DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/1138
Land Adjacent To 1 Woodcot, New Road, Billingshurst, West Sussex, RH14 9DS

DESCRIPTION:

Erection of a chalet style self-build dwelling with associated access from New Road and driveway/car parking.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/23/0541	Erection of a single storey rear extension.	Application Permitted on 19.05.2023
DC/21/2852	Demolition of existing garage and erection of a replacement detached garage, car port and storage building with office above. Erection of a single storey rear extension.	Application Permitted on 15.03.2022

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (August 2026)

Horsham District Planning Framework (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 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection
Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles
Policy 35 - Strategic Policy: Climate Change
Policy 36 - Strategic Policy: Appropriate Energy Use
Policy 37 - Sustainable Construction
Policy 38 - Strategic Policy: Flooding

Billingshurst Parish Neighbourhood Plan (BPNP) 2019 - 2031:
Policy BILL1 – Billingshurst Built-Up Area Boundary
Policy BILL 2 – Housing Design and Character

***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 6: Climate Change
Strategic Policy 7: Appropriate Energy Use
Strategic Policy 8: Sustainable Design and Construction
Strategic Policy 9: Water Neutrality

Strategic Policy 10: Flooding
Strategic Policy 11: Environmental Protection
Strategic Policy 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Strategic Policy 14: Countryside Protection
Strategic Policy 15: Settlement Coalescence
Strategic Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Strategic Policy 19: Development Quality
Strategic Policy 20: Development Principles
Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport
Policy 25: Parking
Strategic Policy 37: Housing Provision
Strategic Policy 38: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Policy 40: Improving Housing Standards in the District

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:

The direct arboricultural impacts of tree and hedgerow loss could be mitigated by replacement planting of indigenous species in keeping with the local rural landscape setting which could be controlled by condition in the short term.

The mature roadside oak tree would dominate the rear amenity space and potentially be under future pressure for lopping/felling in the future.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

Ecology Consultant: No Objection

Having considered the proposed avoidance and mitigation measures above, Horsham District Council concludes that, the project will avoid an Adverse Effect on the Integrity of The Mens SAC or Ebernoe Common SAC, either alone or in combination with other plan and projects

Lanscape:

The application site occupies an enclosed plot within the G2: Itchingfield & Barns Green Wooded Farmlands Landscape Character Area, where wooded boundaries and a strong sense of enclosure are key characteristics. Whilst the proposed replacement of declining boundary vegetation is welcomed in principle, the current submission does not adequately demonstrate how the development has responded to landscape character and arboricultural constraints.

Southern Water: Comment

WSCC Highways: No Objection

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:

None received

Parish Comments:

None received

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

This application is for the erection of a chalet style self-build dwelling with associated access from New Road and driveway/car parking at Land Adjacent To 1 Woodcot, New Road, Billingshurst. The application site is an irregular triangular shaped plot located outside of the defined built up area boundary in a rural location. It is sited on the northern side of New Road, to the east of 1 Woodcot.

Previous to the submission of this application, a similar scheme was submitted to the Council under DC/16/1415 (Construction of three bedroom detached dwelling) which was refused on 21st September 2016. The reasons for refusal are outlined below:

1 *The proposed development would be located outside of a built-up area boundary on a site not allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework, or in an adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan. The proposed development would therefore be inconsistent with the overarching strategy for development set out within the Horsham District Planning Framework. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and to the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).*

2 *The site lies within a rural location outside the limits of any existing settlement and does not constitute a use considered essential to such a countryside location. The proposal would therefore conflict with Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015.*

3 *The applicant has failed to demonstrate that appropriate visibility splays can be provided on the site and that the proposed development would provide a safe and suitable access. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015.*

4 *The site is enclosed by a hedgerow and mature planting on each of its boundaries. It is considered that the enclosure of the site would result in shading and a minimal outlook for the occupiers of the proposed dwelling. The proposal would therefore result in a form of development which would have an adverse impact on the residential environment of future occupiers. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015.*

This decision was appealed under APP/Z3825/W/16/3165694 which was dismissed by the Inspector. The Inspector considered that the proposal would conflict with the NPPF and HDPF noting "the countryside location of the proposal is unjustified". The Inspector also considered that the proposal would not result in a good standard of amenity for all future occupants of land and buildings and would be contrary to transport objectives requiring safe entry and egress from site.

