b Horsham District Council

# DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DC/26/0592
Land at Lower Broadbridge Farm, Billingshurst Road, Broadbridge Heath, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 3LR

DESCRIPTION:
Reserved matters application for the erection of 133 dwellings following approval of outline application DC/22/1052 as amended by DC/25/1886, relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| DC/22/1052 | Outline application for the development of the site to provide up to 133 dwellings including the creation of new vehicular access, public open space, landscape planting, surface water attenuation and associated infrastructure with all matters reserved except access. | Refused 09.02.2023<br>ALLOWED AT APPEAL 07.03.2024 |
| DC/25/1886 | Removal of Conditions 12 (water neutrality strategy), 15 (water efficiency measures and greywater recycling systems) and 19 (verification of implementation of water efficiency measures and greywater systems) of previously allowed application DC/22/1052 (Appeal Reference APP/Z3825/W/23/3321658) (Outline application for the development of the site to provide up to 133 dwellings including the creation of new vehicular access, public open space, landscape planting, surface water attenuation and associated infrastructure with all matters reserved except access). | Permitted 27.01.2026 |
| DC/23/0578 | Variation of conditions 5 and 6 of previously approved application DC/20/2126 (Change of use of the land and buildings for the blending, screening, storage and distribution of landscape materials (Class Sui Generis). Extension of an earth bund along the northern boundary and erection of 2.2m high wall to the western boundary) to allow for the removal of the hopper and in relation to the noise levels on site. | Permitted 03.08.2023 |
| DC/25/0229 | Non Material Amendment to previously approved application DC/22/1052 (Appeal Reference APP/Z3825/W/23/3321658) (Outline application for the development of the site to provide up to 133 dwellings including the creation of new vehicular access, public open space, landscape planting, surface water attenuation and associated infrastructure with all matters reserved except access.) to correct drawing references within conditions 1 and 23 in respect of the Five Oaks roundabout works. | Permitted 13.03.2025 |

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The site relates to an area of 1.7ha of agricultural land to the southwest of Broadbridge Farm and the north of Newbridge Nurseries. The site adjoins Broadbridge Heath, abutting the A281. To the east of the

site lie dwellings (Arun House, the Paddocks and Millmead), the river Arun runs to the west of these dwellings. To the north part of the site is covered by Flood Zones 2 and 3. A high-pressure gas line runs through the site. Public Right of Way 1545 lies to the north of the site with Lower Broadbridge Farmhouse a Grade II listed building situated beyond this. Two further grade II listed buildings Mill House and Mill Cottage are located to the north of the site.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

This application seeks the approval of the matters relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved under condition 3 of an outline planning permission which was Allowed at appeal, for a development of 133 dwellings on land at Lower Broadbridge Heath Farm.

133 dwellings are proposed at reserved matter stage, 45% of these are affordable units, the exact split and tenure mix is set out later in this report.

The proposed dwelling designs are devised in the reserved matters submission into character areas. The submitted materials plan shows that red and brown brick are used throughout the site, with black or sage weather boarding on some dwellings. The rooftiles vary through the site with red, brown and grey tiles being proposed.

A total of 310 allocated car parking spaces are proposed, 31 of these spaces are for visitors. Every dwelling is to have EV charging installed.

Planting is proposed throughout the site with an area of ecological enhancement between Arun House and The Paddocks. A LEAP is proposed to the north of the site alongside an attenuation basin, foul water pump station and publicly accessible open space. Two further attenuation basins are proposed at the south-eastern end of the site.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The following Policies are considered to be relevant to the assessment of this application:

**National Planning Policy Framework (Dec 2026)**
S3: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
S4: Principle of development within settlements
S5: Principle of development outside settlements
S6: Neighbourhood plans and the presumption
CC2: Mitigation of climate change
CC3: Adaptation to climate change
HO7: Meeting the need for homes
HO8: Providing affordable homes
L2: Making effective use of land
L3: Achieving appropriate densities
DP3: Key principles for well-designed places
DP4: The design process
TR3: Locating development in sustainable locations
TR4: Street design, access and parking
TR6: Assessing transport impacts
TR8: Public rights of way
HC3: Community facilities and public service infrastructure serving new development
P3: Living conditions and pollution
P4: Impact of development on existing activities
F4: Assessing flood risk for decision-making
F8: Sustainable drainage systems and watercourses
N2: Improving the natural environment
N3: Trees in new development
HE5: Assessing effects on heritage assets
HE6: Proposals affecting designated heritage assets

**Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF 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 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection
Policy 27 - Settlement Coalescence
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 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
Policy 42 - Strategic Policy: Inclusive Communities
Policy 41 - Community Facilities, Leisure and Recreation

**Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan (2018):**
Policy 3 Green Infrastructure
Policy 4 Conserve and Enhance Biodiversity
Policy 5 Design Principles
Policy 6 Housing Mix

**Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19):**
Strategic Policy 1: Sustainable Development
Strategic Policy 2: Development Hierarchy
Strategic Policy 3: Expansion of Existing Settlements
Strategic Policy 6: Climate Change
Strategic Policy 7: Appropriate Energy Use
Strategic Policy 8: Sustainable Design and Construction
Strategic Policy 9: Water Efficiency
Strategic Policy 10: Flooding
Strategic Policy 11: Environmental Protection
Strategic Policy 12: Air Quality
Strategic Policy 13: Landscape and Settlement Character, Development Patterns and the Natural Environment
Strategic Policy 14: Countryside Protection
Strategic Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Strategic Policy 19: Development Principles
Strategic Policy 21: Heritage Assets and Managing Change within the Historic Environment
Strategic Policy 23: Infrastructure Provision
Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport
Policy 25: Parking
Strategic Policy 27: Inclusive Communities, Health and Wellbeing
Policy 28: Community Facilities, Leisure and Recreation
Strategic Policy 37: Housing Provision
Strategic Policy 38: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Strategic Policy 39: Affordable Housing
Policy 40: Improving Housing Standards in the District

Strategic Policy HA7: Broadbridge Heath BRH1: South of Lower Broadbridge Farm

**Supplementary Planning Guidance:**
Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD (2017)
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2017)

**Parish Design Statement:**
Slinfold Parish Design Statement

**Planning Advice Notes:**
Facilitating Appropriate Development
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:** Comment
[Summary] Tree protection suitable in principle. Compliance with updated AMS be secured.

**HDC Conservation:** Comment
[Summary] Final comments (2nd Sept 2026): Revised layout and design of dwellings amounts to superficial alterations that do little to mitigate harm. My previous view remains relevant.
Previous comments (28th May 2026): Design would contribute to increase level of harm to setting of the listed buildings. Satisfied the harm will be less than substantial and accumulative level will be moderate.

**HDC Waste and Recycling:** Comment
[Summary] Having viewed refuse vehicular tracking published on 13/10/26, satisfied.

**HDC Environmental Health:** Comment
[Summary] Final comments (8/12th October 2026):
Note the comment 'The outline application was submitted post 2018 and approved in March 2024 and the Inspector (and Council) accepted increased noise levels above 55dB for 104 plots in the development'. Our interpretation of the statement of common ground is that this marginal exceedance above the 55dB was accepted on the assumption that an acoustic fence would be installed on all boundaries of the site which face the A264 and that the entire development adopts good acoustic design, following the principles of ProPG.
Note however that due to the easement the acoustic fence is no longer proposed in the southwestern part of the site, also remain unconvinced that the development as currently proposed represents good acoustic design, as detailed in ProPG.
Allowing development so close to the A264 in the southwestern part of the site with no acoustic barrier is poor acoustic design. If Southern Water will not enter into a build over licence to allow for the construction of the noise barrier then, in Environmental Health's view, this part of the development should be pushed back so there is adequate separation between the A264 and the dwellings in this part of the site.

