



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/25/2089

Land Known As Pinkhurst Stud , Pinkhurst Lane, Slinfold, West Sussex, RH13 0QR

DESCRIPTION:

Sitting of a static caravan as a temporary rural workers dwelling (Retrospective).

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

None identified.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The application site comprises a small rural holding known as Pinkhurst Stud, located on Pinkhurst Lane to the south of Slinfold within the countryside of Horsham District. The site extends to approximately 6.39 acres (2.58 hectares) and is characterised by open pasture used as paddocks, together with an equestrian complex including stabling and associated yard. A static caravan has been installed on site.

The land is currently used as a mixed smallholding incorporating equestrian and agricultural activities. At the time of the site visit, the holding accommodated a range of livestock including horses, goats, pigs, poultry and other animals, reflecting its use as a diversified rural enterprise. The surrounding area is rural in character, comprising agricultural land, sporadic residential development and equestrian uses, with the site accessed via Pinkhurst Lane.

The site lies outside of any defined built-up area boundary and is therefore located within the open countryside where development is subject to restrictive planning policies aimed at protecting rural character.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The application seeks retrospective planning permission for the siting and use of a static caravan as a temporary rural worker's dwelling for a period of three years.

The caravan is intended to provide on-site residential accommodation for a rural worker associated with the agricultural enterprise operating at the site, namely the mixed livestock and equine breeding activities at Pinkhurst Stud. The applicant has stated that the presence of a worker on site is required to provide continuous supervision of livestock, including the management of equine foaling, monitoring of animal welfare, and general husbandry requirements associated with the enterprise.

The proposal is put forward as a temporary measure to enable the establishment and expansion of the agricultural business over a three-year period, during which time the functional need and financial viability of the enterprise can be demonstrated. The application is retrospective in nature, as the static caravan is already present on the site, and seeks to regularise its use for residential purposes in connection with the rural enterprise.

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 7 - Strategic Policy: Economic Growth
Policy 9 - Employment Development
Policy 10 - Rural Economic Development
Policy 15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision
Policy 16 - Strategic Policy: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Policy 20 - Rural Workers Accommodation
Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection
Policy 27 - Settlement Coalescence
Policy 29 - Equestrian Development
Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles
Policy 34 - Cultural and Heritage Assets
Policy 35 - Strategic Policy: Climate Change
Policy 37 - Sustainable Construction
Policy 38 - Strategic Policy: Flooding
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking
Policy 43 - Community Facilities, Leisure and Recreation

Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan (2018):

Policy 3 Green Infrastructure 15
Policy 4: Conserve and Enhance Biodiversity
Policy 12: Economy and Enterprise

Slinfold Parish Design Statement (2006)

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 year. 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 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 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 18: Local Green Space
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 29: New Employment
Policy 31: Rural Economic Development
Policy 33: Equestrian Development
Policy 41: Rural Exception Homes

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 Drainage Engineer: No in-principal objection but advises that insufficient information has been submitted to assess compliance with national and local drainage policy. The applicant is required to provide a comprehensive surface water and foul drainage strategy, including details of existing and proposed drainage patterns, site coverage (permeable/impermeable areas), runoff rates, attenuation volumes, and adherence to greenfield runoff rates and the drainage hierarchy. Further information is needed on SuDS design, infiltration testing (or alternative assessments), pollution prevention, exceedance flow routing, and confirmation of foul drainage arrangements with supporting calculations. Maintenance and management plans for all drainage infrastructure must also be provided. Overall, additional technical information is required before the acceptability of the scheme can be determined.

