

ASHINGTON PARISH COUNCIL CONSULTATION COMMENTS

TO:	Horsham District Council – Planning Department
SITE ADDRESS:	Land North of Rectory Lane, Ashington, West Sussex
PROPOSAL:	Outline application for redevelopment of the site to provide up to 125 dwellings, access, public open space and associated landscaping, drainage and highways infrastructure with all matters reserved except access.
REFERENCE:	DC/26/1186
RECOMMENDATION:	OBJECTION
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION: Please find below, a consultation response from Ashington Parish Council following discussion at the Full Council meeting on 10th September 2026	
ANY RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS: N/A	
NAME:	Lee English, Clerk to Ashington Parish Council
DATE:	15th September 2026

MAIN COMMENTS:



Ashington Parish Council

Clerk to the Parish Council: Lee English

Telephone: 07851 009655

Email: clerk@ashingtonpc.org.uk

www.ashingtonpc.org.uk

Development Management
Horsham District Council
Parkside, Chart Way
Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 1RL

15th September 2026

Submitted by email to planning@horsham.gov.uk

FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSE

DC/26/1186 – Land North of Rectory Lane, Ashington, West Sussex

Outline application for redevelopment of the site to provide up to 125 dwellings, access, public open space and associated landscaping, drainage and highways infrastructure with all matters reserved except access.

Dear Planning Officer,

Ashington Parish Council OBJECTS to the application and asks Horsham District Council to refuse planning permission.

The Parish Council has reviewed the application form and plans, the applicant's Planning Statement, Design and Access Statement, Transport Statement, Framework Travel Plan Statement, Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, the consultation response supplied to date, the adopted development plan and relevant evidence.

The proposal is unallocated greenfield development outside the Ashington built-up area boundary. Although the need for housing and the provision of affordable housing attract substantial weight, the evidence submitted does not show that a further 125 home estate is of a scale that Ashington can accommodate having regard to existing or proposed infrastructure.

It also does not provide a sound cumulative transport assessment, a target-led travel plan with effective fallback measures, or certainty that foul-water capacity will be available when required. These are matters at the heart of the current national policy test, not matters of detail that can safely be deferred.

1. Statutory and national policy framework

1.1 The starting point remains the development plan

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the application to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan includes the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) and the made ANP. The emerging Horsham District Local Plan is a material consideration, but it is not yet the development plan.

1.2 The August 2026 National Planning Policy Framework applies now

The Government published a replacement NPPF on 17 August 2026. Annex A states that its national decision-making policies are material considerations from the day of publication. The applicant's July 2026 Planning Statement is therefore materially out of date in its national policy analysis. Its reliance on the former paragraph 11(d) "tilted balance" and former paragraph 14 cannot simply be carried across to the new Framework.

Annex A also makes the position on older plans more nuanced than the applicant suggests. A development-plan policy is not to be discounted merely because it predates the new Framework. Only a policy, or part of it, that is materially inconsistent with a current national decision-making policy should receive very limited weight. The decision-maker must identify and explain any such inconsistency; the age of the ANP is not itself a reason to ignore ASH1.

1.3 NPPF S5 replaces the former paragraph 11(d) analysis

The site is outside the settlement boundary, so NPPF S5 is central. S5(1)(j) can encompass housing where the authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply, but the proposal must also be physically well-related to the settlement and "of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure". The first limb - unmet need - does not disapply the second limb - suitability and infrastructure. Nor does S5 remove the statutory duty to assess conflict with the development plan.

On the applicant's own case, the site is part of a proposed 450-home cluster. Scale and infrastructure must therefore be considered in that real cumulative context, rather than treating 125 homes as an isolated increment. Wastewater reinforcement, walking connections, education, community facilities, green infrastructure, drainage and the interfaces between parcels are all relevant to whether the scale can be accommodated.

1.4 NPPF S6 does not erase the ANP

The ANP was made on 23 June 2021. By the likely decision date it will fall outside the five-year protection in NPPF S6. That means S6's special presumption in favour of a recently made neighbourhood plan is not available. It does not mean that the ANP ceases to be part of the development plan. ASH1, ASH2, ASH5 and ASH8 remain

directly relevant and must be weighed under section 38(6), subject to a reasoned assessment of consistency with the current Framework.