Principle of Development:

Policy 2 of the HDPF sets out the main growth strategy, focusing development in the main settlements. The HDPF outlines that the proposed settlement hierarchy is the most sustainable approach to delivering housing; where new development is focused in the larger settlements of Horsham, Southwater and Billingshurst; and limited new development is directed elsewhere, and only where it accords with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. Specifically, Policy 3 of the Horsham District Planning Framework seeks to retain the existing settlement pattern and ensure that development takes place in the most sustainable locations as possible.

Policy 4 of the HDPF refers to the expansion of settlements outside the built-up area, and states that such development is only supported where: the site is allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan and adjoins an existing settlement edge; the level of expansion is appropriate to the scale and function of the settlement type; the development is demonstrated to meet the identified local housing needs; the impact of development individually or cumulatively does not prejudice comprehensive long term development; and the development is contained within an existing defensible boundary and the landscape and townscape character features are maintained and enhanced

Policy 26 of the HDPF requires development in the countryside be of a scale that is appropriate to its countryside character and location and not lead, either individually or cumulatively, to a significant increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside. It also needs to be essential to its countryside location and to meet one of the following criteria:

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

Policy BILL1 directs new development in Billingshurst parish to within the defined built-up area boundary of Billingshurst village, as shown in the Policies Maps. Proposals located outside this boundary will only be supported where they comply with countryside policies in the development plan, are required for essential utilities, provide appropriate tourism-related uses, or are situated on sites specifically allocated for such purposes in the Horsham District Planning Framework or its successor.

Policy S3 of the NPPF establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Development proposals should be assessed against Policy S4 where they are located within settlements and Policy S5 where they are located outside settlements. Planning permission should be granted without delay where proposals accord with an up-to-date development plan and the relevant national decision-

making policies. Where a site lies partly within and partly outside a settlement boundary, the relevant policies should be applied to each part of the site before reaching an overall planning judgement.

Policy S5 supports certain types of development in the countryside and outside settlement boundaries, provided that any adverse impacts do not substantially outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework's decision-making policies.

In summary, development outside settlements will generally be supported where it:

- Supports rural land uses, such as agriculture, forestry, horticulture, outdoor recreation, infrastructure, mineral extraction, nature conservation, and defence uses.
- Meets the needs of rural businesses and tourism, where a countryside location is genuinely required.
- Involves the reuse, extension, alteration or replacement of existing buildings, provided changes are proportionate and the existing building is lawful and substantial.
- Brings forward the redevelopment of previously developed (brownfield) land.
- Consists of limited infill development within existing groups of houses.
- Delivers rural exception sites, community-led development, or neighbourhood-led schemes (see HO10).
- Meets an identified need for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople accommodation.
- Provides housing or mixed-use development in sustainable locations close to well-connected railway stations, where infrastructure can support the development.
- Is allocated in the development plan for that purpose.
- Addresses an evidenced unmet development need, such as housing shortages where the authority cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply or has poor housing delivery performance, provided the development is well-related to an existing settlement and supported by adequate infrastructure.

Paragraph HO11 sets out the requirements of isolated homes in the countryside. Development proposals for isolated dwellings in the countryside will only be supported where they satisfy one or more of the specified exceptions. These include circumstances where there is an:

- Essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of employment.
- The proposal constitutes enabling development necessary to secure the future of a heritage asset
- The proposal involves the re-use of a redundant or disused building and enhances its setting;
- The development comprises the subdivision of an existing dwelling;
- The proposal is of an exceptional design quality through outstanding architecture that raises design standards and responds sensitively to the character and setting of the local area.

