



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0029

Gaydon, Kennel Lane, West Grinstead, West Sussex, RH13 8LX

DESCRIPTION:

Demolition of stable block and removal of sand school. Conversion of stables to 1 no dwellinghouse and associated landscaping.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/25/1466	Conversion of stables to dwelling with associated landscape works and removal of smaller stable block and sand school.	Application Refused on 27.11.2025
------------	--	-----------------------------------

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The application site forms part of the existing residential planning unit of Gaydon, a detached dwelling in the West Grinstead Parish. The site lies outside of a defined built-up area boundary and therefore is considered a countryside location for planning purposes.

The site consists of the existing dwelling, an ancillary garage and a series of equestrian buildings, including two stable buildings, equestrian storage, a small shed to be retained on site and a sand school to the north. The wider site contains extensive grassed areas, a pond, mature trees and hedgerows along the northern and western boundaries, with wider views to the south and glimpses of a neighbouring dwelling.

The site is accessed by private driveway from Kennel Lane which serves both the existing dwelling and the equestrian development. The surrounding area is characterised by sporadic residential and equestrian development, with the nearest settlement being Cowfold approximately 2 miles away.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The applicant seeks planning permission for the conversion of the existing stables and associated equestrian buildings to form a single dwelling, with external alterations and associated landscaping works. The applicant also seeks to demolish a small stable block and remove the sand school to the north of the site.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):

Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development

Policy 3 - Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy

Policy 4 - Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion

Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character

Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection

Policy 29 - Equestrian Development
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 41 - Parking

West Grinstead Parish Neighbourhood Plan (2021):

Policy 2 Open Space

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 6: Climate Change
Strategic Policy 7: Appropriate Energy Use
Strategic Policy 8: Sustainable Design and Construction
Strategic Policy 10: Flooding
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
Policy 25: Parking
Policy 32: Conversion of Agricultural and Rural Buildings to Commercial, Community and Residential Uses
Policy 33: Equestrian Development

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD (2017)
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2017)

Planning Advice Notes:

Shaping Development in Horsham (SD PAN, 2025)
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:

HDC Arboricultural Officer: Advice

The current site usage and extension of recreational activity associated with the existing dwelling has had and continues to have a detrimental impact on the biodiversity value of the section of Ancient Woodland (AW) within the site ownership to the North - Cock Shaw.

If minded to approve the application, a possible biodiversity benefit would be to clearly constrain the associated extent of property curtilage and reduce/exclude recreational access to the woodland.

HDC Drainage Engineer: Objection

In the absence of an acceptable Drainage Strategy, HDC Drainage require more information to determine that the site drainage meets the requirements of the NPPF and PPG, National standards for the sustainable drainage systems (June 2025), and the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) – Policy 35 and Policy 38.

HDC Environmental Health: Objection

CONSULTATION 1

Given the historic use of the site and the likely presence of made ground associated with the current development we are of the view that the ground on the site has the potential to be contaminated.

Given the above and the fact that proposed use is sensitive to the presence of contamination the application should be supported by preliminary contamination risk assessment (PCRA), undertaken by a suitably competent and experienced environmental consultant.

During site clearance, preparation and construction there is the potential for local residents to experience adverse impacts from noise, dust and construction traffic movements. These should be minimised and controlled by the developer and a construction environmental management (CEMP) plan will be recommended as a condition, once the above matters have been addressed.

CONSULTATION 2

The Preliminary Contamination Risk Assessment (H20geo, February 2026) has been reviewed, and the level of detail is welcomed, however the following should be included:

- Made ground soils should be considered in the assessment.
- Further commentary in the site walkover section on ground levels across the site.
- Assessment should be undertaken more in accordance with technical guidance.

Ecology Consultant: No Objection

No objection subject to conditions

Southern Water: Comment

No soakaways should be connected to the public surface water sewer. We request that a condition be attached to planning approval requiring details of surface water run off disposal prior to construction. The applicant should consult with the Environment Agency regarding the use of private wastewater treatment works disposing to sub-soil irrigation. The applicant should formally notify Southern Water prior to any proposed demolition works being undertaken. Condition recommended.

