



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0035

Land To The South East of, Spring Gardens, Washington, West Sussex,

DESCRIPTION:

Erection of 1 no detached two storey dwelling and associated landscaping. Relocation of existing stable.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/25/1009	Retention of existing entrance and stable block together with reduced area of hardstanding (permeable). (Retrospective).	Application Permitted on 13.08.2025
DC/25/0183	Retention of existing entrance and stable block together with reduced area of hardstanding (permeable) and parking for a single works van / trailer (Retrospective)	Application Refused on 02.04.2025
DC/24/1327	Retention of existing entrance and stable block together with reduced area of hardstanding (permeable) and parking for a single works van / trailer.	Application Refused on 28.10.2024
DC/22/1023	Erection of a stable & kennel building and laying of hardstanding.	Application Refused on 19.06.2024

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The application site comprises approximately 0.35 hectares of land located to the south-east of Spring Gardens, Washington, situated between the A24 trunk road and a cluster of five residential properties (The Orchard, Sumar, Russets, Woodfold, and Birchdown). The site is currently in use as a paddock, historically used for the grazing of livestock for several decades. The applicant resides at The Orchard, immediately to the south-east of the site.

The site is bounded to the east and south by a public footpath linking Spring Gardens to Rock Road. The northern boundary fronts onto Spring Gardens, a cul-de-sac serving 21 dwellings and Spring Garden Nursery, which operates a farm shop, and café. To the north-west, beyond the A24, lies a large cluster of commercial premises including Hughes Pumps, Thermco Systems, Sussex Car & Motorhome Centre, and Toovey's Auctioneers.

The site is not located within a Conservation Area, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, or National Park, and there are no Tree Preservation Orders affecting it. The land lies within Flood Zone 1, indicating a low probability of flooding.

It is noted that there have been several planning applications previously on site, with these submitted retrospectively after the work was done.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The application seeks to erect a 1no detached two-storey 4-bedroom dwelling, with associated landscaping, as well as the relocation of the existing stable to further down the site.

The application seeks the construction of a single detached two-storey dwelling on the north end of an existing paddock, to the east of Spring Gardens. The property has a domestic curtilage of just over 900 sqm and functional 250 sqm of private amenity space. The proposed dwelling also includes a single garage, together with space for the parking and turning of additional vehicles on the proposed drive to the front and side of the property.

A timber post and rail fence, to match the existing, will form the boundary between the rear garden and the retained section of the paddock to the south-west of the site.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):

Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development
Policy 2 - Strategic Policy: Strategic Development
Policy 3 - Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection
Policy 28 - Replacement Dwellings and House Extensions in the Countryside
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 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking

Storrington, Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan (2018-2031)

Policy 1 – A Spatial Plan for the Parishes
Policy 14 – Design

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 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 21: Heritage Assets and Managing Change within the Historic Environment

Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport
Policy 25: Parking
Strategic Policy 38: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Policy 45: Replacement Dwellings and House Extensions in the Countryside
Policy 46: Ancillary Accommodation

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

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

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: No significant Arboricultural concerns

The proposed development would have no significant additional negative impacts on the remaining surrounding vegetation to the North and South of the plot.

HDC Environmental Health: Comment

The proposed dwelling will be located with 40m of the A24 dual carriageway with first floor bedroom windows having direct line of sight to the carriageway. It can be reasonably anticipated that the future occupiers will be exposed to significant adverse noise levels. Acoustic mitigation will be required to ensure suitable internal noise levels and manage overheating risk.

An acoustic assessment undertaken by competent person should be provided to ensure the application is properly determined in accordance with the requirements of the Noise Policy Statement for England, the NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

Archaeology Consultant: Advice

The site is partly within an Archaeological Notification DWS8725 Section of the Hardham to Barcombe Mills Roman Road through the Districts of Horsham and Mid Sussex. The proposed development has the potential therefore to either impact the Roman road itself or settlement or burial activity associated with the road and so a programme of archaeological monitoring and recording during construction to be secured by a planning condition is advised.

Ecology Consultant: No ecological objection subject to conditions

The stable block on site has no potential roost features for bats and no do any of the trees on site. Therefore, we agree that no further surveys for bats are required.

Satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available to support the determination of this application.

Southern Water: Comment

The 150 mm diameter gravity sewer requires a clearance of 3 metres on either side of the gravity sewer to protect it from construction works and to allow for future maintenance access.