The proposal is outside the built-up area boundary and would represent countryside development. The site itself is not allocated within any local or neighbourhood plan. Whilst the proposal would not be isolated in the truest sense of the word given the existing dwellings located in proximity to the site, the proposal is distanced in terms of access to services and amenities, being approximately 1.2km away (as the crow flies) from the nearest built up area boundary of Billingshurst and 1.8km (as the crow flies) from built up area boundary of Barns Green. There is a public right of way system approximate to the site which allow largely uninterrupted routes to both Billingshurst and Barns Green. However, this is unlikely to constitute a desirable daily walking path when considering the length of these routes. Residents of any dwelling would therefore be reliant on private vehicles to facilitate day to day living at the site. The LHA notes that cycling is an option however this is restricted to only confident cyclists.

The Inspector recognised under the previous proposal that the development was situated within an undeveloped, broadly triangular shaped plot of land, bounded by a trees and hedgerow that runs along its southern boundary which fronts New Road. A number of further trees grow along the north-east boundary enclosing the plot beyond which lies an open field. Development along New Road is limited which affords the area a strong, rural character and appearance. The undeveloped nature of the site was recognised as contributing positively to this.

As per the Inspector's report: "*The introduction of a dwelling in this location would be visible in views from along New Road, would erode the spatial qualities of the site and would exert an intensified domestic character along this part of the road. This would appear at odds with and would result in harm to the predominant and prevailing rural character and appearance of the road and area. As such, it would fail to maintain the District's rural character*". In addition to this, the Inspector noted that "[t]*he appeal site is located a considerable distance from the nearest settlement of Billingshurst and its range of services and facilities. New Road has no footpaths or street lighting and is subject to the national speed limit. These factors would, in my view, discourage any future occupiers from making the journey to Billingshurst on foot or by bicycle*".

It is not considered that the proposal would meet any of the exceptions provided by the NPPF in relation to isolated homes in the countryside. The proposal is not considered to result in the subdivision of the dwelling to the west of the site given the nature of the plot.

As considered, the proposal is not included within any allocated housing site under the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) or Billingshurst Parish Neighbourhood Plan nor is the proposal situated in a sustainable location or meets an exception under HO11 under the NPPF. As a result, residential development in this location would conflict with the requirements of Policies 2, 3 and 4 of the HDPF. In addition, the proposed development is not considered to be essential to the countryside location and would be in conflict with Policy 26 of the HDPF.

It is however recognised that the Council's most recent Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) confirms that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites. The latest AMR also confirms that the Council is not currently able to demonstrate a Housing Delivery Test score higher than 75%. The NPPF (2026) states that such shortfalls establish an "evidenced unmet need" for housing across the District (in accordance with Policy S5 and Annex D). S5(j)(i) goes on to state that where an unmet need is identified, development should be 'be physically well-related to an existing settlement (unless the nature of the development would make this inappropriate) and be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure'. The development would not be physically well-related to an existing settlement, located at a distance from the built-up boundaries of Billingshurst and Barns Green.

It is also necessary to consider the Framework as a whole, where Policies CC2 and TR3 direct sustainable patterns of development. NPPF TR3 requires development be located where it can support sustainable patterns of movement, enable good accessibility for different users and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure. NPPF CC2 requires that sustainable patterns of movement are prioritised, opportunities are taken to improve walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport, and infrastructure is provided to support the transition to zero-emission vehicles. This is achieved through supporting good access to facilities in order to limit the need to travel, whether through the development's location, through development densities which improve catchment populations for local services, or by incorporating community facilities and premises to support local employment opportunities.

The location of the site would continue to create a daily reliance on private vehicles to access surrounding settlements and the related services, where the site itself would not be well related to the nearest settlements.