WSCC Highways: No Objection

In summary, 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.

Nature Space: No Objection

We are satisfied with the approach provided and therefore recommend the use of a compliance condition to secure the measures outlined in the Preliminary Ecological Assessment.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:

Representations:

None received.

Parish Comments:

West Grinsted Parish Council: Support

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

Background:

Th previous application on the site for the conversion of the stables to a dwelling (DC/25/1466) was refused in November 2025 for the following reasons:

- 1. It has not been sufficiently demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the proposed development would represent a conversion. The development would be located 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, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015). 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 in this instance which would outweigh harm arising from conflict with Local and Neighbourhood Plan policies in these regards.*
- 2. The relationship between the subject building and the neighbouring property to the south-west is considered to result in a degree of overlooking and overbearing impact that would result in a poor quality environment for future occupiers of the proposed dwelling. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).*

The current application has been amended insofar that a detached bin and bike store has been moved within the site and a native hedge is now proposed beside the post and rail fencing intended to delineate the property's rear garden.

The application is supported by a Planning Statement which seeks to explain why the proposal represents the conversion of the stable building rather than a rebuild. The Planning Statement sets out that *'the existing cladding to roof and walls will be retained and the building will be insulated internally within the existing envelope. Existing doors will be retained as a feature with new doors and windows fitted behind them to provide compliance with building control whilst resulting in minimal alteration to the buildings appearance'*. The application is also now accompanied by a letter from a structural engineer.

As a consequence, the proposed floor plan now shows new walls within the existing, rather than outside as before, and with an external kitchen door now removed.

Principle of Development:

Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF, 2015) Policies 2 (Strategic Development), 3 (Development Hierarchy) and 4 (Settlement Expansion) as well as Policy 1 (Local Gap) of the West Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan (WGNP) collectively seek to ensure that development is appropriately sited to retain the districts distinctive settlement pattern and rural landscape character.

Policy 3 designates a series of built-up area boundaries (BUAB) where development is accepted in principle, with development on land outside of these boundaries more strictly controlled. When considering these BUAB it is clear that the proposal is not located within any of those stated within the policy and therefore Policy 4 applies.

Policy 4 outlines the circumstances where development outside of a BUAB will be supported, however as the site is not allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan and does not adjoin an existing settlement edge, the requirements of Policy 4 are not met.

Policy 26 of the HDPF does make allowances for a certain level of development in the countryside so long as it is essential to its location, for example it supports rural enterprise or provides recreational use. However, the proposal is not essential to its countryside location and does not meet any of the criteria stated and therefore does not comply with Policy 26.

Considering the above, the proposal directly conflicts with the overarching hierarchy and locational strategy of the development plan.

However, the proposal is put forward on the basis of the conversion of an existing building. Policy 10 of the HDPF states that proposals for the conversion of rural buildings to business and commercial uses will be considered favourably over residential in the first instance.

With regard to the proposal's ability to re-use an existing building, officers acknowledge the submitted letter from a structural engineer deeming the structure suitable for conversion to residential use subject to the installation of insulation and plasterboard with the roof remaining consistent with the existing. Additional timbers should be installed in between the existing purlins and plywood sheathing glued and screwed to the new joists. The cross beams would also need to be strengthened. The Letter states that these are minor works, where the structure is suitable for conversion from a structural perspective.

The letter is considered sufficient to demonstrate that the building would be suitable for conversion. Whilst Policy 10 of the HDPF supports the conversion of buildings to dwellings, it is necessary to consider the sustainability of the development.

Notwithstanding compliance with Paragraph 84 of the NPPF, it is recognised that this paragraph sets out criteria that would allow the development of 'isolated homes in the countryside' including where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and would enhance the buildings immediate setting. Paragraph 84(c) makes clear that any building to be developed should be redundant or disused. The submitted Planning Statement deems the buildings redundant as the applicant does not keep horses, citing appeal reference APP/R3650/W/24/3339079 (Waverley Borough Council) whereby the Inspector took redundant to mean *'no longer being needed or useful'*. On the date of the site visit it

was clear that the applicant was still utilising the building for storage purposes and therefore it could still be considered 'useful' to the applicant, irrespective of the fact it is not being used for its intended purpose. It is therefore concluded that the building does not constitute a redundant or disused building.