HDC Environmental Health: Objection due to insufficient information and concerns regarding site capacity. No details have been provided for foul drainage despite the lack of mains connection, and it is unclear whether the site can accommodate an appropriate sewage treatment system, with no percolation testing submitted. The proposed layout also appears too constrained to meet required caravan spacing standards or licensing requirements, and no parking provision is identified. Concerns are additionally raised regarding potential noise and disturbance to nearby residents. Overall, it has not been demonstrated that the site is of sufficient size to support the proposed use or associated infrastructure.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

Agricultural Consultant: There is not a justified essential need for a full-time worker to reside on site to meet the needs of the horses and livestock. The applicants have provided a Business Plan with anticipated income and costs for the three-year business plan. The Agricultural Consultant suggests that the Council request a cashflow forecast with more detailed projections for the three years with evidence for the output and direct costs calculations. The Agricultural Consultant is not aware of any other residential dwellings in the immediate locality that are suitable and available and would meet the potential essential need. The Agricultural Consultant considers that the proposal for the temporary siting of a rural worker's dwelling at the application site is not compliant with national and local planning policy.

Further information has been provided to the Council by the agent in emails dated 10 March 2026 and 16 March 2026 following the Agricultural Consultant's appraisal dated 6 March 2026. However, the Agricultural Consultant considers that while could be a marginal justified essential need for a full-time worker to reside on site to meet the needs of the horses and livestock by the end of the three year business plan, there are concerns regarding the availability of land for the proposed enterprises and

recommend the council seek further clarification or information. As such, the conclusions remain that the proposal for the temporary siting of a rural worker's dwelling at the application site is not compliant with national and local planning policy. This is discussed in greater depth below.

WSSC 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.

Representations:

1 letter of Objection has been received from 1 address, objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Loss of amenity
- Will set an unwanted precedent for future residential development

1 letter for Support have been received from 1 address, supporting the application on the following grounds:

- Use of land for agricultural use and for the farming of their animals would be an appropriate use of the land

Parish Comments:

Slinfold Parish Council: Objection on the basis that it fails to comply with Policy 20 of the Horsham District Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The Parish Council considers that insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate the functional need for a rural worker to be present on site, or that the equine business is financially viable and capable of remaining so in the long term. In particular, the supporting information is considered to rely on generalised industry data rather than evidence specific to the operation at Pinkland Stud, raising concerns regarding the robustness of the viability case.

Concerns are also raised that no adequate assessment has been undertaken to identify whether suitable alternative accommodation exists in the locality that could meet the welfare needs of the livestock, as required by policy.

The Parish Council further questions the scale of the operation, noting that the Agricultural Justification Statement refers to approximately six horses being present during peak periods only. It is argued that this level of activity does not justify an essential need for an on-site residential presence, particularly given that such numbers would not typically necessitate overnight supervision within the equine sector. In addition, the Parish Council disputes elements of the applicant's planning justification, specifically the classification of the site as previously developed land (PDL) and references to "grey belt." It is noted that the NPPF definition of PDL excludes land last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings, and that "grey belt" policy considerations apply only to land within the Green Belt, which is not applicable in this case.

Overall, the Parish Council concludes that the submission does not provide sufficient justification for a temporary rural worker's dwelling in this rural location and recommends refusal of the application.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUALITY:

The application has been considered having regard to Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act 1998, which sets out a person's rights to the peaceful enjoyment of property and Article 8 of the same Act, which sets out their rights in respect to private and family life and for the home. Officers consider that the proposal would not be contrary to the provisions of the above Articles.

The application has also been considered in accordance with Horsham District Council's public sector equality duty, which seeks to prevent unlawful discrimination, to promote equality of opportunity and to foster good relations between people in a diverse community, in accordance with Section 149 of the

Equality Act 2010. In this case, the proposal is not anticipated to have any potential impact from an equality perspective.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

Principle of Development:

Policy 20 of the HDPF states that outside the defined built-up area, new housing for rural workers will be supported provided that: there is a functional need for the dwelling and the occupation of the dwelling is to support the established business use; and evidence is submitted to demonstrate the viability of the rural business for which the housing is required.

Policy 26 of the HDPF states that outside built-up area boundaries, the rural character and undeveloped nature of the countryside will be protected against inappropriate development. Any proposal must be essential to its countryside location and meet one of the identified criteria, including supporting the needs of agriculture or enabling the sustainable development of rural areas. Development must also be of a scale appropriate to its countryside setting and should not result in a significant increase in activity or harm to landscape character.