No development or tree planting should be carried out within 3 metres of the external edge of the public gravity sewer without consent from Southern Water. All existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works.

WSCC Highways: Comment

The existing vehicle access point on Spring Gardens will be utilised, with no alterations to this existing arrangement proposed. The LHA has previously assessed and approved the use of this access for previous applications at this site, and no concerns would be raised for its use for the current proposals.

From inspection of the plans, there appears to be suitable space to the rear of the site for the parking and turning of vehicles associated with the relocated stable use.

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.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:

Representations:

7 letters of Objection have been received from 6 addresses, objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Overdevelopment
- Site unsuitable for residential development
- Previous applications refused but built anyway
- Poor drainage and flood risk
- Loss of privacy due to overlooking
- Amenity harm
- Noise and disruption from construction traffic
- Loss of grazing land
- Negative impact on wildlife
- Limited parking in the area
- Unsafe access to A24 due to poor visibility and high-speed traffic

Parish Comments:

Washington Parish Council: Strong Objection

- Spring Gardens outside of the built-up area boundary, not designated for residential development in the neighbourhood plan or local plan
- Proposed development does not meet local strategic policies
- Cumulative impact and additional traffic would be harmful to rural character

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

Principle of Development:

Policies 3 (Development Hierarchy) and 4 (Settlement Expansion) of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) (HDPF) seek to ensure development takes place in a manner that ensures that the settlement pattern and the rural landscape character of the District is retained and enhanced, but still enables settlements to develop in order for them to continue to grow and thrive. The mechanism by which this will be achieved is through the designation of built-up area boundaries and the planned expansion of existing settlements through the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Planning.

The site is located outside of the built-up area boundary and is therefore considered to be located within a countryside location. Policy 26 of the HDPF would be relevant and requires development outside the Built-Up Area boundaries (BUAB) to be essential to its countryside location in order to protect the rural character and undeveloped nature of the countryside against inappropriate development. In addition, it must meet one of the following criteria:

1. Support the needs of agriculture or forestry;
2. Enable the extraction of minerals or the disposal of waste;
3. Provide for quiet informal recreational use; or
4. Enable the sustainable development of rural areas.

Furthermore, this policy requires that development be of a scale that is appropriate to its countryside character and location and should not lead either individually or cumulatively to a significant increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside and protects and/or conserves, and/or enhances the key features and characteristics of the landscape character area.

The development would provide 1 no. dwelling on a site located outside of a built-up area boundary, where such development would be contrary to the overarching spatial strategy as expressed through Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

As the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply (1.7 years at the time of writing), Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF would thus be engaged in the overall planning balance and considerations of any future application. In recognition of this, the Council published the Shaping Development in Horsham District Document in September 2025. The document recognises that the Council is likely to receive applications outside the defined BUABs and on unallocated sites (such as this proposal) as it is unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply.

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

Paragraph 84 of the NPPF outlines that planning decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:

- a) there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;
- b) the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;
- c) the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;

- d) the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential building; or
- e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it:
 - i. is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and
 - ii. would significantly enhance its immediate setting and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

While the site is not considered to be within an isolated rural location for the purposes of paragraph 84 of the NPPF, due to the residential dwellings to the south-east, and north-west, it is nonetheless a site that lies beyond any built-up area boundary. The nearest built settlement to the north, based on aerial measurements, is Ashington which is 0.8km from the site. Ashington is classed as a 'medium village' within the HDPF, with a moderate level of services and facilities. The second nearest built settlement to the southwest, based on aerial measurements, is Storrington, which is approximately 0.9km away and classed as a 'Small Towns and Larger Villages', with a good range of services and facilities.

WSCC Highways in their consultation response noted that the site location lacks immediate services and amenities within the vicinity of the site. While the Design and Access Statement notes that the site is located 200m away from Spring Gardens bus stop and adjacent to the proposal is a large tea rooms which also sells farm goods and groceries, the nearest built-up settlement edges are still 0.8km to the north, and 0.9km to the southwest by car. These aerial measurements are taken from the application site to the nearest edge of the built-up area boundary of each settlement. WSCC Highways note that this would result in residents relying on the private car for travel. Alongside the location next to the A24, it would be difficult to leave the site without relying on a car for travel.

While there are public rights of way near the site that provide a route to the built-up settlement edge of Storrington, these are still some distance, which is not suitable or accessible for everyday use and to reach the centre of Storrington with services and amenities, is approximately 3.9km from the application site. The surrounding walking routes are not considered to provide a realistic option to meet the day-to-day needs of potential occupiers. While the Planning Statement states that the proposal will not create unsustainable travel patterns due to the site's proximity to nearby settlements and links to public transport, it is considered that the location of the site limits opportunities for sustainable travel.