**HDC Housing**: Support
[Summary] Following revised information, support.

**HDC Landscape Architect:** Advice
[Summary] Final comments: Conditions recommended. Outstanding comments remain as advice and decision to resolve prior to determination deferred to case officer. Previous Comments: More information/modification

**Parks and Countryside:** More information/modification
[Summary] Play area amendments and amenity space size information sought alongside security and maintenance access.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

**Ecology Consultant:** No Objection

**Environment Agency:** No Objection
[Summary] Condition recommended

**Historic England:** Comment
[Summary] Revert to Local Authority Conservation Officer.

**Southern Water:** Comment
[Summary] Most recent comment; confirm water supply can be facilitated to the development and adequate capacity in the local surface water network accommodate the foul water. Restrictions to the site layout in relation to proposed pumping station and landscaping provided. No soakaways be connected to public surface water sewer.

**WSCC Highways:** No Objection
[Summary] Third and Final Comments (14th Oct 2026): In highway terms, site layout remains substantially as shown initially. Comments made concerning materials in shared surface areas/ dedicated footways. Second Comments (21st Aug 2026): Changes may be required as part of adoption process.
Initial Comments (12th May 2026): No Objection. WSCC not requesting to approve any detailed aspect as being suitable for adoption, dealt with under Section 38 of Highways Act. No concerns with layout approach. Parking broadly compliant with current guidance. Conditions securing details of pedestrian dropped crossing points and cycle parking.

**WSCC Lead Local Flood Authority:** No Objection
[Summary] Five comments have been provided by the LLFA.

Following the provision of additional information the most recent comment has confirmed the LLFA no longer object to the proposal.

**WSCC Rights of Way:** No Objection
[Summary] No provision / arrangements for Public Right of Way in previous applications. No drainage systems or structures be installed on path and request boundary changes and sustainable drainage systems opposite PROW agreed with WSCC.

**WSCC Fire and Rescue:** Comment
[Summary] Fire Hydrant conditions recommended.

**Sussex Police:** Comment
[Summary] Good active frontage with public areas and streets overlooked. Advice on Secure by Design.

**Health and Safety Executive:** Comment
[Summary] HSE does not advise on safety grounds, against grant of planning permission.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

3.19 Representations:

10 letters of Objection received, on following grounds:

- Insufficient infrastructure, including schools and local services. Infrastructure should be in place prior to the delivery of housing. The infrastructure for other developments has not come forwards.

- Increased traffic
- Highway safety concerns, particularly with limited footways.
- Lack of meaningful investment in in infrastructure.
- Loss of greenfield land, biodiversity and habitats for wildlife.
- Erosion of the rural setting.
- Surface water drainage and flood risk.
- The proposal would result in an increase in traffic noise and vehicle emissions.
- Amenity impacts from construction- noise, vehicle movements, dust.
- Design
- Overdevelopment
- Privacy, light and noise.
- Trees and landscaping.
- Detrimental impact on the floodplain of the river and downstream and an increase in flooding.
- The field close to the development has increased in its number of flood events.
- Concern over whether houses can be insured with increase in heavy rainfall/flooding.
- Further development is not required.
- Highways access and parking.
- Loss of character for the area and reduction in attractiveness.
- The proposal would not be sustainable.
- The pumping station would impact the strategic gap with the listed buildings.
- Query as to when the pumping station would be operational and how noise would be controlled.
- What boundary would be present between plots 67-72 and the pumping station/attenuation basin.
- Query as to light pollution control as street lighting not shown on the plans.
- Increase in litter.
- Detrimental impact on general neighbouring amenity.
- No benefits for local people.
- The proposal will increase surface water runoff, resulting in further flooding.
- The proposal will cause hydraulic overload of the existing wastewater treatment works, exacerbating the existing situation where emergency sewage discharges are frequent.
- The proposal would cause an increase in environmental pollution.

One comment neither supporting nor objecting received on following grounds:

- Design.
- Privacy, light and noise.
- There is a loss of screening from trees in the winter, permanent screening should be introduced to protect neighbouring amenity.
- The developer has offered no permanent solution to the screening and screening could be secured between the drainage ditch and woodland edge.

Parish Comments:
[Summarised]

**Warnham Parish Council**: Objection
- Inadequate highways infrastructure provision.
- Highways issues due to development in Broadbridge Heath not adequately addressed.
- Developer should provide highway improvements funding to address potential additional traffic from development.

**Slinfold Parish Council**: Neither objecting to nor supporting
- No objection.

Member Comments:
Local members called-in the application to Planning Committee if the recommendation was to be approval. However, following implementation of the new National Scheme of Delegation (14th October

2026 onwards) Schedule 1 applications for reserved matters, such as this application, are ineligible for referral to a planning committee unless they constitute an 'own interest' application. This application does not constitute an own interest application.

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:

**Decision-Making Planning Policy Framework**

As at Outline Stage, the development plan relevant to the proposed development comprises the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF, 2015) and the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan (SNP, 2018). In accordance with planning law, these documents are the starting point for the assessment of the development proposals (as they were at Outline Stage).

Additionally, two new material planning considerations relevant to the decision-making planning policy framework for determination of the reserved matters have arisen since the Appeal was Allowed which permitted the Outline Proposals, these being; the emerging Horsham District Local Plan 2023-40 and the publication of the updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, Aug 2026).

It is important to recognise the emerging Horsham District Local Plan 2023-40 is at the time of writing, not yet the development plan and is only a material planning consideration, albeit of weight; therefore, the need for strict compliance with its policies (including adherence to quality standards therein) remains a matter of planning judgement that rests with the decisionmaker. In the case of this proposal, what is being determined are technical matters that flow direct from an outline permission where principles and expectations around quality standards (such as detailed in the Design and Access Statement and supporting documents submitted at Outline Stage) have already been subject to a level of review and acceptance.

*Emerging Development Plan Policy*

The Horsham District Local Plan 2023-40 (the emerging Local Plan or 'eLP') has recently completed its examination in public and the examining inspector has stated in his Post-Hearing Note of 30th October 2026 that he considers the plan to be sound, subject to some further modifications. The Horsham District Local Plan 2023 - 2040 remains the emerging Local Plan (eLP) in the context of NPPF Policy DM4 and therefore constitutes a material consideration. Nonetheless, given the plan is now at post-examination stage, the policies and background evidence base within the eLP are now considered to carry significant weight in decision-making.

It is noted that in the emerging local plan, the reserved matters site is subject of an allocation (BRH1: South of Lower Broadbridge Farm) for 133 homes subject to a set of criteria a – f inclusive. The applicant has addressed this emerging policy in their submission in a policy compliance statement. Officers do not disagree with its conclusions that the reserved matters present a development proposal that is sufficiently compliant with policy BRH1 (and to which as previously explained, strict adherence is not yet required as the policy is not yet adopted). This includes criteria b) related to heritage impact and c) noise impacts, for the reasons set out later in this report.

*National Planning Policy Framework*

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published August 2026 is a material consideration 'of critical importance' in decision making. Annex A of the NPPF sets out that development plan policies) which are materially inconsistent with national decision-making policies within the NPPF 2026 should be given very limited weight.