In the context of the Council's current 5-year housing land supply position, the provision of housing as a general principle is a matter of significant weight. However, because this proposal would provide for one dwelling, it makes limited meaningful contribution toward recovering this shortfall. As such, the weight attributable to this specific scheme's housing delivery is tempered to moderate weight.

It is acknowledged that any development would bestow socio-economic benefits, such as the creation of temporary jobs during the construction phase in the short-term, and local expenditure and contribution to the local economy in the medium to long-term arising from increase occupancy. However, this is not a particularly unique benefit that would result from this development. Nonetheless, this benefit is afforded limited weight in the overall planning balance.

When considering the development as a whole, it is considered that the benefits of approving the development proposal would be substantially outweighed by adverse effects as outlined above. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, and 26 of the HDPF and Policies S3, S4, CC2 and TR3 of the NPPF.

Design and Appearance;

Paragraph DP3 of the NPPF (2026) states "Development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets. This should not preclude innovation or change where appropriate".

Policy 25 of the HDPF seeks that the natural environment and the local character of Horsham District including the landscape, the landforms and development pattern will be protected from inappropriate development. The policy aims to:

- Protects, conserves and enhances the landscape and townscape character, considering areas identified as being of landscape importance, the individual settlement characteristics, and maintains settlement separation.
- Maintain and enhances the Green Infrastructure Network and addresses any identified deficiencies in the District.
- Maintains and enhances the existing network of geological sites and biodiversity, including safeguarding existing designated sites and species, and ensures no net loss of wider biodiversity and provides net gains in biodiversity where possible.
- Conserve and where possible enhance the setting of the South Downs National Park

Policy 32 and 33 of the HDPF seeks to ensure that development promotes a high standard and quality of design in order to enhance and protect locally distinctive characters. The policies also seek to ensure that the scale, massing and appearance of development relates sympathetically with the built surroundings, landscape, open spaces and routes within and adjoining the site, including any impact on the skyline and important views

Policy BILL 2 of BPNP advises that development should be of high quality that respects the character and rural feel of the parish. It should reflect the local scale and vernacular of the area and use materials that are in keeping to the character of the area.

The proposal is for a chalet bungalow dwelling approximately 11.7m width; 11.5m depth; 6.4m height. The proposal is roughly rectangular in shape with a rearward glazed projection at full height. To the front, the dwelling has a porch with two dormers to allow additional roof space. The previous proposal under DC/16/1415 was a chalet bungalow too, though orientated facing north whereas this proposal is orientated to the west to allow a rear garden. The proposal is an increase in built form compared to the previous proposal, increasing in footprint from $72m^2$ to $110m^2$ and increasing by around 0.4m compared to the previous proposal. This increase in scale to the dwelling over the previous proposal, coupled within this modest plot, is likely the maximum size which can be realistically accommodated given the need for parking.

The proposal is designed in a contemporary fashion though the area does not have a distinct architectural style given the surrounding character. It is not considered the design of the proposal would be of detriment to the wider character of the area and would not introduce a vernacular which would be considered to disrupt the visual build character of the area in terms of built townscape.

The previous proposal under DC/16/1415 was refused on design grounds (see reason 4 above) and was judged by the inspector to:

"[result in a] *proposal* [that] *would provide a poor level of sunlight and daylight and outlook and as such, would provide inadequate living conditions for any future occupiers. The Council cites conflict in this regard with Policy 32: The Quality of New Development and Policy 33: Development Principles, of the*

HDPF. However, whilst I note that Policy 33 requires, amongst other things, buildings to be orientated to gain maximum benefit from sunlight, these policies do not refer specifically to the living conditions of future occupiers. I therefore turn to the Framework. The proposal would be contrary to its broad aims and objectives which require a good standard of amenity for all future occupants of land and buildings".

This was due to the orientation of development which was tucked against the southern edge of the curtilage and faced northwards. This orientation was thought not to allow an acceptable amount of light into the dwelling, obscured by the amount of vegetation and closed in nature of the site. It is thought this would result in a degraded living experience for future occupiers.