2. Conflict with the adopted spatial strategy

2.1 Direct conflict with Policy ASH1

Policy ASH1 is the clearest expression of the community's spatial strategy: development is focused within the built-up area boundary; the plan allocates approximately 75 dwellings at Chanctonbury Nursery and approximately 150 dwellings west of Ashington School; and development outside the boundary and those allocations is not permitted unless it is an appropriate countryside use, on previously developed land, or relates to the retention or appropriate provision of commercial businesses.

The application site is outside the built-up area boundary, is not an ANP allocation, is greenfield land and is proposed for open-market and affordable housing. It does not satisfy ASH1(D). The resulting conflict is fundamental, not technical. The applicant's Planning Statement lists several ANP policies but omits ASH1 from its "relevant" policy list, then seeks to diminish the neighbourhood plan mainly by reference to its age. That does not provide a proper development-plan assessment.

The ANP is also misstated in the Planning Statement as "2023-2036" in one heading, although the made plan is the Ashington Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2031. This should be corrected in any updated submission.

2.2 Transport and movement: Policy ASH2

ASH2 seeks to maximise sustainable movement, secure safe pedestrian links to the school/community cluster, shops and walkway routes, and prevent unacceptable effects on those routes. The ANP records the underlying constraint: no railway station, limited bus services and heavy reliance on the private car. It also notes that short trips within the village are often made by car because the pedestrian environment needs improvement.

Against that policy context, the application evidence is not reassuring. The nearest bus stops are approximately 600 metres from the site and served by one route. The applicant records 17 weekday northbound services, 15 on Saturdays and 9 on Sundays. More importantly, its Walking Route Audit identifies the following deficiencies:

- Route 1 scores 0 for coherence; tactile paving is absent at the Meiros Way junction and the proposed remedy is attributed to neighbouring application DC/25/1327.
- Route 1 records an uneven/wobbly footway edge, a narrow section before Blakiston Close and no lighting west of the Rectory Lane/Blakiston Close junction. The application proposes only footway resurfacing for some of these shortcomings.

- Route 2 also scores 0 for coherence.
- Public Right of Way ASH-2607 is expected to be upgraded under the separate Chanctonbury Nurseries permission, with timing tied to occupation of that other scheme rather than this application.

A development of this scale cannot demonstrate compliance with ASH2 and NPPF TR3/TR4 by counting on a patchwork of uncertain or differently timed works under other permissions. The necessary continuous, inclusive and adequately lit routes should be within the applicant's control or secured by enforceable obligations before occupation.

2.3 Landscape and countryside: Policy ASH5

ASH5 requires development abutting open countryside to avoid a hard edge, provide an appropriate buffer, minimise visual impact through layout, heights and landscaping, retain the rural village feel and be sympathetic to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

The application would project built development across a greenfield parcel beyond the present settlement boundary. Appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved, so the outline material must nevertheless demonstrate that the stated maximum can be accommodated without unacceptable harm.

That exercise cannot sensibly be divorced from the rest of the proposed northern cluster. The position of development, open space, drainage basins, strategic planting and connections must be designed at the whole-site level. A parcel-specific parameter plan risks fixing one edge and one drainage/landscape solution before the integrated landscape framework has been examined.

2.4 Community infrastructure: Policy ASH8

Policy ASH8 identifies the Community Cluster around the Recreation Ground as the focus for new and improved facilities serving Ashington. Criterion B requires that provision be “secured and delivered” as summarised in Table 7.1. For “Other sites”, that table identifies financial contributions towards a full-sized floodlit multi-use games area, a sports pavilion/changing and storage facility, improved play provision, improvements to the existing multi-use games area, drainage improvements to existing grass pitches, and a flexible community building including hall/meeting space and a Parish Council office. The supporting text explains that contributions from development are intended to help deliver these requirements and lever other funding.

The applicant expressly treats ASH8 as relevant. Paragraphs 5.14-5.18 of its Planning Statement acknowledge Table 7.1, record that the Parish Council directed the applicant to the ANP, and state only that Taylor Wimpey “expect” a contribution for any outstanding facilities to be provided through CIL. The draft section 106 heads of terms at paragraphs 7.1-7.3 identify no ASH8 project, sum, formula, trigger, recipient or delivery arrangement; they merely propose later discussion of potential obligations. This is an evidential and delivery gap at outline stage, when the principle and infrastructure consequences of 125 dwellings are being determined.