Policy 10 of the HDPF supports sustainable rural economic development where it contributes to local employment and maintains the character of the countryside. Policy 29 supports equestrian development where it is appropriate in scale, well-related to existing buildings, and compatible with its surroundings.

At a national level, paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) seeks to avoid isolated homes in the countryside unless there is an essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work.

The primary test, as set out in the NPPF and Policy 20 of the HDPF, is whether there is a clearly established essential need for a rural worker to reside on the site. This requires consideration of the nature and scale of the enterprise, the functional demands arising from livestock and equine management (including cattle as previously referenced within the agricultural appraisal), and whether those demands necessitate a continuous on-site presence.

The application site extends to approximately 6.39 acres (2.58 hectares) and operates as a mixed livestock smallholding centred on an equine breeding enterprise, supported by poultry production, goat breeding, pig keeping and a small-scale sheep enterprise. The applicant has indicated that the holding previously accommodated a broader mix of livestock, including cattle, and that the current proposals represent a re-establishment and diversification of that earlier use rather than a wholly new enterprise.

The enterprise currently comprises a modest number of animals, including broodmares, goats, pigs and poultry, with proposed expansion over a three-year period to include increased poultry numbers, an expanded goat herd and the introduction of store lambs. The applicant has set out a business plan indicating a gradual increase in income and activity, alongside diversification into multiple revenue streams.

The proposal seeks retrospective consent for the siting of a static caravan to serve as a temporary rural worker's dwelling for a period of three years, during which time the enterprise would be further established and its viability demonstrated.

The Council's agricultural consultant has reviewed the submitted information and concludes that the proposal does not currently demonstrate a justified essential need for a rural worker to reside on site. Whilst it is acknowledged that there could be a marginal functional need by the end of the three-year business plan period, this is dependent on the successful expansion of the enterprise and is not established at present. The existing scale of operations is limited and characteristic of a smallholding and does not generate sufficient functional demand to justify a full-time on-site presence.

Furthermore, the consultant raises significant concerns regarding the robustness of the financial information submitted. The business plan lacks detailed and verifiable evidence, including comprehensive cashflow projections and clarity regarding income assumptions. As such, it has not been demonstrated that the enterprise is financially sound or capable of supporting a full-time rural worker in a sustainable manner.

In addition, concerns are raised regarding the availability of land to support the proposed scale of the enterprise, with the level of livestock proposed exceeding what could reasonably be accommodated within the site. This further undermines confidence in the realism and deliverability of the business plan.

Whilst it is noted that there are no other suitable dwellings in the immediate locality that could meet the identified need, this factor does not outweigh the fundamental requirement to first demonstrate that an essential need exists.

Overall, whilst the proposal would support a rural enterprise in principle, the evidence provided does not demonstrate that the enterprise is sufficiently established, functionally demanding, or financially viable to justify the provision of a rural worker's dwelling. The proposal therefore fails to meet the requirements of Policy 20 of the HDPF and paragraph 84 of the NPPF.

In the absence of a clearly demonstrated essential need, the development represents an unjustified form of residential development in the countryside, which is not essential to its location and is therefore contrary to Policy 26 of the HDPF.

Design and Appearance and Impact on the Countryside

Policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF seek to promote development of high quality and inclusive design for all development in the district, ensuring that it is complementary of local distinctive character and heritage, integrating with their surroundings. Furthermore, these policies ensure that the scale, massing and appearance of the development is of a high standard of design and layout and where relevant, relates sympathetically with the built surroundings.

The static caravan is positioned on existing hardstanding in close proximity to the established stable buildings and associated equestrian infrastructure. In visual terms, the static caravan is a utilitarian structure and does not represent a high quality or permanent form of design. Its domestic appearance is not inherently characteristic of traditional agricultural buildings and, as such, it introduces a degree of visual discord within the rural landscape. However, it is noted that the structure is modest in scale, low in height, and is sited within the immediate context of existing built form associated with the equestrian use, thereby limiting its visual prominence in wider views.