**Principle of Development**:

Outline planning permission for up to 133 dwellings on the site under application DC/22/1052 was Allowed at Appeal on the 7th of March 2024 (and as amended by DC/25/1886). All matters except access were reserved under DC/22/1052 (as amended by DC/25/1886). As previously approved, vehicular access would come from an arm of a roundabout on the A281 and pedestrian access would come from the A281 and the site would also connect to the existing Public Right of Way network. A Unilateral Undertaking was secured in the Appeal, which included:

- An Affordable Housing Scheme.
- Rented unit details.
- Open Space.
- Management Company Provisions.

The Appeal being Allowed established the principle of development and mean of access in and out of the site. These settled matters. This application therefore seeks approval for those matters not previously permitted, these being; reserved matters relating to layout, scale, landscape, housing mix and appearance only.

The Allowed Appeal was conditioned to address archaeological works, contamination, drainage, ecological matters at Outline Stage. Aside from when such matters relate to site layout (which was reserved), these are either settled matters or to be addressed in the discharge of the conditions imposed at Outline. The material considerations relevant to this application for reserved matters consent are therefore limited to the layout, tenure mix, appearance, scale and landscaping of the proposals.

<u>Parameter Plan:</u>

The Outline approval was subject to reserved matters have regard to, and broadly accord with, the principles set out on parameter plan ref: 1273.S03 (dated 25.01.22) as approved under planning permission DC/22/1052 (condition 3 of DC/25/1886).

In compliance with the Outline permission, the proposed reserved matters site layout shows the vehicular access to the site is off the roundabout at Five Oaks Road, opposite Newbridge Nurseries. A pedestrian link is provided to the north of the site to connect with the Public Right of Way and Five Oaks Road.

As at Outline stage, it is considered that the proposed layout would respect the boundary with Lower Broadbridge Farm, The Paddocks and Arun House and suitably reflects the existing development in Broadbridge Heath.

In broad compliance with the Outline Permission, the sustainable drainage strategy (attenuation basins and foul water disposal) and associated infrastructure is located within the site, with an area of biodiversity enhancement set aside between Arun House and The Paddocks. A LEAP is located to the north of the site along with an area of public open space.

While the green infrastructure area to the north has decreased in size with the extent of developable area moving northward, the broad arrangement of land uses across the development site as a whole remains consistent with the principles set on the parameter plan at Outline; the 2 and 2.5 storey housing areas remain grouped in a similar manner and Officers consider the public open space and LEAP to the north of the site continues to facilitate an appropriate transition to the semi-rural countryside.

*Summary on Principle*

Taking account of the content of both the emerging Horsham District Local Plan and the most updated version of the NPPF (Aug 2026), neither are judged to render the principle of development secured at Outline Stage now unacceptable (as no direct conflict with new policy contained in either is identified with the Outline approval allowed at appeal).

It therefore remains and has been considered for the reasons set out above, that the submitted reserved matters submission material substantially accords with the expectations of the parameter plans approved at outline.

**Housing Mix and Affordable Housing**:

Nationally, policy HO8 requires development proposals to meet or exceed up-to-date development plan requirements for the proportion and tenure of affordable housing, with a priority for on-site provision in the first instance.

HDPF Policy 16 requires residential development to provide a mix of housing sizes, types and tenures to meet the needs of the district's communities as evidenced in the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). For a development of the size proposed the policy requires 35% of the proposed homes to be affordable. SNP Policy 6 states 'Housing developments which provide a suitable mix of one, two, three and four bed dwellings will be supported. This also includes centrally located level sites suited to older residents'

The reserved matters proposals continue to include a provision of 45% affordable housing, beyond that required by current development plan policy and reflective of what was secured at Outline Stage.

The overall housing mix is shown below alongside comparisons with the council's current SHMA (2019):

| Open Market | Proposed Units | SHMA 2019 | Over/under supply |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1-bed | 0 | 4 | -4 |
| 2-bed | 17 | 22 | -5 |
| 3-bed | 29 | 29 | 0 |
| 4+ bed | 27 | 18 | 9 |
| Total | 73 | 73 | 0 |

| Affordable Rent | Proposed Units | SHMA 2019 | Over/under supply |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1-bed | 15 | 15 | 0 |
| 2-bed | 17 | 13 | 4 |
| 3-bed | 7 | 10 | -3 |
| 4+ bed | 3 | 4 | -1 |
| Total | 42 | 42 | 0 |

| Shared Ownership | Proposed Units | SHMA 2019 | Over/under supply |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1-bed | 0 | 4 | -4 |
| 2-bed | 3 | 7 | -4 |
| 3-bed | 13 | 4 | 9 |
| 4+ bed | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Total | 18 | 18 | 0 |

The District Housing Officer has confirmed the Housing Register for Broadbridge Heath identified 364 households in need of accommodation with the following distribution:

- 105 households (29%) requiring one-bedroom accommodation;

- 76 households (21%) requiring two-bedroom accommodation;
- 138 households (38%) requiring three-bedroom accommodation; and
- 45 households (12%) requiring four-bedroom or larger accommodation.

Following amendments to the affordable housing mix in negotiations with Officers which increased the number of two and three bed dwellings, the District Housing Officer has confirmed they support the proposal.

An accessibility plan has been submitted as part of the application and shows 14 M4(2) compliant dwellings and 2 M4(3) compliant dwellings; so, there is an offer that complies with the current development plan standard relevant to this site (SNP Policy 6 centrally located dwellings on level sites, suited to older residents), and the emerging policy standards are not yet requirements.

Overall, Officers advise the proposal would result in a policy compliant affordable housing provision with a suitable tenure split that focuses on the provision of one-bed affordable rent homes and three bed shared market where need is greatest. The proposed housing mix is therefore considered appropriate in accordance with HDPF Policy 16 and Policy 6 of the SNP and the Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD,

**Heritage:**

Section 66 of the Town and Country (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides a statutory requirement for decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting. National policies HE4, HE5 and HE6 refer to proposals affecting heritage assets, including their settings, requiring a clear and convincing justification in the event of harm to, or loss of, a designated heritage asset, and its setting.

HDPF Policy 34 states that development should be reinforce the special character of the historic environment through appropriate siting, scale, form and design; and should make a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of the area. Proposals should preserve and ensure clear legibility of locally distinctive vernacular building forms and their settings, features, fabric and materials.

NPPF (Aug 2026) Policy HE6(4) states where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal.

Following commentary from the Council's Conservation Officer on design quality impacting on the setting significance of designated heritage assets, Officers have secured amendments to the scheme to include chimneys and other architectural betterments and amendments to building positions and arrangements, particularly focused on those buildings nearest the listed buildings in response to this context. Included is provision of a denser tree boundary between the development and heritage assets, to provide a greater sense of separation despite the proximity of the new houses. In the event of approval, a regulatory condition restricting permitted development rights for roof level works will be secured to help prevent any additional future harm to the heritage assets.

Notwithstanding comments received, the Conservation Officer has concluded the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to setting significance of designated heritage assets, including taking account of cumulative harm of adjoining development proposals.

*Heritage Balancing Test – Harm Vs Benefit*

Therefore, the proposals are judged to cause harm to designated heritage assets. NPPF Policy HE6(4) requires harm a development proposal would cause to a designated heritage asset to be weighed against any public benefits of the development. This balance was carried out at Outline Stage and is again undertaken at reserved matters stage; the public benefits arising from the scheme include the provision of 133 no. market and affordable homes to local housing supply, increased local trade and spend. Overall, Officers consider these public benefits would outweigh the identified harm to the heritage assets that

would result, in conformance with national and local planning policy (as was similarly concluded at the Outline stage by the Appeal Inspector).