Any planning obligation must be necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to it, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. But reliance on an unquantified CIL liability is not equivalent to demonstrating compliance with ASH8(B): CIL is collected and allocated through a separate regime and the present application does not show what proportion, if any, will be directed to the listed Community Cluster projects or when a project will be delivered.

Before determination, HDC should therefore publish a project-specific infrastructure assessment showing: the additional demand generated by 125 homes; which Table 7.1 facilities remain outstanding; current cost and funding gaps; the estimated CIL liability and neighbourhood portion; the contribution or direct works reasonably attributable to this scheme; and enforceable delivery triggers.

If HDC concludes that a necessary and proportionate ASH8 measure cannot be secured through CIL, condition or a lawful section 106 obligation, that unresolved infrastructure harm weighs against permission under ASH8, HDPF Policies 39, 42 and 43, NPPF S5 and emerging HA5-ASN2(d).

2.5 Conflict with the adopted Horsham District Planning Framework

The adopted HDPF reinforces these objections. Policies 3 and 4 establish the development hierarchy and settlement-expansion approach; Policy 25 protects the natural environment and landscape character; Policy 26 protects the countryside; Policy 39 addresses infrastructure provision; and Policy 40 supports development that is appropriate in scale to existing transport infrastructure, is integrated with wider routes and is located where there is a choice of transport modes.

Ashington is identified as a Medium Village with a moderate level of services and some public transport, but one which relies on larger settlements for a number of needs.

The application is outside the established settlement boundary and would expand the village into countryside. It has not demonstrated that its cumulative scale is matched by coordinated infrastructure or that the site offers a genuine non-car choice. Those conflicts reinforce, rather than duplicate, the conflict with ANP ASH1, ASH2 and ASH5. Policies 38/39 and the detailed drainage and infrastructure evidence must also be applied when the authority assesses wastewater reinforcement, shallow groundwater and the whole-cluster delivery strategy.

3. The emerging Horsham District Local Plan

3.1 The Parish Council objects to MM229 and HA5-ASN2

Ashington Parish Council does not support Proposed Main Modification MM229 or proposed Policy HA5-ASN2, which would add the approximately 25-hectare Ashington Northern Cluster for a further 450 homes. The made ANP already planned positively for 225 dwellings on two allocated sites. MM229 would impose substantial additional growth outside that neighbourhood-plan strategy. Nothing in this

representation accepts the soundness, sustainability or development principle of the Northern Cluster allocation.

The fact that this application site forms one parcel of the land promoted through MM229 does not give it policy support. MM229 has not been adopted, remains subject to the examination process and unresolved representations, and cannot displace the adopted ANP. Permission for this parcel should not be used to pre-empt the Inspector's consideration of whether the 450-home allocation should be included at all.

3.2 Appropriate, not determinative, weight

The emerging Local Plan was submitted for examination in July 2024. Hearings resumed in 2026, and proposed Main Modifications were consulted on between 13 July and 24 August 2026. The Inspector has not yet concluded the examination and MM229 is not adopted policy.

NPPF DM4 requires weight to reflect the stage of preparation, unresolved objections and consistency with current national plan-making policy. The Parish Council's objection is part of the unresolved policy position. The proposed allocation therefore cannot be treated as settled or as establishing the principle of development. The Inspector must consider representations on MM229 and the plan may still change.

The applicant cannot rely on the emerging allocation for the principle of development while treating its safeguards as optional or capable of being satisfied by assertion. Without prejudice to the Parish Council's opposition to MM229, if HDC nevertheless treats HA5-ASN2 as material, it must apply the proposed policy as a complete package.

3.3 Without prejudice: failure to demonstrate HA5-ASN2 as a whole

Proposed HA5-ASN2 requires development to:

- accord with a comprehensive site-wide masterplan that coordinates the whole allocation and delivers an integrated and sustainable settlement form;
- show that separate phases or parcels will not prejudice adjoining land or infrastructure, including by facilitating inter-parcel and future connections;
- be landscape-led and use that framework to inform layout, capacity, boundary treatment and high-quality design for the site as a whole;
- demonstrate delivery of the supporting infrastructure, services and facilities needed for the allocation as a whole;
- provide open space, sport and recreation, address heritage and surface-water matters, and be supported by HRA and wintering-bird evidence.

The submitted Planning Statement says a masterplan has been “agreed between the three developers” and appended to the application. Yet the same table says each developer has independent access and can proceed “separately and independently without encumbering each other”. Independence of access may assist deliverability; it does not demonstrate a coordinated delivery mechanism. Nor does it secure the timing, funding, land, design standards and cross-boundary connections needed for the allocation as a whole.