This proposal sees the orientation of the dwelling spun 90° from the prior application, with its principal elevation facing west and a more centralised positioning within the plot. It is considered this would result in a more agreeable orientation to the dwelling which would allow a greater degree of light into the site, though this is still constrained given the amount of vegetation present. In addition, the proposal includes tree and hedgerow removal to facilitate a greater degree of light into the site both along the southern and northern boundaries. However, this exposes the development to be observable from the roadside and coupled with the enlarged massing and closer proximity to the road, the development will be prominent in this locale.

Though the development would still be observable from the roadside, it is considered that dwellings are already prominent along this part of the road and that the development has addressed issues raised within the previous application and the connected appeal. Whilst there may be some effect on the character of the area owing to the new addition, it is considered that the proposal would meet the above policies and would be considered of a sound design.

Residential Amenity:

Policy 33 of the HDPF states that permission will be granted for development that does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of the occupiers/users of nearby properties and land.

Given the siting of the dwelling, it is not thought the proposal would be of detriment to the neighbouring amenity in terms of overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing.

Given the siting and layout of the proposed dwelling and the resulting relationship with adjoining properties would be sufficient to prevent any unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity.

Highways Impacts:

Policy 40 of HDPF promote development that provides safe and adequate access, suitable for all users. Policy 40 focuses on supporting development of a sustainable and integrated transport system that sup-ports sustainable transport travel to access jobs, homes, and services. It encourages development that aligns with existing transport infrastructure, reduces carbon emissions, and looks to reduce travel distances and conflicts. Development will be supported where public transport access is improved, routes for cyclists and pedestrians are well implemented and ensures safe highways use for all transport modes.

Policy 41 seeks to find the right balance between ensuring that adequate parking is provided and that it is suitably located and does not conflict with other uses. It should be of good urban design and be ap-propriate to ensure highway safety. Development which involves the loss of existing parking spaces will only be allowed if suitable alternative provision has been secured elsewhere the need for the development overrides the loss of parking and where necessary measures are in place to mitigate against the impact.

As per the LHA's assessment: "The LHA would typically request that access gates are set back at least 5m, to allow a vehicle to pull in off the carriageway and wait whilst the gates are in operation. Although, the LHA would acknowledge that the road in this location is most likely low traffic and vehicles would be traveling at a lower speed due to the geometry of the road. Additionally, any obstruction of the public highway whilst the gates are operated would be considered to be temporary in nature and given the context of the road in this location, would not be anticipated to result in a highway safety concern.

As this application is for a single dwelling only, the LHA does not anticipate that the proposed development would give rise to a significant material intensification of movements to or from the site".

The LHA consider that there would need to be provision for 3 parking spaces for a house of this size in this locale. Whilst two parking spaces are shown, the LHA consider there is enough space for a third and that movements can occur on site to egress from the site in a forward gear.

Given the LHA's assessment, the Council considers that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the highway and is considered to accord with the above policies.

Ecology; Trees and Landscaping:

Policy 31 of the HDPF promotes development that protects and enhances green infrastructure and bio-diversity. It supports projects that maintain ecological networks, create new habitats, and improve existing biodiversity. Loss of green infrastructure must be mitigated or compensated, and protected trees must be replaced if felled. The policy prioritizes safeguarding designated nature sites and habitats, and requires rigorous assessment and mitigation for developments impacting sensitive areas like the Arun Valley SPA and the Mens SAC.

The council has been granted a licence from Natural England, allowing developers to be authorised to undertake works which may affect great crested newts. NatureSpace deliver the District Licensing Scheme on the council's behalf. Subject to the acceptability of the proposal, it would be recommended that the applicant apply to NatureSpace to join the District Licensing Scheme.