Finally, paragraph 84(c) states that any development of isolated homes in the countryside must enhance the buildings immediate setting. While the proposal includes removal of the smaller northern stable block and sand school, the resulting residential use together with formalised curtilage, parking, garden areas, domestic paraphernalia and associated lighting would introduce suburbanising elements into a currently open and distinctly rural part of the site. The overall effect would be the domestication of the countryside rather than a genuine landscape enhancement.

The applicant places weight on the Council's current housing land supply position, which is calculated at approximately one year. As such, paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged. While the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies, paragraph 11(d)(ii) is clear that permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would "significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits" when assessed against the Framework as a whole. In this case, the conflict with the adopted spatial strategy (Policies 2, 3, 4 and 26), the unjustified introduction of a new dwelling in the countryside, and the absence of any evidence that the proposal represents a legitimate rural conversion, collectively attract substantial weight against the development. Officers consider that this harm significantly and demonstrably outweigh the limited benefits of a single dwelling, even in the context of the tilted balance.

Accordingly, the proposal fails to comply with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 10 and 26 of the HDPF, and does not meet the criteria of paragraph 84 of the NPPF. The principle of development is therefore unacceptable.

Design and Appearance:

Policies 32 (The Quality of New Development) and 33 (Development Principles) seek to ensure that development in the district promotes a high standard of urban design, architecture and landscape while taking account of the existing character of the area and creating a 'sense of place'. In addition, Policies 25 (The Natural Environment and Landscape Character) and 26 (Countryside Protection) are also relevant here given that they seek to protect the rural landscape from inappropriate development.

The existing equestrian buildings consist of a traditional stable to the west and open-ended hay barn to the east, which are both of simple construction using standard materials. Overall, their appearance is typical of equestrian use, albeit slightly run down.

The proposed scheme would remain largely similar in terms of external form, with new windows and doors fitted as well as additional external cladding to join the two buildings and to enclose the eastern elevation. This would result in the building appearing slightly more domestic in character; however, with the retention of existing features such as stable doors it is not considered that this would detract from the overall character and appearance of the building.

Overall, the proposal is considered to relate appropriately to the character and appearance of the building, in accordance with the above policies.

Residential Amenity:

Policy 33(2) of the HDPF requires development to ensure that it is designed to avoid unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupiers/users of nearby property and land through loss of privacy, outlook, light, noise or general disturbance. Similarly, Paragraph 198 of the NPPF requires development to be appropriate for its location and avoid impacts upon living conditions.

The nearest neighbouring dwelling (Gaydon) is located on the wider site, immediately adjacent to the proposal. The proposal is set slightly further back than the existing dwelling and is in line with its rear garden. The existing neighbouring dwelling extends to two floors, with both internal and external amenity space overlooking the proposal.

The proposed dwelling is configured so that the main amenity space (living room and kitchen) and access will be located on the eastern side, facing away from the neighbouring property. There are no windows proposed on the southern elevation and five windows proposed on the west, serving the two bedrooms and a bathroom. The proposal includes its own parking area, outdoor amenity space clearly demarked with a post & rail fence and native hedging and the planting of 2no. native trees in the southwest corner to further shield the neighbouring dwelling from view.

Whilst it is recognised that efforts have been made to ensure the residential amenity of existing and future occupiers, the distance between the existing dwelling and the proposal is such that there remains a degree of overlooking that is likely to lead to a poor-quality living environment for occupiers. The presence of a two-storey dwelling in such close proximity to a single-storey dwelling gives an oppressive feel and is likely to feel overbearing to future occupiers of the proposal. Furthermore, the proposed landscaping cannot be secured in perpetuity and could not therefore be relied upon to make the development acceptable.