For criterion (d), the applicant's response is merely "See Sections 5 and 7". Elsewhere it accepts that full service-capacity details are not yet available and that off-site sewer improvements will be required. A policy requirement to demonstrate infrastructure for 450 homes is not met by showing that one 125-home parcel might connect later or by relying generally on CIL. A site-wide infrastructure delivery plan should identify what is needed, where it sits, who provides it, its cost/funding, triggers, dependencies and contingency if another landowner does not proceed.

3.4 Prematurity and prejudice to plan-making and comprehensive development

Prematurity is a high-threshold, secondary ground and should not be used loosely. However, DM4 expressly permits it where the proposal, alone or cumulatively, is so significant that permission would predetermine scale, location or phasing central to an advanced emerging plan.

This application is for more than a quarter of the disputed 450-home cluster and would establish access, development quantum and infrastructure assumptions on one parcel. Together with other live or resolved-to-approve schemes around Ashington, its cumulative effect is capable of pre-empting both whether MM229 should be accepted at all and, if it were accepted, critical choices about its form and phasing.

If the District Council concludes that the DM4 threshold for refusal on prematurity is not met, that does not cure the substantive deficiencies. The absence of a binding whole-site framework remains directly relevant to S5, DP2/DP3, TR3/TR4, the development plan and the emerging allocation criteria.

4. Site-specific infrastructure and environmental concerns

4.1 Wastewater capacity and phasing

The applicant acknowledges that additional off-site sewers or improvements to existing sewers will be required for sufficient foul-drainage capacity. Southern Water's consultation response dated 2 September 2026 states that additional flows may cause a minor increased risk to the sewer network and requests a condition aligning occupation with delivery of the required network reinforcement. This is not an objection in principle from the undertaker, but it is positive evidence that capacity cannot be assumed.

A condition may prevent premature occupation of this parcel. It does not, without a wider strategy, demonstrate that the cumulative 450-home allocation can be accommodated or explain how reinforcement interacts with other schemes. The need for works therefore bears directly on NPPF S5(1)(j), emerging HA5-ASN2(d), HDPF infrastructure policies and the ANP's long-standing concern about sewer capacity.

4.2 Surface water and groundwater

The submitted monitoring results record groundwater at or very close to ground level in multiple wells during winter and early spring, including readings of 0.00 metres below ground level at WS101 and WS102. That does not prove the proposed drainage strategy is incapable of working, but it materially increases the need for robust seasonal groundwater assumptions, exceedance routing, attenuation, maintenance and protection of neighbouring land and watercourses.

The local planning authority and Lead Local Flood Authority should be satisfied that the detailed surface-water strategy is deliverable for this parcel and compatible with a whole-cluster strategy. Any approval would need enforceable phasing and management provisions under NPPF F4/F8 and local policy; such matters should not be left to an uncoordinated reserved-matters process.

4.3 Education and community infrastructure

West Sussex County Council's education consultation response raises no objection and indicates that CIL would be sought for education mitigation, including SEND. The Parish Council acknowledges that position. However, a general expectation of CIL does not itself demonstrate the location, timing or delivery of the facilities needed for the proposed 450-home cluster, nor does it answer HA5-ASN2(d)'s whole-allocation requirement.

The same applies to community, recreation and health provision. In particular, the applicant's generic reference to CIL does not demonstrate that the outstanding ASH8 Community Cluster facilities identified in section 4.4 will be funded and delivered.

4.4 Habitat and biodiversity safeguards

Proposed HA5 requires HRA and a wintering-bird survey to protect the Arun Valley SPA/Ramsar site. The applicant says those documents have been submitted. Before determination, the competent authority must complete and publish a lawful Habitats Regulations assessment addressing the project in combination with the proposed cluster and other relevant plans/projects. Any biodiversity-net-gain figures are benefits, but they cannot substitute for the separate statutory habitats assessment or cure a strategic infrastructure/master planning deficiency.

5. Planning balance under the current NPPF

The Parish Council gives proper weight to the benefits: up to 125 homes in a district with a serious housing shortfall; affordable housing; construction activity; public open space; biodiversity net gain; and potential contributions through CIL and planning obligations. Housing delivery deserves substantial positive weight.