As per the Arboriculture Officer's assessment "[t]he principal individual tree of merit is the roadside oak tree (T2 of submitted survey)" which is considered to make a positive contribution towards the landscape character of the area. In addition, the trees which surround the site in terms of height and branch spread would dominate the relatively small rear amenity space and foreseeably be under significant future pressure for lopping/felling in the future due to the constrained nature of the site and foreseeable associated recreational use/desires. To allow a considered and acceptable living space, the image of the countryside is needed to be disturbed heavily.

Since the proposal is unacceptable for other reasons, a revised statement has therefore not been requested in this instance. It is considered that the concerns raised by the Arboricultural Officer could be addressed by an amended arboricultural impact / method statement, with this secured via condition. However as stated, since the proposal is refused on other grounds which cannot be overcome via resubmission, amended reports were not requested to be submitted.

Other Matters:

<u>Climate Change</u>:

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.

Conditions subject to acceptability, include provision:

- Water consumption limited to 110litres per person per day
- Requirement to provide full fibre broadband site connectivity
- Dedicated refuse and recycling storage capacity
- 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 development site is less than 0.5 hectares in area and is therefore exempt from BNG

Conclusion and Planning Balance:

Planning permission is sought for the change of use of land and erection of five dwellings. The site is not allocated for development with the HDPF or a made neighbourhood plan, owing to the site's location outside of the built-up area boundary, the principle of the development is resisted under Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), S3, S5 and HO11 of the NPPF (2026), and BILL1 of the Billingshurst Parish Neighbourhood Plan. The proposal also conflicts with Policies 25, 32, 33 of the HDPF (2015).

The proposal's ability to demonstrate an absence of adverse ecological harm and acceptable highways impact (among others) are neutral considerations that demonstrate general policy compliance rather than positive benefits weighing in favour of the scheme. No other discernible benefits would arise from the granting of this permission.

As per the preceding sections of this report, the granting of this permission would conflict with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the HDPF. This conflict with the development plan is afforded *significant weight*, as it would undermine the strategic process of allocating housing sites for development in appropriate locations, and the democratic process of selecting sites within Neighbourhood Plans.

While the Council's 5-year housing land supply deficit establishes an 'evidenced unmet need' under Policy S5 and Annex D of the Framework, this does not grant automatic support for unsustainable development in unallocated locations. The site fails to meet the locational criteria of the Council's SDPAN, which would not be well-related to an existing settlement, contrary to NPPF (2026) S5(j)(i), and the proposal would result in demonstrable adverse impacts on the character and settlement strategy of the local area, alongside identified amenity harms. When weighed under Policy S5 and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, these adverse impacts and direct conflicts with HDPF Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, and 26 substantially outweigh the moderate benefits of delivering a market dwelling. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify a departure from the spatial strategy. The proposal therefore fails to constitute sustainable development, and the application 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

C3 Dwellinghouse	85	0	85
		Total Gain	**85m²**
		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(s) for Refusal:

1 The site is located outside of any settlement boundary and has not been allocated for development. The proposal would not promote sustainable patterns of movement, with the location remote from existing settlements, creating a dependency on private vehicles whcih would not provide a genuine choice of transport modes for residents and visitors. The proposal therefore fails to accord with Policies 2, 3, 4, 26 and 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Policy BILL1 of the Billingshurst Neighbourhood Plan, and Policies TR3 and CC2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026). There are deemed to be no material considerations which would outweigh conflict with the above development plan and National Planning Policy Framework 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/26/1138
(The approved plans will form Condition 1 on the Decision Notice of all Permitted applications)

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

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location & Block plan		FE01 REV B	15.07.2026
Floor plan	Proposed ground and first	FE02 REV A	15.07.2026
Elevation plan	Proposed	FE03 REV A	15.07.2026
Tree plan	Protection	SHT-2	15.07.2026
Tree plan	Survey	SHT-1	15.07.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial JBurrowes Date: 08/09/2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial TDale Date: 09.11.2026