**Landscaping and Trees**:

HDPF Policies 25 and 26 seek to preserve, conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character of the district, considering individual settlement characteristics, and maintaining settlement separation. HDPF Policy 31 seeks opportunities to enhance green infrastructure. SNP Policy 5 supports proposal where they protect and retain and wherever possible, enhance the green infrastructure and valued landscape features of the Parish.

Nationally, Policy N2(1) of the NPPF seeks to ensure that developments respond positively to the natural environment, and support nature's recovery. The policy goes on to require the following relevant parts:

(a) consideration is given to the environmental qualities of development sites, including habitats, landscape character and the natural beauty and that those qualities are enhanced and conserved
(d) Conserve and enhance existing natural features or visual, historic or nature conservation value (such as hedgerows and trees), and use appropriate landscaping to help create a well-designed place and integrate the development into its surroundings
(e) Use green infrastructure as part of the scheme and nature-based solutions to secure multiple benefits
(g) Ensure that green infrastructure and other features which support nature are located and designed to minimised risk of failure, and that appropriate measures are in place for any necessary long-term management

Policy N2 sets out refusal for proposals where significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for.

Aligned with N2, is Policy DP3, which sets out an expectation that development proposals respond to their context (character and setting), to integrate with and enhance their surroundings, and under DP3(2)(c) to incorporate and / or connect to a network of quality and accessible, multi-functional green infrastructure to provide opportunities for recreation and healthy living, strengthen habitats, improve climate change resilience and improve air and water quality, including maintaining and enhancing tree cover (in accordance with policy N3, which expects suitable tree species, and new tree-lined streets).

At outline stage, the site was considered to have the capacity to accommodate the same maximum quantum of development now applied for at reserved matters stage. As commented on by the Appeal Inspector, the proposed landscape strategy at Outline (which these reserved matters are broadly compliant with), would provide extensive native planting to the north and northeast boundaries, reducing the visual impacts of the proposals. Amendments made during these reserved matters application have increased the total number of trees proposed to circa 263 no. (albeit from a number short of that indicative at outline), and these are frequently located along site boundaries to maximise screening benefit.

The Landscape Masterplan in this reserved matter submission shows the retention and enhancement of the site boundary vegetation, assisting to enclose the new development within the existing field. Parts of the eastern boundary are edged with an acoustic fence, with details of its design approved at outline stage and appropriate screening (accepting the limitations to planting due to the easement constraint). Within the site itself, tree planting is proposed alongside the provision of amenity grass areas and an ecological enhancement area. The areas around the attenuation basins are proposed to be planted as well as with the open space to the north of the site.

Officers accept the built form is located farther northwards into the site. However, the open space continues to be focused on the central pedestrian corridor of the site, which is lined with trees. This path leads to the open space at the north end of the site which includes a LEAP and grassed open space with perimeter trees. The open space at the north end of the site continues to offer a softer and transition through landscape features that are sympathetic to the open aspect at the north end of the site. Therefore, the landscape features sufficiently reflect the strategy expectations set at outline stage.

The Council's Tree Officer has assessed the proposed layout noting the better tree/build relationship. The Officer confirms in their comments that the Arboricultural Method Statement is a fair reflection of the proposed works, and the tree protection measures are acceptable. Since the submission of revision C of the Arboricultural Method Statement revision D has been provided due to changes in the drainage basin. It appears that changes have also been made throughout the site to add secondary fencing. The agent has confirmed these changes have been made where hedgerow and scrub are protected and where the protection needs to be lighter along the northeastern boundary with the road. Ultimately a form of tree protection fencing has remained in the same location as shown in revision C and the updated document is considered acceptable by officers.

Following amendments to the detailed layout, the Landscape Officer has continued to provide advice on the proposal, with recommended conditions (relating to wetland feature, loss of G20 compensation, open space management, seating, alongside hard and soft landscaping details).

The Council's Parks Manager was satisfied with the submitted Land Budget analysis of the proposals as these were submitted in September, which evidenced more than sufficient open space for the number of houses being proposed, as set out in the Council's Open Space, Sport and Recreation Review (OSSR June 2021). The Parks Officer noted that whilst there was a deficiency in the Parks and Recreation typology and no allocation of land for youth, this is met and surpassed by the additional land identified for amenity and play (plus 690 square metres and 250 square metres respectively). Across all typologies, the total open space provision on the site exceeded requirements by circa 8000 square metres.

On this reason alone, the overall open space offer is itself a material planning consideration of public benefit.

Even in recognition of the subsequent amendments , the land offer for amenity typology (reduced by 322 square metres) still remains well in excess of the OSSR requirements (by 368 square metres). In her September comments, the Parks Manager was satisfied the youth allocation can be addressed by precise details of the play offer (such as safety surfacing, equipment type) and this is unchanged by the altered basin, and can be further negotiated via condition discharge.

The commentary levelled at the open space offer by the landscape officer are made in pursuit of further betterment, with a focus to a 'kick about' area at the north end of site, and do not to seek to readdress a conflict to planning policy (as overwise, formal objection would be made).

On balance, Officers consider that the proposal, subject to the recommended conditions, is in sufficient conformance with HDPF policy expectations, with the boundary planting and native planting helping to enhance green infrastructure, in accordance with the SNP, and therefore, no substantial adverse harm nor conflict with HDPF policies 25, 31, 32 and 33, policies DP3, N2 and N3 of the NPPF, and the SNP, and emerging local plan policy is identified.

**Design and Appearance**:

HDPF Policies 32, and 33 set out that proposals should consider development seeking to provide an attractive, functional and accessible environment that complements locally distinctive character. 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 surroundings.

SNP Policy 5 supports proposal which seek to respect the design, density and layout of the surrounding area, as detailed in the Slinfold Parish Design Statement.

Nationally, these ambitions are embedded within policy DP1 as a whole, calling for refusals of developments which fail to conflict with DP3(1), or the paragraphs of DP3(2) without clear justification. The design quality of any proposal needs to be assessed against local plan policies, including Neighbourhood Plans (NP), and Parish Design Statements if these have been incorporated into the NP.

The proposal consists of two and two and half storey buildings, with the dominant scale being two storey. The two and half storey buildings are clearly defined larger blocks or set well within the site on the main

spinal road. Officers consider the scale is suitably representative of the surrounding area in accordance with HDPF Policy 33 and allied design policies/ Statement.

The proposed dwellings are located within three-character areas. Ceramic tiling has been used to reflect those found at Broadbridge Farm; black weatherboarding has been proposed to dwellings drawing from the materials at Newbridge Nurseries. Sage weatherboarding is proposed on the flats and some dwellings within the site; these provide some points of interest within the site and on the flats. GRP chimneys are proposed to some properties bordering the site and in closer proximity to Lower Broadbridge Farm.

While the Conservation Officer comments on general design are noted, Officers judge the proposals to be appropriately detailed to provide sufficient visual and character interest, with a varied composition throughout the development. This is in the backdrop context of a recent growth in the settlement of Broadbridge Health in the form of strategic scale housing developments. These developments comprise of primarily red brick dwellings, cream/white render and cream/white weather boarding. The proposals in comparison provide a similar level of design variety and use of materials, with an enhanced boundary with the listed buildings provide further separation.