An appeal decision for Lancasters Cottage (DC/24/0669) – for one dwelling outside the built-up area boundary – was refused due to the location not being considered sustainable by the Inspector. The Inspector highlighted that *there is no footpath, nor is there a separate cycleway. Even if traffic levels are low, it is still unlikely that this would be an attractive walking or cycling option for future occupiers, particularly in the dark or in poor weather. It is unlikely that future occupiers would use the bus services that would also require travelling this route. While there is a public right of way opposite the site, it is still some distance until the next village. Although there is a footpath from Littleworth to Partridge Green, this would not overcome the issues that exist between the site and Littleworth.... Even taking account of its rural location, the appeal site is not in a location which would allow for ready use of means of travel other than the private car.*

In discussing a number of appeal decisions for and against dwellinghouses in the countryside, outside of the built-up area, the Planning Inspector for Clockhouse Cottage (ref: DC/25/0108) noted *there was an agreed failure to provide a five-year supply of housing land and therefore the presumption in favour of sustainable development applied. Even so, the theme linking these decisions is that to provide occupiers in rural areas with a realistic alternative to the car, local roads need to provide safe and suitable pedestrian and cycle routes to nearby services and/or bus stops. In situations where such provision is not available, new dwellings in the countryside would give rise to inappropriate patterns of transport, resulting in heavy reliance on the car.*

It is the case that even though the Council cannot provide a five-year housing supply, that the sustainability of the location is still of significant weight in decision-making for dwellings outside of the built-up area boundary. The proposed dwelling subject of this application would be remote from day-to-day services where the provision of four market dwellings in this location, not linked to a rural use, would be contrary to Policy 26 of the HDPF and would not be in accordance with the overarching spatial strategy for development as set out in Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF. It is therefore considered to

be contrary to the spatial strategy and principles of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Development Plan.

With the above in mind, the principle of the proposal is resisted. The appropriate degree of weight to be assigned to conflict with these policies is detailed further below.

Design and Appearance:

Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) require development to demonstrate high-quality design that respects the character of the surrounding area. Policy 32 highlights that design is a core component of sustainable development and must respond to the site context, while Policy 33 requires proposals to make efficient use of land, ensure appropriate scale, massing and layout, and integrate positively with the character of the site and surroundings.

The proposed detached dwelling is located centrally within the northern end of the site, to sit between the existing properties on either side of the site. The proposed dwelling provides 4 bedrooms, a living space, bathrooms, kitchen, etc. There is sufficient rear amenity space provided. The dwelling proposes an attached single garage with space for parking and turning on the drive to the front and side of the property. Cycle storage will be provided as well as bin and recycling facilities.

The materials reflect those already present within the immediate locality, with multi-coloured stock brick, plain clay tiles and vertical tile hanging and cladding on the roof. The height, scale and massing would respect the established scale of the neighbouring development and sit comfortably within the plot. It is considered that the proposed dwelling is of a significant scale, however, due to the distance with the neighbouring development as well as the size of the plot, the dwelling would be of an appropriate size and scale. The existing site entrance is being retained as existing and the existing sectional timber stable building which is already on site will be relocated and re-erected to the south of its current position and in the south-east corner of the proposed paddock. The environmentally sustainable construction is also acknowledged with solar panels proposed on the rear roofslope. The orientation of the building is such that the larger living room doors and windows to the rear facing east-west, to maximise passive solar gain.

Therefore, the proposed development is considered to sit comfortably within the context of the site and surroundings and would relate sympathetically to the character and visual amenity of the locality. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with the above policies.

Trees and Landscaping:

There are no trees on site that identified as being subject of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). All of the existing trees, hedging and planting are to be retained as existing, and the rooting environments of existing trees will be safeguarded by the erection of temporary tree protection fencing. New planting of hedges is proposed to the north-eastern and south-eastern boundary of the proposed curtilage of the property, which will enhance the rural nature of the site. The Arboricultural Team confirmed that the proposed development would have no significant additional negative impacts on the remaining surrounding vegetation to the North and South of the plot.

Heritage and Archaeology:

Policy 34 of the Horsham Development Framework aims to sustain and enhance the historic environment through positive management of development affecting heritage assets. By reassuring development preserve and ensure clear legibility of, locally distinctive vernacular building forms and their settings, features, fabric, and materials.

