

SCHEDULE OF PRINCIPAL MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Appeal Reference:

Application DC/25/2104

Land at Winstons Farm (Formerly Jinkers Farm), Muttons Lane, Ashington

Table 1 – Principal Material Considerations

Material Consideration	Planning Weight	Appellant's Assessment
National Planning Policy Framework – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development (Paragraph 11(d))	Very Significant	The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. The tilted balance is therefore engaged and planning permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
Five-Year Housing Land Supply Deficit	Very Significant	Horsham District currently has approximately 1.7 years' housing supply. This is a substantial shortfall and materially reduces the weight to be attached to restrictive housing policies.
Previously Developed Land (Brownfield Site)	Significant	The Council expressly accepts that the appeal site comprises previously developed land. National policy strongly supports the effective reuse of such land.
Government Support for Small Housing Sites	Significant	National policy recognises that small sites make an important cumulative contribution towards housing delivery. The proposal is for only one dwelling.
Efficient Use of Land	Significant	The proposal redevelops an existing lawful building and associated hardstanding rather than extending into undeveloped countryside.
Existing Lawful Development	Moderate	The site already contains a permanent lawful building together with associated infrastructure and access. Redevelopment is materially different from developing a greenfield site.
Existing Vehicular Access	Moderate	The proposal utilises an established access. No highway objection has been raised in principle.
Highway Safety	Neutral to Positive	West Sussex County Council raises no objection in principle and identifies no visibility concerns.
Conservation	Neutral to Positive	The Council's Conservation Officer considers a replacement dwelling acceptable in principle, with detailed design reserved for Technical Details Consent.
Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain	Neutral to Positive	Biodiversity Net Gain and ecological mitigation can be secured at the Technical Details Consent stage.

Material Consideration	Planning Weight	Appellant's Assessment
Land Contamination	Neutral	Any contamination investigation is appropriately addressed through Technical Details Consent. It is not a reason for refusing Permission in Principle.
Drainage	Neutral	Drainage is a technical matter reserved for later determination.
Water Neutrality	Significant Positive	The previous reason for refusal has been overcome. The Council's Appropriate Assessment concludes there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley European sites.
Environmental Impact Assessment	Neutral to Positive	The Secretary of State has confirmed that the proposal is not EIA development.
Green Belt	Neutral	Horsham District contains no designated Green Belt. No Green Belt policy restraint applies.
Article 4 Direction	Neutral	The appeal site is not subject to an Article 4 Direction imposing additional planning restrictions.
Isolated Homes Policy (NPPF Paragraph 84)	Neutral to Positive	The Council accepts that the appeal site is not isolated. The restrictive policy relating to isolated homes is therefore not engaged.
Residential Amenity	Neutral	The Council identifies no significant adverse impact on neighbouring occupiers arising from the principle of one dwelling.
Landscape Character	Limited Adverse Weight	Whilst the proposal lies outside the Built-Up Area Boundary, it replaces an existing building on previously developed land and detailed landscape treatment will be addressed at Technical Details Consent.
Conflict with Settlement Boundary Policies	Moderate Adverse Weight	The proposal conflicts with the Development Plan spatial strategy because it lies outside the Built-Up Area Boundary. However, that conflict attracts reduced weight due to the operation of paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF and the Council's acknowledged housing land supply deficit.

Overall Planning Balance

Having regard to Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the National Planning Policy Framework, the Horsham District Planning Framework and all other material considerations, the Appellant respectfully submits that the balance falls decisively in favour of granting Permission in Principle.

The proposal delivers the sustainable redevelopment of acknowledged previously developed land, contributes to housing delivery in a district with a severe housing land

supply deficit, utilises existing infrastructure, and raises no overriding technical, environmental or statutory objection. The sole identified harm is conflict with settlement boundary policies, which, in the circumstances of this appeal, attract reduced weight owing to the operation of paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF.

Accordingly, the adverse impacts of granting Permission in Principle do **not** significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework taken as a whole. The Appellant therefore respectfully invites the Inspector to allow the appeal and grant Permission in Principle.