Those benefits do not make the present application policy-compliant. The application conflicts with ASH1 and the plan-led strategy; compliance with ASH8 is asserted but not secured or demonstrated; it is supported by an obsolete national-policy analysis; the cumulative scale has not been shown to be accommodated by coordinated

infrastructure; the emerging allocation's central master planning safeguards are not secured; sustainable transport depends on deficient routes and third-party works; and sewer reinforcement is acknowledged. These are not minor harms that can safely be deferred to reserved matters.

Accordingly, the proposal has not demonstrated that it falls within the supportive route in S5(1)(j). Even if the District Council concludes that S5(1)(j) is engaged, the identified adverse effects substantially outweigh the benefits when assessed against the current national decision-making policies. The development plan conflict is not displaced by other material considerations.

6. Policy compliance matrix

Policy/test	Requirement	Parish Council assessment
ANP ASH1	Focus growth within the boundary and on allocations; limited countryside exceptions.	Direct conflict: unallocated greenfield housing outside the boundary and no exception applies.
ANP ASH2 / NPPF TR3-TR4	Safe, coherent active travel and genuine alternatives to private car use.	Not demonstrated: zero coherence scores, narrow/uneven/unlit sections and reliance on works under other schemes.
ANP ASH5 / NPPF DP2-DP3 / N2	Landscape-led development, rural-edge transition and context-led design.	Not secured at whole-cluster level; outline parcel could fix the form and edge before integrated design review.
ANP ASH8 / HDPF 39, 42-43	Secure and deliver the Community Cluster facilities identified in Table 7.1, with proportionate infrastructure mitigation.	Not demonstrated: no project, amount, formula, trigger or delivery mechanism is identified; the applicant relies only on an expectation of unspecified CIL receipts.
NPPF S5(1)(j)	Well-related to settlement and scale accommodated by existing or proposed infrastructure.	Infrastructure limb is not demonstrated in the cumulative 450-home context.
NPPF DM4 / MM229	Weight according to stage, unresolved objections and consistency; prematurity only at high threshold.	The Parish Council objects to MM229. It is not adopted and cannot establish the development principle; parcel permissions risk pre-empting the examination outcome.
Emerging HA5-ASN2 - without prejudice	If relied upon, it requires a comprehensive, coordinated, landscape-led masterplan and whole-allocation infrastructure.	Reliance does not imply Parish Council support. In any event, the applicant offers no binding cross-landowner mechanism and

Policy/test	Requirement	Parish Council assessment
		says parcels can proceed independently.
NPPF F4/F8 / local drainage policy	Safe lifetime drainage, no increased risk, maintainable SuDS.	Shallow groundwater and cumulative drainage interfaces require a coordinated and enforceable solution.

7. Requested reasons for refusal

The precise wording is for HDC, but the Parish Council asks that the reasons for refusal address the following matters:

- 1. Principle and development-plan conflict.** The proposal is for major residential development on unallocated greenfield land outside the Ashington built-up area boundary and does not fall within any exception for countryside development. It conflicts with Ashington Neighbourhood Plan Policy ASH1 and HDPF Policies 3, 4 and 26. The applicant has not demonstrated that material considerations, assessed under the August 2026 NPPF, justify departure from the development plan.
- 2. Scale, infrastructure and comprehensive development.** Without accepting MM229 or the principle of the proposed 450-home Ashington Northern Cluster, the application does not demonstrate that 125 homes can be accommodated having regard to existing or proposed infrastructure. If HDC nevertheless relies on proposed HA5-ASN2, the absence of a binding comprehensive site-wide masterplan, phasing plan and infrastructure delivery strategy would risk prejudicing adjoining parcels and coordinated infrastructure. The proposal therefore fails NPPF S5(1)(j), DP2 and DP3 and, in the alternative, is inconsistent with proposed Policy HA5-ASN2.
- 3. Community infrastructure.** The application does not demonstrate how the development will secure and deliver a necessary and proportionate contribution towards the outstanding Ashington Community Cluster facilities. The applicant identifies no project, amount, formula, trigger or delivery mechanism and relies only on an expectation that unspecified CIL receipts will be available. In the absence of a project-specific assessment and a lawful, non-duplicative mechanism securing the mitigation required to make the scheme acceptable, the proposal conflicts with Ashington Neighbourhood Plan Policy ASH8, HDPF Policies 39, 42 and 43, NPPF S5 and proposed Policy HA5-ASN2(d).
- 4. Unsustainable and insufficiently secured movement strategy.** The proposal has not demonstrated a genuine choice of transport modes or safe, coherent and inclusive active-travel connections. The submitted audit records

material defects and relies in part on works controlled by other developments. The necessary improvements are not shown to be fully within the applicant's control or secured at the correct time. The proposal conflicts with NPPF TR3 and TR4, ANP Policy ASH2 and HDPF Policy 40.