In summary, Officers are satisfied that the detailed site layout demonstrates a suitable and appropriate development for this site, ensuring sufficient space is maintained to the retained trees, the required open space, children's play space and landscaped buffers and incorporating the principles established locally under HDPF policies 32 and 33, and nationally under policies DP3, CC3, N2, and N3.

**Residential Amenity**:

Policy 33 of the HDPF requires that development is designed to avoid unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupiers / users of nearby property and land. Policy 32 of the HDPF, further, seeks to ensure that development provides an attractive, functional, accessible and adaptable environment. Under NPPF Policy P3, development proposals should take into account of living conditions, both within new sites and in relation to existing residential properties. Specifically, policy requirement P3(b) states that new development should not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, and that adverse impacts should be avoided where possible, or mitigates to an acceptable degree.

The proposed dwellings are set away from the proposed development. To the south the proposal is set away from existing dwellings by the A281. To the north the public right of way provides separation between proposed plot no. 73 and neighbouring Lower Broadbridge Farm, with a separation distance of approximately 125 metres. The LEAP, attenuation basin and open space provide separation between the proposed dwellings, Mill House and Millmead and future dwellinghouse units.

No new dwellings are proposed between The Paddocks and Arun House to the west, with the south westerly dwellings set back approximately 128 metres from the built form at the Paddocks and approximately 163 metres from the dwellinghouse at Arun House.

Within the site, the dwellings are laid out in such a manner that would prevent unacceptable impacts on amenity for future occupiers whilst offering adequate living conditions (indoor and outdoor) with access to open space. The site layout therefore prevents any unacceptable levels of overlooking or impact on future neighbouring privacy or amenity, in accordance with the national and local plan policies.

*Noise*

Noise is a relevant material consideration to the development proposals, both at Outline and now Reserved Matters. This matter has been the subject of careful consideration by Officers, informed by advice from the Council's Environmental Health Officers (EHO) and evidence submitted by the Applicant. Nonetheless, determination of a planning application is ultimately a planning decision, and the final judgement to acceptability rests with the decision maker.

At the appeal at Outline stage, the District Council's Statement of Case confirmed that it would not be defending the reasons for refusal in relation to the impact of noise on residential amenity (reason 2). This is noted by the Appeal Inspector in his reasoning to allow the appeal (paragraph 6).

The Council's position was explained in the District Council's Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) with the Appellant (paras 3.24 and 3.25). At the time of the appeal, in response to continued advice from the Council EHO concern that a number of gardens were still likely to be subject to noise levels above 55db or above during the day, the BS8233 threshold above which a 'serious annoyance' can occur, the applicant submitted an amended Noise Impact Assessment (Cass Allen Associated Ltd, Revision 3, dated 11th July 2023) and an amended site layout plan under the appeal. The amended layout plan at the appeal indicated acoustic fencing to the eastern site boundary to a height of 2.4 metres and a 'very small part' of the boundary with an acoustic fence of 3 metres. Whilst some parts of gardens remained marginally over the 55db threshold, having regard to the improvements made, Officers were satisfied that an acceptable acoustic environment for future could be secured (via condition and reserved matters).

Now, at reserved matters stage, the applicant has submitted an updated Noise Impact Assessment (Cass Allen Associated Ltd RP01-26012-Revision 3 dated 24 June 2026) on the scenario of there being no acoustic fence to the southeast corner of the site. This is presented to be because since the allowed appeal, the extent of easement to this part of the site has been further investigated and is now confirmed to present a constraint to providing such a fence. In summary, the Noise Assessment June 2026 concludes that the site layout has been amended such that transportation noise levels in gardens are predicted to be within 1-2 dB of the BS8233 guidance of 55dB LAeq.T. Commercial noise levels in gardens are 5dB below background noise levels. It is the Applicant's view that noise levels in gardens are acceptable for both transportation and commercial sources.

Following back and forth which has resolved various queries related to the noise assessment methodology, the District Council EHO remains of an opposed view to the applicant in relation to the acceptability of noise levels in a number of gardens. From reading the EHO October 2026 comments, the reason given for this opposing view is that the acoustic fence no longer being proposed is poor acoustic design (as the Council's position in the SOCG at appeal was accepted on the basis of an acoustic fence being installed on all site boundaries facing the A264).

Council Planning Officers have undertaken a comparison exercise of the daytime noise levels in the number of gardens in question between the July 2023 and June 2026 Noise Impact Assessments. In doing so, Planning Officers heed the advice of the EHO that 55dB is widely accepted as the upper limit for daytime noise in gardens and residential outdoor amenity spaces because it represents the threshold where noise becomes a significant source of annoyance and begins to negatively impact the usability of the space. However, it is a point of fact that as modelled (June 2026) only some 17 no. of future dwelling unit gardens (representing approximately 12% of the overall 133 plots across the entire development) in the south-western part of the site would be subject to noise levels 2dB over the 55dB criteria detailed in BS8233 (and in most cases only parts of the gardens would be subject to these noise levels, with the dwellings providing for an acoustic buffer immediately to their rear). This compares to 15 no. that would have been impacted under the acoustic fence scenario previously presented (July 2023 Assessment), albeit of those impacted, an increased number would be exposed to 56/57db than 55/56db under the 2026 Assessment.

The explanation to how the levels of exposure are modelled to be representative of only a marginal increase without the acoustic fence to the southwest boundary, is presented in the June 2006 Assessment. To mitigate for the absence of the acoustic fence in this location, it is proposed to install garden fences to heights of 2.4 metres to a select number of plots, 8 in total (in most cases, limited to a single plot boundary onto roadside or estate managed land). This is evidence of the adopting acoustic design as mitigation, as advocated by ProPG – Planning and Noise.

From reading the EHO October comments, the concern identified is limited to the above (daytime noise from transportation source onto a number of gardens in the southwest corner of site, in the absence of an acoustic fence). There is no dispute to the mitigation approach to securing acceptable nighttime noise across the entire development of 133 units and also internal noise impacts. Neither is issue identified in the Oct 2026 comments with the daytime noise levels to the remainder 88% of the total dwellings (116

no.) subject to installation of the 3 metre acoustic barrier to the east site boundary as mitigation, which is sufficiently distant from future occupiers to avoid curtailment of aspect and outlook (and to which the district landscape officer does not raise substantive issue with given opportunity for roadside vegetation screening of it outside of easement constraints).

For all the above reasons, Planning Officers consider that whilst harm has been modelled and the concerns of the Council EHO to this is acknowledged, this should be balanced out and set against the level of harm that was accepted at Outline Stage in the Allowed Appeal, and is judged that the severity of that additionality would not render the reserved matters to be in direct conflict with development plan policies, and therefore does not translate to a justified reason for refusal on planning ground. Officers are also mindful that future occupiers will be aware of the noise climate when choosing to purchase/rent properties on the development. As such, Officers consider that the future living environment for future occupiers has been fully considered and balanced in the making of this decision.

**Highways Impacts:**

Nationally, the revised NPPF promotes a vision-led approach to creating well-designed, sustainable, inclusive and popular places in allocating and assessing development sites. Policy TR3(1) of the NPPF states that development should be located where it can support sustainable pattens of movement, enable good accessibility for different users and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure. Furthermore, development proposals should be in a location that can effectively limit the need to travel, particularly by car, and which can offer genuine alternative travel options for residents and users.

HDPF Policy 40 states that development will be supported if it is appropriate and in scale to the existing transport infrastructure, including public transport; is integrated with the wider network of routes, including public rights of way and cycle paths, and includes opportunities for sustainable transport. HDPF Policies 40 and 41 promote development that provides safe and adequate access, suitable for all users.