The site is partly within an Archaeological Notification Area DWS8725 Section of the Hardham to Barcombe Mills Roman Road through the Districts of Horsham and Mid Sussex. A scheduled monument covering a section of the Roman Road north of Rock is present approximately 600m to the north-west of the site. Roman Greensand Way (or Sussex Greensand Way) is an ancient Roman road, approximately a mile to the north of the escarpment of the Sussex Downs that runs approximately 25 miles from Barcombe Mills in the east to Hardham on Stane Street to the west.

The Heritage Statement provides a methodology for archaeological monitoring to ensure that the archaeological features within the footprint of all groundworks are preserved. The Archaeological Consultant notes that this document omits key details including but not limited to the need for all of the intrusive work to be directly monitored by a professionally qualified archaeologist. This work can be secured by planning condition.

Residential Amenity:

Policy 33 of the HDPF states that development should consider the scale, massing, and orientation between buildings, respecting the amenities and sensitivities of neighbouring properties.

The representation letters received are acknowledged. These concern; overdevelopment of the site, the potential amenity harm such as overlooking and loss of privacy, noise and disruption from construction traffic, negative impact on wildlife and poor drainage.

The proposed residential dwelling is located approximately 12m away from the closest residential property to the northwest and 20m from the nearest residential property to the south-east. Due to orientation of the site, there are no nearby residential properties that would be harmfully impacted by the proposed dwelling. There is an existing line of trees along the north-west boundary which provide a level of screening and the proposal seeks to plant additional planting along the south-east boundary to ensure more screening from those residential properties. The distance between the dwellings would be maintained and it is considered that the majority of windows have been placed on the front and rear elevations to avoid any potential overlooking. The amenity space for the existing dwelling on site would be appropriate and provide adequate external amenity garden space.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would be in accordance with the above policy.

Highways Impacts:

Policy 40 of the HDPF deals with sustainable transport and seeks new developments to provide safe and suitable access for all vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists, horses riders, public transport, and the delivery of goods. Policy 41 which relates to parking requires adequate parking and facilities to be provided within developments to meet the needs of anticipated users.

The existing vehicle access point on Spring Gardens will be utilised, with no alterations proposed. Both pedestrian and vehicular access would be provided onto Spring Gardens.

WSCP Car Parking Demand Calculator requires a minimum of three car parking spaces in this location. There would be sufficient off-street parking provision provided on the driveway situated to the front of the proposed dwelling, with adequate turning provision within the site boundaries. A single garage is proposed, although WSCP Highways noted that the proposed garage does not meet the minimum internal specifications for single bay garages for 3m x 6m, so may not be suitable for car parking provision. It is considered that there is sufficient driveway space to accommodate parking provision. Furthermore, electric vehicle charging will also be provided at the dwelling.

WSCP Highways in their consultation response noted that the site location lacks immediate services and amenities within the vicinity of the site and the nearest settlement of Ashington is approximately 1.5km to the north, and Storrington, 7.5km southwest by car. As such, residents would have a reliance on the private car for travel. WSCP Highways however, raised no concerns and concluded that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network.

Ecology:

Policy 31 of the HDPF states that development will be supported where it demonstrates that it maintains or enhances the existing network of green infrastructure. Development proposals will be required to contribute to the enhancement of existing biodiversity and should create and manage new habitats where appropriate.

The site lies approximately 12.3km southeast of The Mens Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (MAGIC maps) and therefore lies outside within the 12km Wider Conservation Area for The Mens SAC. Ecology was satisfied that there was sufficient ecological information available to support determination of the application.

The application is supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, which identifies a number of species within a radius of the site. However, there are no suitable habitats or roost features identified on site. The stable block on site has no potential roost features bats nor do any of the trees on site. The report concludes that the proposal would not be anticipated to impact on any of the identified species, as such there are no enhancement or mitigation measures proposed. The Council's Ecologist confirmed that there was sufficient ecological information to support determination of the application and concluded that there were no ecological objections to the proposal.

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:

Noise:

Due to the location of the site, close to the busy A24, it is expected that there would be a significant level of noise for residential occupants. Environmental Health raised that the proposed dwelling would be located 40m from the A24 dual carriageway, with the first-floor bedroom windows having direct line

of sight of the carriageway, and acoustic mitigation will be required to enable suitable internal noise levels and manage overheating risk.

