environment that complements the locally distinctive character of the district. Buildings should contribute to a sense of place, and should be of a scale, massing, and appearance that is of a high standard or design and layout which relates sympathetically to the landscape and built surroundings.

Within the context of a Permission in Principle application the consideration of 'amount' is limited to whether the number of dwellings proposed is appropriate in relation to the size of the site, having regard to the site's countryside location and position outside the defined settlement boundary. The proposed development would introduce 1no dwelling onto the site, with a footprint of approximately 182sqm. While the applicant has provided an indicative site layout and elevations plan to aid with decision making, it is important to note that these are not fixed at this stage.

The proposal would result in the addition of built form within the grounds of an existing dwelling. The submitted plan demonstrates that a single dwelling could be accommodated on the site, whilst ensuring a suitable size garden, private off-road parking, visitor parking and landscaping along all boundaries. A single dwelling is not considered excessive having regard to the size of the site and there is no evidence to suggest that one dwelling could not be physically accommodated. As such, the amount of development is considered acceptable.

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.

Other Matters:

The matters of scale, design, layout, and access for the proposed development are reserved for consideration under the subsequent "Technical Details" application.

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.

A minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity value will be required to be demonstrated at the Technical Details Consent stage, through submission of a habitat baseline assessment and Biodiversity Metric calculation in accordance with the Environment Act 2021 and the Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (General) Regulations 2024.

Ecology:

Given the outline nature of this Permission in Principle application, detailed ecological information has not been submitted at this stage. Should the principle of development be supported, ecological survey work and appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures would be required at the Technical Details Consent stage to ensure compliance with Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), the NPPF (2024), and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).

Conclusions:

As the site is not allocated for development within the HDPF or a made neighbourhood plan, owing to the site's location outside of the built-up area boundary, the principle of the development is contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework and W1 of the WNDP.

The Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply and the presumption in favour of sustainable development at paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged in this instance. NPPF paragraph 11(d)(ii) states that where there are no relevant development plan policies in place, the policies that are considered most important for the determination of applications (in this case, Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the HDPF, owing to the lack of a five-year housing land supply) are out of date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

In circumstances where Paragraph 11(d) is engaged, NPPF Paragraph 225 (Annex 1) sets out that due weight can be given to the most important policies for determining an application according to their degree of consistency with policies in the Framework. However, the Framework does not prescribe the weight to be given to conflict with development plan policies. This is affected by the purpose of the policy and the circumstances of the case.

In this case the most important policies include those relating to the spatial development strategy as set out in HDPF Policies 1, 2, 3 and 4. Policy 1 reflects the Framework presumption in favour of sustainable development and is thus fully consistent with the NPPF. Policies 2, 3 and 4 set out how sustainable growth will be achieved, though as they seek to focus development within settlements and only allow expansion on allocated sites, they have a restrictive element. Nonetheless, they generally reflect the Framework preference for development to be well located in relation to services and facilities. Therefore, moderate weight is applied to these policies.

HDPF Policy 26 refers specifically to countryside protection outside built up area boundaries, requiring development to be essential to its location. Whilst again this reflects the Frameworks preference for

development to be well located in relation to services and facilities, given the current housing undersupply, this policy is afforded moderate weight.

As per the preceding sections of this report, the granting of this permission would conflict with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the HDPF and W1 of WNDP. Whilst the proposal would not support the spatial strategy for the District, these policies are not fully framework compliant. Furthermore, the issues associated with the Council's current five-year housing land supply situation result in moderate weight being applied to these policies in the overall planning balance.

The proposal would provide a single market dwelling. In light of the Council being unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply (with a 1.7 year supply only), the Council has published the Shaping Development in Horsham District Planning Advice Note (SDPAN). The SDPAN provides guidance on how to positively assess residential development proposals coming forward outside of settlement boundaries, with Paragraph 5.12 of the SDPAN stating that the Council '*will consider positively applications that meet all of the criteria below:*

- *The site adjoins the existing settlement edge as defined by the BUAB;*
- *The level of expansion is appropriate to the scale and function of the settlement the proposal relates to;*
- *The proposal demonstrates that it meets local housing needs or will assist the retention and enhancement of community facilities and services;*
- *The impact of the development individually or cumulatively does not prejudice comprehensive long-term development; and*
- *The development is contained within an existing defensible boundary and the landscape character features are maintained and enhanced.'*

The current housing shortfall is a material consideration of significant weight. Whilst the site would be within a defensible boundary, and the contribution of a market dwelling would provide socio-economic benefits in the form of housing delivery, the site does not adjoin an existing settlement edge. The nearest settlement edge, Warnham, is located approximately 2.2km away. The proposal in this regard does not comply with the SDPAN.

Whilst compliance with the SDPAN is not determinative, given it is guidance only, the document does seek to identify sustainable development. In this case the application site is on Dorking Road (A24), which is unlit and does not benefit from a dedicated pedestrian footway. The road itself is subject to a 50mph speed limit and even if traffic levels are low, it would not be an attractive walking or cycling option for future occupiers, particularly in the dark or in poor weather. There are no interconnecting Public Right of Ways and as a result, future occupiers would likely be heavily reliant on private vehicles to access everyday services, amenities and facilities. The location of this site is not therefore considered sustainably located to be able to offer non-car transport options for future residents, and is contrary to the Council's spatial strategy for housing. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would result in an acceptable level of amenity for future residents in relation to high levels of road noise from the A24.

The cumulative benefits from the provision of a single dwelling and the socio-economic benefits this would generate are considered to be outweighed by the identified adverse impacts of the development, namely the conflict with the development plan and the site's unsustainable location. This harm would demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Therefore, the Permission in Principle application is recommended for refusal, as it is considered contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 24, 26, and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Policy W1 of the made Warnham Neighbourhood Development Plan (2019), and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

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.

In the case of Permission in Principle applications the CIL charge will be calculated at the relevant Technical Details stage. Please note that 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

Reason(s) for Refusal:

- 1. The proposed development would be located within an unsustainable location in the countryside, beyond a defined built-up area on a site not allocated within the Development Plan and would not be essential to this countryside location. The development would therefore be contrary to the overarching spatial strategy and hierarchy approach of concentrating development within defined settlements and advocating a planned approach to settlement expansion, contrary to policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy W1 of the made Warnham Neighbourhood Development Plan (2019). Notwithstanding the absence of a five-year land housing supply, and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) at paragraph 11(d), it is not considered that there are any material considerations which would outweigh harm arising from conflict with the above policies.
- 2. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that occupiers of the proposed dwelling would not be exposed to unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance from the close proximity of the A24 dual carriageway, contrary to Policies 24 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/26/0938

(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
Location plan			05.06.2026
Block plan			05.06.2026
Supporting Docs	Planning Statement, Proposed Elevations and Details		05.06.2026
Block plan			05.06.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Sam Nye Date: 17/07/2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial Tamara Dale Date: 20/07/2026