

The Planning Inspectorate
c/o QUADIENT
69 Buckingham Avenue
Slough
SL1 4PN

Our ref: DC/26/0035

Your ref: 6009593

Contact: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: 26.08.2026

Dear Gemma,

6009593 – Land East of Spring Gardens, Washington, West Sussex, RH20 3BP

The Council writes in response to the Inspector's invitation dated 21st August 2026 to consider whether the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2026 has relevance to the above appeal.

The Council considers that the NPPF 2026 is directly relevant to the determination of this appeal.

The most relevant provisions are Policies S3 and S5. Policy S3 directs decision-makers to Policy S5 in relation to development located outside of defined settlements. Policy S5(1)(d) provides support for the redevelopment of previously developed land outside settlements. The Council does not dispute that the appeal site constitutes previously developed land as defined within Annex B of the NPPF.

Paragraph 7 of the NPPF states that decision making policies should 'be read as a whole'. Therefore, the proposal must also be assessed against the other relevant criteria within Policy S5. In particular, Policy S5 requires residential development outside settlements to be physically well-related to an existing settlement. The Council's position remains that the appeal proposal does not satisfy this requirement.

The site is physically separated from the nearest settlement and is not well-related to its built form. The nearest built-up settlement edges are 0.8km to the north and 0.9km to the southwest by car. Access to services and facilities within the settlement would require movement along the A24, and the surrounding walking routes are not considered to provide a realistic option to meet day-to-day needs of potential occupiers. The development would also not read as a logical extension to an existing settlement. Whilst it is acknowledged that the Council is presently unable to demonstrate a five-year housing supply, this does not alter the requirement that development should be physically well-related to an existing settlement in accordance with Policy S5.

Accordingly, the Council remains of the view that the proposal conflicts with Policy S5 of the NPPF. The introduction of the revised Framework does not therefore alter the Council's position regarding the acceptability of the development.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the Council remains of the view that the development would be contrary to the relevant policies of the Horsham District Planning Framework and the NPPF 2026. The Inspector is therefore respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal.

Yours sincerely,

Bethan Tinning
Planning Officer