It is therefore concluded that the proposal has not demonstrated that it conforms with either Policy 32 or 33 of the HDPF and there is potential for a poor quality living environment for future occupiers.

Highways Impacts:

Policies 40 (Sustainable Transport) and 41 (Parking) of the HDPF requires development to provide safe and suitable access for all as well as ensure that adequate parking and facilities are provided to meet the needs of anticipated users. In addition, paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that development should only be refused on highways grounds if there were to be an unacceptable impact upon highway safety or the cumulative impact on the road network severe.

The proposed dwelling will be accessed via the existing access point on Kennel Lane, a privately maintained road, with the application not proposing any changes to this access point. The proposed dwelling includes parking provision for two vehicles without reducing parking provision for the existing dwelling, which is in line with the WSCC Parking Standards for a dwelling of this size and location. There is also provision for secure cycle storage and EV charging as shown on the proposed Block Plan.

Following consultation with the Local Highways Authority, it is not thought that the development will give rise to significant material intensification of the existing junction at Cowfold Road and on-site turning looks to be achievable which will allow cars to exit in a forward gear.

For these reasons the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact upon highways safety or cause a severe impact, and will benefit from acceptable access and parking, therefore complying with the relevant local and national policies.

Ecology:

Policy 25 of the HDPF (2015) seeks to protect existing biodiversity and green infrastructure in the District by ensuring no net loss while Policy 31 looks to encourage the provision and enhancement of new habitats, while outlining requirements for areas of particular importance (SPAs, SACs, SSSIs etc.). This is in line with paragraphs 187-188 of the NPPF (2024).

The application is accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Assessment (Sylvatica Ecology Ltd., August 2025) which has been reviewed by the Council's Ecology Consultant. The assessment surveyed the existing buildings and surrounding land, which consist of equestrian structures, heavily grazed modified grassland, hardstanding, boundary trees and hedgerows, and a pond located to the northwest of the application area. The submitted report confirms that all buildings on site have a negligible bat roost potential, and no trees are to be removed on site. It is therefore concluded that no further surveys for bats are required.

The site lies outside the 12km Wider Conservation Area for The Mens SAC, and therefore the development does not trigger a Habitats Regulations Assessment in connection with the designation.

The pond on site was subject to Environmental DNA (eDNA) testing for Great Crested Newt (GCN), with results returning negative. NatureSpace reviewed the approach and confirmed that the negligible risk of GCN presence justifies the use of a precautionary, non-licensed method of works, subject to conditions securing compliance with these measures.

The Ecology Consultant advised that the development is acceptable subject to the following measures being secured by condition:

- A Precautionary Method Statement for mobile protected and priority species.
- A Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy.
- A Lighting Design Strategy in accordance with Guidance Note 08/23 (Institute of Lighting Professionals).

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is required for this development under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by the Environment Act 2021), unless exempt. The applicant has submitted a Biodiversity Gain Assessment which is discussed in the relevant section below.

Subject to the recommended conditions, the proposal is considered to comply with the relevant policies in the HDPF and NPPF, with ecological impacts appropriately mitigated.

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:

Contaminated Land:

Agricultural buildings and land can be subject to significant contamination risks arising from their use, previous land uses, construction and storage of machinery, equipment, fuels, or other chemicals. Potentially hazardous materials may also be incorporated in made grounds, yards, and hardstanding. Risks arising from the use therefore require evaluation by the applicant.

HDC Environmental Health were consulted as part of this application advising that a preliminary contamination risk assessment be undertaken by a suitably competent and experienced environmental consultant. The applicant submitted a Preliminary Contamination Risk Assessment (PCRA) (H2Ogeo, February 2026) concluding that the site presents a negligible risk with respect to land contamination and does not warrant intrusive investigation.

HDC Environmental Health were consulted on the PCRA, welcoming the level of detail it provided. Despite this, they were of the opinion that further consideration should be given to made ground soils within the report as well as further commentary on ground levels provided in the site walkover section. In addition, they advised that the assessment should be undertaken more in accordance with current technical guidance.