The applicant undertook an acoustic assessment and provided the report. The report concluded that the external building fabric should be sufficient to control external noise ingress to habitable spaces, a 1.8m fence will be required in the rear private garden for daytime noise mitigation and the bedrooms located on the most exposed elevations will require alternative ventilative solutions to provide suitable thermal comfort with windows closed at night. Environmental Health reviewed the Noise Impact Assessment and concluded that the report was satisfactory and has made appropriate recommendations for managing noise impacts and overheating risks at night; recommending conditions if the application was to be approved.

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:

- Requirement to provide full fibre broadband site connectivity
- Dedicated refuse and recycling storage capacity
- Opportunities for biodiversity gain
- Cycle parking facilities
- Electric vehicle charging points

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 demonstrated that the development is exempt from the requirement to achieve a minimum 10% BNG by reason of:

- The development qualifies as 'self-build or custom housing' under Regulation 8 of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024.

Conclusions and Planning Balance:

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

Housing Land Supply

Chapter 3 of the Council's most recent Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) revealed that the Council currently benefits from a deliverable supply of housing sites of 1.7 years. On the basis of the Council's lack of 5-year housing land supply, the presumption in favour of sustainable development at paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged in this instance.

NPPF paragraph 11(d)(ii) states that where there are no relevant development plan policies in place, the policies that are considered most important for the determination of applications (in this case, Policies 1, 2, 4 and 26 of the HDPF, owing to the lack of a five-year housing land 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.

Development Plan Policies

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

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

HDPF Policy 26 refers specifically to countryside protection outside built up area boundaries, requiring development to be essential to this location. Whilst again this reflects the Frameworks preference for development to be well located in relation to services and facilities, as the definition of built-up areas is based on out-of-date housing numbers, this policy is afforded moderate weight.

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

Planning Balance

The proposal would provide for one market dwelling. As above the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing supply, the provision of an additional dwelling 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.

The proposal's ability to demonstrate no adverse amenity impacts, safe access and suitable parking are not considered benefits to the scheme but would rather be necessary to demonstrate compliance with local planning policies. No other discernible benefits have been identified that would weigh in favour of granting permission.

The Council published the Shaping Development in Horsham District Document in September 2025. The document recognises that the Council is likely to receive applications outside the defined BUABs and on unallocated sites (such as this proposal) as it is unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. Given this position and the principles behind HDPF Policy 4, it will consider positively applications that meet all of the criteria:

- The site adjoins the existing settlement edge as defined by the BUAB;

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

While the current housing shortfall is a material consideration of significant weight, and the contribution of one market dwelling would bestow socio-economic benefits in the form of housing delivery, the site is not adjacent to nor adjoining an existing settlement edge. Therefore, the proposal would not benefit from the provisions of the Shaping Development in Horsham District document as above.

The cumulative benefits (the provision of one market dwelling (moderate weight) and the socio-economic (moderate weight) would be outweighed by the identified adverse impacts of the development. Namely the conflict with the development plan (moderate weight) and the site's unsustainable location (significant weight). On balance, this would demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Therefore, the proposal 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
District Wide Zone 1	279.11		279.11
	Total Gain		
	Total Demolition		

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 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.

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/26/0035

Schedule of plans/documents **not approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Plans	Acoustic Plan	684-12	19.03.2026
Supporting Docs	Noise Impact Assessment by Anderson Acoustics dated 17.03.2026	8891_001R_1-0_BP	19.03.2026
Plans	Plan As Proposed Entrance to Site	684-11	19.03.2026
Location plan	Location Plan	684-01 A	12.01.2026
Plans	Entrance to Site Visibility Splays	684-07 A	12.01.2026
Plans	Landscape Plan As Proposed	684-08 C	19.03.2026
Elevation plan	Proposed Dwelling	684-10 B	15.01.2026
Site plan	Site Plan	684-02 A	12.01.2026
Floor plan	Plans As Existing	684-03 A	12.01.2026
Floor plan	G.F. Plan As Proposed	684-04 B	19.03.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	F.F./Roof Plan As Proposed	684-05 C	19.03.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed Dwelling Relocation of Existing Stable	684-06 A	12.01.2026
Tree plan	Arboriculture/Root Protection Plan	684-09 A	12.01.2026
Supporting Statement	Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Ecology & Habitat Management Ltd dated 25.11.2025	NONE	12.01.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Bethan Tinning Date: 07.04.2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial Tamara Dale Date: 09.04.2026