The caravan is not isolated within open fields but is instead read in association with the existing cluster of development on the site. As a result, its presence does not materially extend the built form into the surrounding countryside, nor does it result in a significant encroachment into undeveloped areas of the holding. Furthermore, the use of an existing area of hardstanding ensures that no additional land take or urbanising features are introduced.

It is also a material consideration that the proposal seeks temporary permission for a period of three years only. Temporary rural worker accommodation of this nature is not uncommon within agricultural and equestrian settings, particularly where enterprises are in the early stages of establishment and require a degree of flexibility. The limited duration of the proposal reduces the weight that can be attributed to any visual harm identified.

Having regard to the above, whilst the static caravan is not considered to make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the countryside, the harm identified is limited and localised. In the context of a temporary permission and its siting adjacent to existing buildings, it is not considered that the proposal would result in a level of harm sufficient to warrant refusal on design or landscape grounds. As such, the proposal is considered to broadly accord with Policy 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework in this respect.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

Policy 33 of the HDPF provides that development will be required to ensure a design that avoids unacceptable harm to the occupiers/users of nearby property and land with sufficient regard to the sensitivity of surrounding development.

The nearest residential properties to the application site are Foxways and Westholme Cottage, located approximately 20 metres and 37 metres to the north respectively, with Doomsday Cottage situated approximately 84 metres to the north-east. The siting of the static caravan in this context is therefore noted and has been carefully considered in terms of its potential impact on neighbouring amenity.

The caravan is a single-storey structure of limited height and massing and is positioned adjacent to existing stable buildings and associated infrastructure. Given its modest scale and its relationship with existing built form, it is not considered to give rise to any materially harmful overbearing impact when viewed from neighbouring properties. Furthermore, existing boundary treatment, including established hedging and trees along the site boundaries, provides a degree of natural screening which further reduces intervisibility between the caravan and neighbouring dwellings.

In terms of privacy, the separation distances involved, combined with the presence of boundary vegetation, are such that no unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy would arise. The use of the caravan as a single rural worker's dwelling is also not considered likely to result in levels of activity or disturbance that would materially harm the living conditions of nearby occupiers, particularly when viewed in the context of the lawful agricultural and equestrian activities already taking place on the site.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and would therefore comply with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework in this regard.

Highways Impacts

Policies 40 and 41 of the HDPF seek to ensure that development provides safe and suitable access for all users, promotes sustainable transport, and delivers adequate parking provision to meet the needs of development.

The application site is accessed via Pinkhurst Lane, an unadopted track which connects to the adopted highway network at Lyons Road. The Local Highway Authority (West Sussex County Council) has been consulted on the application and has raised no objections on highway safety or capacity grounds. It is noted that visibility at the junction with Lyons Road is considered acceptable based on available mapping, and no concerns have been identified in relation to the existing access arrangements.

In terms of traffic generation, the proposal relates to the provision of a single temporary rural worker's dwelling within an established agricultural holding. Given the modest scale of the development, it is not anticipated that it would give rise to a material intensification of vehicular movements to or from the site. Indeed, the provision of on-site accommodation for a rural worker can reasonably be expected to reduce the need for daily commuting, thereby limiting additional vehicle trips associated with the operation of the enterprise.

With regard to parking provision, there appears to be sufficient space within the site to accommodate vehicles associated with the proposed dwelling, and no evidence has been provided to suggest that the development would result in the loss of existing parking to the detriment of the site's operation. While no details of cycle parking have been submitted, the rural location of the site is such that reliance on cycling as a primary mode of transport is likely to be limited, and this is not considered to justify refusal in this instance.

Overall, the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the operation of the surrounding road network. The development is therefore considered to accord with Policies 40 and 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework, as well as the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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.

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.

The Applicant has demonstrated that the development is exempt from the requirement to achieve a minimum 10% BNG, as the application is retrospective made under Section 73(A) of the Town and Country Planning Act.