At the time of receiving this advice, the application was already recommended for refusal for other reasons and it was therefore deemed inappropriate to ask the applicant to undertake further work. Nevertheless, in this instance it is considered that this matter can be suitably resolved by way of planning condition.

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. The proposed development includes the following measures to build resilience to climate change and reduce carbon emissions:

- Water consumption limited to 110 litres per person per day
- Dedicated refuse and recycling storage capacity
- Opportunities for biodiversity gain
- Cycle parking facilities
- 1 electric vehicle charging point

Subject to these conditions the application will suitably reduce the impact of the development on climate change in accordance with local and national policy.

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 149.15% net gain is achievable by way of onsite biodiversity gains, and a 83.84% gain to hedgerow units on site. As the biodiversity gain is being delivered onsite and is not deemed 'significant' intervention a legal agreement to secure the maintenance and monitoring of the net gain is not required.

Conclusions:

As the site is not allocated for development within the HDPF or a made neighbourhood plan, the principle of development is contrary to Policies 1, 2, 4 and 26 of the HDPF, and paragraphs 2, 11, 12 and 47 of the NPPF owing to the site's location outside of the built-up area boundary.

Housing Land Supply

Chapter 3 of the Council's most recent Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) states that the Council currently benefits from a deliverable supply of housing sites of 1.7 years. Therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development as dictated by 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 or the policies that are considered most important for the determination of applications are out of date (in this case, Policies 1, 2, 4 and 26 of the HDPF, owing to the lack of a five-year housing supply) 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.

It should be noted that neither Footnote 7 or paragraph 14 of the NPPF applies and therefore the tilted planning balance is not nullified.

Planning Balance

The proposal would provide one additional dwellinghouse. As the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing supply, the provision of an additional dwellinghouse towards this supply is afforded *significant* weight. However, the Council considers that this benefit would be *limited* given the negligible overall contribution to the supply.

Occupants of the proposed dwelling would be reliant on use of a private motor vehicle. Even taking into account that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions vary between urban and rural areas, the proposed location would be incompatible with paragraphs 110 and 115 which focus development on locations which limit the need to travel, offer a choice of transport modes, and prioritise sustainable transport modes with suitable access for all users.

It is recognised that paragraph 125(c) of the Framework gives substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land for homes. However, the Framework is clear that such land should be within settlements and thus would not apply to the proposal. Paragraph 84(c) of the Framework supports development that would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting. However, the building is functional and in use and it is not considered redundant or disused.

As discussed, the distance between the proposal and the existing dwelling to the south-east would result in a poor-quality living environment due to overlooking, overbearing and oppressive impact, and is therefore not in conformity with Policy 32 or 33 of the HDPF.

When considered against the requirements of the NPPF and the development plan, the fact that the proposal conflicts with the spatial strategy and is likely to significantly impact residential amenity significantly and demonstrably outweighs the limited benefits of one additional dwelling. Accordingly, even when applying the tilted balance under paragraph 11(d), the proposal does not constitute sustainable development.

For these reasons, the application is recommended for refusal.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

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

It is considered that this development constitutes CIL liable development.

Use Description	Proposed	Existing	Net Gain
	70.78	91.04	-20.26
	Total Gain		70.78
	Total Demolition		91.04

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

Exemptions and/or reliefs may be applied for up until the commencement of a chargeable development.

In the event that planning permission is granted, a CIL Liability Notice will be issued thereafter. CIL payments are payable on commencement of development.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

- 1 The development would be located 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, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015). 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 in this instance which would outweigh harm arising from conflict with Local and Neighbourhood Plan policies in these regards.
- 2 The relationship between the subject building and the neighbouring property to the south-west is considered to result in a degree of overlooking and overbearing impact that would result in a poor quality environment for future occupiers of the proposed dwelling. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

POSITIVE AND PROACTIVE STATEMENT

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

Plans list for: DC/26/0029

(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
-----------	-------------	----------------	----------