It is noted public representations have raised concerns about the capacity of the roads and highway infrastructure. The principle of development and number of proposed dwellings were agreed under the appeal at outline stage. Given the above the quantum of trips to and from the site along with visitors was considered acceptable under the outline application at appeal.

*Parking*

Policy 41 of the HDPF states that adequate parking and facilities must be provided within developments to meet the needs of anticipated users, with HDPF policy requiring safe, convenient and visually attractive areas for parking vehicles and cycles without dominating a development, which is echoed by NPPF Policy TR4(1)(e).

The parking layout plan PL-09 J includes a total of 310 parking spaces with 226 allocated parking spaces and 31 visitor parking spaces, 2 M4(3) compliant parking spaces, 14 M4(2) compliant car parking spaces. WSCC Highways Officer consider the parking to be broadly compliant with the adopted guidance, confirming the amended number of visitor parking spaces proposed is not an issue due to the opportunity for on-street parking. The District Waste team are satisfied with waste collection arrangements (refuse vehicular tracking published on 13/10/26).

WSCC as the Local Highway Authority (LHA) have raised no objection to the proposal. Notwithstanding the absence of dedicated footway outside dwelling plots 20-21, given the cul-de-sac location of these plots a footpath is not judged by Planning Officers to be a requirement to make the proposal supportable on planning grounds; WSCC comments on materials and footway arrangements related to shared surfaces can be addressed with details of shared surfacing materials secured by condition. Officers are satisfied the LHA position is none of these matters present a highway safety issue.

Each dwelling is to have an EV charging point installed. Whilst reliance can be had on Part S to secure these ports for the houses, a condition is required in this instance to secure an appropriate level of EV charging strategy for the flats and communal parking areas.

The Highways Officer seeks pedestrian dropped crossing points and cycle parking be secured by condition. These have been attached to the application alongside the requirement parking spaces are in place prior to occupation.

Officers consider that the proposed layout results in a proportionate and appropriate approach with accessible and continuous pedestrian connectivity in accordance with the requirements of Policy 32 and 40 of the HDPF.

Policy TR6(4) of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be a severe adverse impact on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Based on the information submitted and subject to conditions, and the Travel Monitoring secured at Outline, WSCC Highways are satisfied that the development would not result in any unacceptable safety or otherwise severe impacts and would provide for appropriate sustainable transport choices in compliance with policies TR3, TR4, TR6 and CC2 of the revised NPPF.

**Ecology**:

HDPF Policy 31 seeks to protect the natural environment of the district against inappropriate development and encourages opportunities to enhance green infrastructure and biodiversity.

Policy N2(1)(e) and (f) of the NPPF indicates that when determining planning applications local planning authorities should ensure that development proposals minimise adverse impacts on biodiversity and include features which support priority or threatened species and take suitable opportunities to connect and strengthen ecological networks which extend beyond the site (such as Local Nature Recovery Strategies). Developments resulting in the loss of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient, or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons (such as infrastructure projects where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of habitat) and a suitable compensation strategy exists (policy N6(2)).

Public representations have raised concerns about impact on ecology, species and habitats. These matters were assessed under the outline stage of the application and ruled satisfactory by the Appeal Inspector, subject to conditions.

Condition 7 required a Construction Environmental Management Plan (Biodiversity); condition 16 required an ecological report with baseline surveys in relation to newts and badgers. Condition 17 restricted development above ground floor slab level until a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy is approved by the local planning authority. Condition 21 secured provision of lighting scheme for biodiversity before occupation is approved by the local planning authority.

The Council's Ecology Consultee has commented on the reserved matters submission confirming no ecological objection. Whilst the Ecology consultee has indicated the provided Ecology report is sufficient for Condition 16 to be discharged, the report recommendation is clear that further monitoring will need to take place and the results provided pursuant to discharge.

Accordingly, the proposal meets the criteria set out under HDPF policy 31 and Policy N1 of the NPPF, and would contribute towards the enhancement of existing biodiversity, and would retain and / or enhance significant features of nature conservation

**Drainage and Flood Risk**:

Policy 38 (3) of the HDPF states *'Where there is the potential to increase flood risk, proposals must in corporate the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) where technically feasible, or incorporate water management measures which reduce the risk of flooding and ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere.'*

A condition securing broad compliance with the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, dated May 2022, was secured by the Inspector as part of the outline application. This condition also secured

details of phasing, details of control measures and a management and maintenance plan. A further condition secured the provision of a drainage strategy detailing the proposed means of foul water disposal by condition.

The suite of submitted documents included a drainage strategy [Drainage Strategy Report by Perega [W24149-PER-XX-XX-RP-C-00001 Rev P5; dated 17/08/2026] which following comments from the LLFA has been amended and further to this two amended drainage strategy plans W24149-PER-XX-XX-DR-C-02021 P11 and W24149-PER-XX-XX-DR-C-02022 P11 have been provided.

The outline application's drainage strategy shows three proposed drainage basins and two foul water pumping stations. The strategy submitted under this reserved matters application shows three drainage basins and one foul water pumping station. As such the proposal remain broadly in compliance with that considered under the outline application.

Following the provision of additional information regarding the drainage layout of the site and ditch bed level the LLFA have confirmed in their most recent comment they have no objection to the proposal.

Southern Water have raised no objection to the proposal and their requested conditions have been noted. The proposal is located more than 15m from the nearest dwelling, with a layout plan showing this approved under this application. Therefore, a condition securing this as recommended by Southern Water is not considered necessary.

The Environment Agency provided a comment on the application re-providing their comment from the outline application DC/22/1052 to secure finished floor levels and compliance with the Flood Risk Assessment, May 2022. This control was put in place by condition under the outline application, it does not need to be replicated under this reserved matters.

Officers therefore recommend that subject the conditions recommended by the LLFA and Southern Water the proposed drainage strategy is acceptable, would not result in an increased risk of flooding on or off site in accordance with HDPF Policy 38 and the requirements of the NPPF.

**Other Matters**:

Infrastructure:

Public representations have raised concerns about a lack of infrastructure for the proposed development. The principle of development, including the maximum quantum of development and its location serviced by infrastructure (existing and proposed) was ruled acceptable by the Appeal Inspector at Outline stage. It is noted matters of infrastructure for health and education services for developments of this size are dealt with via a Community Infrastructure Levy contribution. Fire Hydrant provision is addressed by Building Regulations.

*Public Right of Way (PROW)*
Officers note the request for drainage specification of public right of way 1454 from the PROW Team at WSCC; however, means of and impacts related to access were matters assessed under the outline application; the Appeal Inspector being satisfied there was no need for upgrade of the off-site public right of way 1454. Therefore, it would not be reasonable to now require agreement to specification at reserved matters stage. Furthermore, the internal estate layout would provide alternative means to access onto the Public Right of Way network.

*Gas Main*
The high-level gas main is safeguarded through the detailed layout to allow for future maintenance and access.

Climate Change:

Policies 35, 36 and 37 of the HDPF and emerging Horsham District Local Plan 2023-2040 Strategic Polices 6 and 7 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 CC2 and CC3 of the NPPF. The proposed measures are proposed and secured by condition or legal agreement either at Outline or Reserved Matters stages. Subject to these, the application will suitably reduce the impact of the development on climate change in accordance with local and national policy:

- Water consumption limited to 110litres per person per day
- Integration of SUDS and green infrastructure to manage flood risk
- Requirement to provide full fibre broadband site connectivity
- Dedicated refuse and recycling storage capacity
- Opportunities for biodiversity enhancement
- Cycle parking facilities
- Improved pedestrian and cycle links
- Sitewide electric vehicle charging points
- Air quality mitigation strategy

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**:

The original planning permission to which these reserved matters relate was made or granted before 12th February 2024 (in respect of major development), or before 2nd April 2024 (in respect of non-major development) under Regulation 3 of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024.