Foul Drainage

Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) requires that development avoids unacceptable harm to amenity, including from pollution, whilst Policy 26 seeks to protect the countryside from inappropriate development that would adversely affect its environmental qualities.

The application does not include any details in respect of foul sewage disposal. In circumstances where a development is not connected to the mains drainage network, it is necessary to demonstrate that a suitable and effective means of foul water treatment and disposal can be provided, in

accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to ensure that development does not give rise to pollution or unacceptable impacts on the natural environment.

The Council's Environmental Health Officer has advised that the application lacks fundamental information regarding the proposed foul drainage arrangements, including the type and capacity of any sewage treatment plant, the method of discharge, and whether the site is capable of accommodating a soakaway or drainage field. In particular, no percolation testing has been submitted to demonstrate that the ground conditions are suitable for the infiltration of treated effluent, nor has any evidence been provided to confirm that discharge to a watercourse would be feasible or compliant with Environment Agency requirements. This information would be required were the application to be approved, either in advance of permission being granted or by way of a planning condition.

Planning Balance and Conclusions:

The application seeks retrospective planning permission for the siting of a static caravan as a temporary rural worker's dwelling for a period of three years at Pinkhurst Stud, Slinfold. The principle of providing accommodation to support a rural enterprise is recognised in national and local planning policy, including Paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Policy 20 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF). However, for such proposals, the primary test is whether there is a clearly established essential functional need for a rural worker to reside on site, and whether the associated enterprise is financially viable and capable of sustained operation.

In this case, the applicant proposes that the static caravan would be occupied by a full-time rural worker, specifically Mr or Mrs Bell, to provide daily management, supervision, and care for all horses and livestock on the holding. The Agricultural Consultant acting on behalf of the Council (RAC) has reviewed the submitted information and concludes that there could be a marginal justified essential need for a full-time worker to reside on site to meet the needs of the horses and livestock by the end of the three-year business plan. RAC acknowledges that, if the enterprise were fully established and operating at the scale envisaged, a functional need for on-site presence may emerge. However, this need is not currently established, as the present scale of operations is limited, characteristic of a smallholding, and does not generate sufficient functional demand to warrant a full-time on-site presence at this stage.

RAC further advises that the financial information submitted in support of the application is not sufficiently robust. While a business plan has been provided outlining anticipated income and costs over the three-year period, RAC recommends that the Council request a more detailed cashflow forecast, including evidence to support assumptions for outputs, income, and direct costs. Without such clarity, it cannot be confirmed that the enterprise is financially sound or capable of sustaining a full-time rural worker. Additional concerns are raised regarding the availability of land to accommodate the proposed expansion of livestock and the broader enterprise, further undermining confidence in the deliverability of the business plan.

While the siting of the static caravan adjacent to existing stables and infrastructure limits visual impact and avoids significant harm to neighbouring amenity, these are neutral considerations which do not outweigh the principal harms identified.

The development constitutes an unjustified form of residential development in the countryside, contrary to Policies 20 and 26 of the HDPF and Paragraph 84 of the NPPF, and the unresolved drainage issue adds a further fundamental reason for refusal. Overall, the limited potential benefit of supporting a marginally justified future functional need by the end of the three-year period is outweighed by the absence of an established need, the lack of financial clarity, and the uncertainty regarding environmental compliance. The proposal is therefore considered unacceptable in principle and fails to comply with the relevant planning policies.

Recommendation: Permission Refused

Reasons:

1. The development would be located in the countryside, outside of any defined built-up area boundary, on a site not allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework or an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the development is essential to its countryside location and that there is an essential and functional need for a rural worker to live on-site. The development represents inappropriate and unjustified development within the countryside, contrary to Policies 1, 3, 20 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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/25/2089

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

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Elevation & Floor plan		NONE	21.01.2026
Supporting Statement	Heritage	NONE	05.01.2026
Location plan		NONE	08.01.2026
Block plan		NONE	15.12.2025
Supporting Statement	Agricultural Justification Statement	NONE	05.01.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Daniel Holmes Date: 25/03/2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial Guy Everest Date: 27.03.2026