5. **Wastewater and drainage.** The submitted evidence and statutory undertaker response confirm a need for sewer-network reinforcement, while groundwater monitoring records very shallow groundwater. Without an enforceable, coordinated and cumulative infrastructure and drainage solution, the authority cannot be satisfied that the development and proposed wider cluster would be served safely and without unacceptable risk. The proposal conflicts with NPPF S5, F4 and F8, HDPF Policies 38 and 39 and proposed HA5-ASN2.
6. **Landscape-led rural-edge design.** The outline proposal, considered as an independent parcel, does not demonstrate a comprehensive landscape-led layout and rural-edge transition for the proposed cluster as a whole. It risks an urbanising and piecemeal extension into countryside, contrary to ANP Policy ASH5, HDPF Policies 25 and 26 and NPPF DP2, DP3 and N2.

8. If HDC is not presently minded to refuse

The Parish Council's primary request is refusal. If officers are not presently minded to recommend refusal, the application should be deferred rather than approved until the following have been received, published and consulted upon:

- A current-NPPF addendum and a fresh officer assessment under S5, DM4, TR3/TR4, DP2/DP3, F4/F8 and N2.
- Without prejudice to the Parish Council's opposition to MM229, if HDC relies on HA5-ASN2, an approved, publicly consulted and binding whole-allocation masterplan, design code, phasing plan and infrastructure delivery schedule agreed by all controlling landowners and relevant infrastructure providers.
- A legal mechanism securing inter-parcel walking, cycling, emergency, ecological, drainage and utility connections, with step-in/contingency provisions if another parcel is delayed.
- No occupation until Southern Water confirms completion of necessary sewer reinforcement; the condition should be tied to objective confirmation rather than an aspirational programme.
- All off-site walking, wheeling and cycling works necessary for safe occupation to be fully designed, funded and delivered before the relevant occupation trigger, without reliance on an uncertain third-party permission.

- A whole-cluster drainage strategy based on appropriate seasonal groundwater data, with exceedance routes, watercourse protection, adoption and long-term maintenance secured.
- A published ASH8 Community Cluster schedule identifying outstanding Table 7.1 projects, costs and funding gaps; the scheme's estimated CIL liability and neighbourhood portion; and any necessary, directly related and proportionate contribution or works, secured by a lawful and non-duplicative mechanism with clear payment and delivery triggers.
- Completion of the competent authority's in-combination Habitats Regulations assessment and securing of all necessary mitigation before permission.
- A maximum of 125 dwellings, affordable housing, housing mix, accessible homes, biodiversity net gain, open space, landscape buffers, play/recreation, travel-plan monitoring and construction controls secured through conditions and/or a section 106 agreement.
- A review mechanism ensuring that reserved matters conform to the final adopted Local Plan policy and approved whole-site framework, without using outline permission to pre-empt those outcomes.

The Parish Council requests notification of any material amendments or further technical evidence and the opportunity to comment before determination. It also requests that the application be reported to the appropriate planning committee if officers are minded to recommend approval.

Yours faithfully,
Lee English
Clerk to Ashington Parish Council

Sources reviewed

[Application DC/26/1186 - public register and external documents](#)
[National Planning Policy Framework, August 2026](#)
[GOV.UK NPPF publication page \(published 17 August 2026\)](#)
[Ashington Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2031, made 23 June 2021](#)
[Horsham District Council - Ashington neighbourhood planning page](#)
[Horsham District Local Plan - Main Modifications page](#)
[Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications, including MM229 / HA5-ASN2](#)

Application evidence specifically reviewed includes the application form; Planning Statement (including paragraphs 5.14-5.18 on ASH8 and paragraphs 7.1-7.3 on draft heads of terms); Transport Assessment and walking-route audit; Flood Risk Assessment/Drainage Strategy and groundwater monitoring; relevant plans; Southern Water consultation response dated 2 September 2026; and West Sussex County Council education response dated 27 August 2026.