**Conclusions**:

Officers consider that the reserved matters proposal sufficiently accords with parameters established within the appeal outline consent, and that the proposed housing mix, layout, landscaping, scale and appearance is of an appropriate design relative to the surrounding built and landscape character in accordance with the development plan policies 16, 32, 33 and 35 of the HDPF, the requirements within the Section 106 Agreement, and the outline planning permission, subject to the recommended conditions.

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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 14243.19 | 0 | **14243.19** |
| | | **Total Gain** | **14243.19** |
| | | **Total Demolition** | **0** |

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

**Recommendation: Application Permitted**

Conditions:

1 Plans list

2 **Pre-Commencement Condition**: Notwithstanding the approved plans no development shall commence until full details of underground services, including locations, dimensions and depths of all service facilities and required ground excavations, have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The submitted details shall be coordinated with and result in no clashes with the landscaping proposals and Arboricultural Method Statement. Details and positions of root barriers and root cells to be provided where trees are located adjacent to services. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to the acceptable delivery of this permission, to ensure the underground services do not conflict with satisfactory landscaping in the interests of amenity in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

3 **Pre-Commencement Condition**: No development of the pumping station shall take place until the design and details of the new on-site drainage and pumping station are submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority These details shall include but not be limited to:

- Elevations
- Materials
- Access arrangements
- landscaping proposals and Southern Water and or adopting authority restrictions and maintenance of tree planting adjacent to sewers, rising mains and water mains.
-

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development that is properly drained, sympathetic to the landscape and townscape character and built form of the surroundings, highways and in the interests of visual amenity and impact on the setting of the heritage assets in accordance with Policies 33, 34, 35, 38 and 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

4 **Pre-Commencement (Slab Level) Condition**: Notwithstanding condition 17 of DC/25/1886, no development shall commence above ground floor slab level, until full details of the glazing specification and means of mechanical ventilation have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The measures to be submitted shall have regard to the recommended mitigations set out within the submitted Noise Impact Assessment (Noise Impact Assessment-RP01-26012-R3, dated 24th of June 2026 Cass Allen associated Ltd).

The approved sound attenuation works shall be completed before the dwellings are occupied and be retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

5 **Pre-Commencement (Slab Level) Condition**: Notwithstanding the approved plans no development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until a schedule of materials and finishes and colours to be used for external walls, windows and roofs of the approved building(s) has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing and all materials used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall conform to those approved.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail in the interests of amenity by endeavouring to achieve a building of visual quality in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

6 **Pre-Commencement (slab level) Condition**: No dwelling shall be constructed above slab level until plans and details showing the provision of pedestrian dropped kerb crossing points at all junctions and other appropriate locations within the internal estate have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved the crossing points shall be

installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the final dwelling. All pedestrian crossing points shall include tactile paving in accordance with the guidance within Inclusive Mobility.

Reason: In the interests of road safety and in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

7 **Pre-Occupation Condition**: No dwelling within the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the cycle parking facilities serving it have been constructed and made available for use in accordance with approved drawing numbers [Detailed Layout Sheet 1 PL-04 Rev L and Detailed Layout Sheet 2 PL-05 Rev O, Proposed Plans and Elevations 7564 PL-46 Rev B, Proposed Plans Flat Block Sheet 1 PL-60 Rev G, Proposed Plans Flat Block Sheet 1 PL-61 Rev E]. The cycle parking facilities shall thereafter be retained as such for their designated use.

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate provision for the parking of cycles in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

8 **Pre-Occupation Condition**: Notwithstanding condition 13 of DC/25/1886 no dwelling within the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until full details of the acoustic fence, which shall be located and dimensioned broadly in accordance with the Noise Impact Assessment (Noise Impact Assessment- RP01-26012-R3, dated 24th of June 2026 Cass Allen associated Ltd) including garden plot fences as identified in the assessment shall be submitted to and approved by the Council in writing. The acoustic fence and garden fencing shall subsequently be installed in accordance with the approved details in advance of the first occupation of any approved dwelling and thereafter maintained for the lifetime of development.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

9 **Pre-Occupation Condition**: Notwithstanding the approved plans no part of the development hereby permitted shall be first occupied until full details of all hard and soft landscaping works shall have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include plans and measures addressing the following:

a) Details of all existing trees and planting to be removed and retained
b) Details of all proposed trees and planting, including schedules specifying species, planting size, densities and plant numbers and tree pit details; to include compensation planting for G20
c) Hard and soft written specifications (NBS compliant) including ground preparation, cultivation and other operations associated with grass/meadow establishment
d) Tree pit and staking/underground guying details, including details for sloping ground and position of root barriers and root cells where proposed adjacent/within hard landscape
e) Details of all hard surfacing materials and finishes including shared surfacing.
f) Details of all boundary treatments; to include fence cut-outs
g) Details of all external lighting to accord with details submitted pursuant to condition 19 of DC/25/1886.
h) Details of minor artefacts and structures - such as bin stores and cycle parking within open space, stores, street furniture, play equipment and safety surfacing, and signage - including location, size, colour and specification.

The approved landscaping scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details within the first planting season following the first occupation of any part of the development. Unless otherwise agreed as part of the approved landscaping, no trees or hedges on the site (other than those within private gardens) shall be wilfully damaged or uprooted, felled/removed, topped or lopped without the previous written consent of the Local Planning Authority until 30 years after completion of the development. Any proposed or retained planting outside of private gardens, which dies, is removed, or becomes seriously damaged or diseased

shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development that is sympathetic to the landscape and townscape character and built form of the surroundings, highways and in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policies 33 and 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

10 **Pre-Occupation Condition**: No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a landscape management and maintenance plan (including long term design objectives, management responsibilities, a description of landscape components, management prescriptions, maintenance schedules and accompanying plan delineating areas of responsibility including areas to be defined as private gardens and other areas such as buffer zones) for all communal landscape areas (including any buffer zones) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscape areas shall thereafter be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development and in the interests of visual amenity and nature conservation in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

11 **Pre-Occupation Condition**: No dwelling within the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until provision for the storage of refuse and recycling has been made for that dwelling in accordance with drawing number [Detailed Layout Sheet 1 PL-04 Rev L and Detailed Layout Sheet 2 PL-05 Rev O] These facilities shall thereafter be retained for use at all times.

Reason: To ensure the adequate provision of recycling facilities in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

12 **Pre-Occupation Condition**: No dwelling within the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the car parking spaces (including garages where applicable) necessary to serve it have been constructed and made available for use in accordance with approved drawing number [Parking Plan PL-09 rev J]. The car parking spaces permitted shall thereafter be retained as such for their designated use.

Reason: To provide car-parking space for the use in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

13 **Pre-Occupation Condition**: No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until a fast charge electric vehicle charging point for that dwelling has been installed. As a minimum, the charge point specification shall be 7kW mode 3 with type 2 connector. The means for charging electric vehicles shall be thereafter retained as such.

Reason: To mitigate the impact of the development on air quality within the District and to sustain compliance with and contribute towards EU limit values or national objectives for pollutants in accordance with Policies 24 & 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

14 **Regulatory Condition**: All works shall be executed in full accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment/Method Statement [Arboricultural Method Statement 12790_AMS.001 Rev D, 03/11/2026].

Reason: To ensure the successful and satisfactory protection of important trees, shrubs and hedges on the site in accordance with Policies 30 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

15 **Regulatory Condition**: Other than detailed on the approved plans/supporting documents, notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 or Orders amending or revoking and re-enacting the same,

no gate, fence, wall or other means of enclosure shall be erected or constructed in front of the forward most part of any building which fronts onto a highway without express planning consent from the Local Planning Authority first being obtained.

Reason: To safeguard the character and visual amenities of the locality and/or highway safety and in the interests of the landscape and character of the surroundings including approved Character Areas of the development in accordance with Policies 32, 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

16 **Regulatory Condition**: Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (and/or any Order revoking and/or re-enacting that Order no development falling within Class B of Part 1 of Schedule 2 (of the order shall be erected, constructed or placed within the curtilages of Plots 73, 74, 75, 76, 77 of the development hereby permitted without express planning consent from the Local Planning Authority first being obtained.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and due to the impact on the setting of the listed building in accordance with Policies 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

NOTE TO APPLICANT

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/26/0592**
(The approved plans will form Condition 1 on the Decision Notice of all Permitted applications)

Schedule of plans/documents **approved**:

| Plan Type | Description | Drawing Number | Received Date |
|---|---|---|---|
| Location plan | | | 29.10.2026 |
| Block plan | | PL-02 Rev H | 29.10.2026 |
| Site plan | Site Layout | PL-03 Rev Q | 29.10.2026 |
| Site plan | Affordable Housing Plan | LG1 Rev G | 29.10.2026 |
| Site plan | Detailed Site Layout Sheet 1 | PL-04 Rev L | 29.10.2026 |
| Site plan | Detailed Site Layout Sheet 2 | PL-05 Rev O | 29.10.2026 |
| Site plan | Plan Tenure Plan | PL-06 Rev I | 29.10.2026 |
| Site plan | Storey Heights Plan | PL-07 Rev H | 29.10.2026 |
| Site plan | Dwelling Size Plan | PL-08 Rev H | 29.10.2026 |
| Site plan | Parking Plan | PL-09 Rev J | 29.10.2026 |
| Site plan | Materials Plan | PL-10 Rev J | 29.10.2026 |
| Site plan | Accessibility Plan | PL-11 Rev K | 29.10.2026 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Plans | Hard Landscape Proposal Sheet 1 of 5 | CSA/7945/100 Rev C | 29.10.2026 |
| Plans | Hard Landscape Proposal Sheet 2 of 5 | CSA/7945/101 Rev C | 29.10.2026 |
| Plans | Hard Landscape Proposal Sheet 3 of 5 | CSA/7945/102 Rev C | 29.10.2026 |
| Plans | Hard Landscape Proposal Sheet 4 of 5 | CSA/7945/103 Rev C | 29.10.2026 |
| Plans | Hard Landscape Proposal Sheet 5 of 5 | CSA/7945/104 Rev C | 29.10.2026 |
| Plans | Soft Landscape Proposal Sheet 1 of 6 | CSA/7945/105 Rev C | 29.10.2026 |
| Plans | Soft Landscape Proposal Sheet 2 of 6 | CSA/7945/106 Rev C | 29.10.2026 |
| Plans | Soft Landscape Proposal Sheet 3 of 6 | CSA/7945/107 Rev C | 29.10.2026 |
| Plans | Soft Landscape Proposal Sheet 4 of 6 | CSA/7945/108 Rev C | 29.10.2026 |
| Plans | Soft Landscape Proposal Sheet 5 of 6 | CSA/7945/109 Rev C | 29.10.2026 |
| Plans | Soft Landscape Proposal Sheet 6 of 6 | CSA/7945/110 Rev C | 29.10.2026 |
| Plans | Landscape Masterplan | | 29.10.2026 |
| Plans | Open Space Typologies | CSA/7945/113 Rev H | 29.10.2026 |
| Plans | LEVELS STRATEGY SHEET 1 OF 2 DRAWING NO 02011 | 02011 P09 | 13.10.2026 |
| Plans | LEVELS STRATEGY SHEET 2 OF 2 DRAWING NO 02012 | 02012 P09 | 13.10.2026 |
| Supporting Statement | Highways Technical Note | | 13.10.2026 |
| Supporting Statement | Arboricultural Method Statement | 12790_AMS.001 Rev D | 04.11.2026 |
| Supporting Statement | LEAP Proposals | | 08.10.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Streetscenes Sheet 1 | PL-70 rev C | 08.10.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Streetscenes Sheet 2 | PL-71, REV D | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Streetscenes Sheet 3 | PL-72 Rev F | 08.10.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Streetscenes Sheet 4 | PL-73 Rev E | 08.10.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Streetscenes Sheet 5 | PL-74 Rev F | 08.10.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMT42 | PL-53A | 08.10.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMA47 Sheet 3 | PL-52 Rev B | 08.10.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMA47 Sheet 2 | PL-45 E | 08.10.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMA47 Sheet 1 | PL-44 Rev E | 08.10.2026 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Plans | Proposed Plans Flat Block Sheet 1 | PL-60 Rev G | 08.10.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed elevations Flat Blocks sheet 2 | PL-63 Rev C | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Elevations Flat Blocks Sheet 1 | PL-61 Rev E | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans Flat Blocks Sheet 2 | PL-62 Rev D | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plan and Elevations - EMTP31 and EMAP41 | PL-47 Rev A | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plan and elevations - EMA34 | PL-48 Rev A | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plan and Elevations - EMT21 | Pl-49 Rev A | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations BSP2B+Study - BSP2B+Study Sheet 2 | PL-50 Rev A | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMT41 Sheet 2 | PL-51 | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMT42 | PL-53 Rev A | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMA46 | PL-43 Rev C | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plan and Elevations - Garages, Cycle Stores and Substation | PL-46 Rev B | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations BSP3B+Study - BSP3B+Study | PL-39 Rev D | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMA44 | PL-40 Rev C | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMT45 | PL-41 Rev B | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMT41 Sheet 1 | PL-37 Rev C | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations BSP3B+Study | PL-38 Rev D | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMAW22-EMAW22 | PL-20 Rev B | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMAP22-EMAP22 | PL-21 Rev C | 18.08.2026 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMAP32-EMAP32 | PL-23 Rev B | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMAP41-EMAP41 | PL-24 Rev B | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMAP41-EMAP32 | PL-25 Rev B | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMAP22-EMTP31 & EMAP32-EMTP31 | PL-27 Rev C | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMAP31-EMTP31 | PL-28 Rev B | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMT31 | PL-29 Rev C | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMT31-BSP2B | PL-30 Rev D | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMB32-EMB32 | PL-31 Rev D | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMT32 | PL-32 Rev B | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMT33 | PL-33 Rev D | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations EMT33-EMB32 | Pl-34 Rev C | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations BSP2B+Study - BSP2B+Study Sheet 1 | PL-35 Rev E | 18.08.2026 |
| Plans | Proposed Plans and Elevations BSP2B+Study - EMA34 | PL-36 Rev D | 18.08.2026 |
| Supporting Statement | Noise Impact Assessment- RP01-26012-R3 | RP01-26012-R3 | 04.06.2026 |

**DELEGATED**

Case Officer sign/initial Matthew Porter Date: 05/11/2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial Adrian Smith Date: 06/11/2026