



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/25/2072
40 Newland Road, Upper Beeding, West Sussex, BN44 3JJ

DESCRIPTION:

Erection of 1no. single storey dwelling.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

No relevant planning history

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 15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision
Policy 16 - Strategic Policy: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
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 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking

Upper Beeding Parish Neighbourhood Plan (UBPNP) 2018-2031:

Policy 1 - Spatial Plan for the Parish
Policy 8 - Design Standards for New Development

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old, the most important policies for the determination of this application must be considered as to whether they are 'out of date' (NPPF paragraph 11d).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 2: Development Hierarchy

Strategic Policy 4: Horsham Town

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 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character

Strategic Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

Policy 18: Local Green Space

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:

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

WSCC Highways: No Objection [Summary]

The Local Highway Authority does not consider that the proposal for 1 dwelling 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: Objection

The provision of this dwelling will provide a serious obstruction and affect the visibility at this junction.

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

The application is for the erection of a single storey dwelling at 40 Newland Road, Upper Bedding. The application site is to the east of 40 Newland Road, a bungalow sited away from the corner between Newlands Road and Manor Road, Steyning, Upper Beading. No planning history is available for the site itself. The surrounding area of the western end of Newland Road (which 40 Newland Road is akin to) primarily consists of semi-detached and stepped bungalows finished with brick and cladding. The character of Manor Road of which the property sits on the corner is a street with a mixed architectural style though there is cohesion between dwellings.

Principle of Development:

Policy 1 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) states that the Council will take positive approach to development proposals, aligning with the National Planning Policy Framework's emphasis on sustainable 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 1 of UBPNP states development is supported when it aligns with the Neighbourhood Plan, the Horsham District Framework (2015), and the South Downs Local Plan. Outside these boundaries, development is only supported where it accords with national and local countryside protection policies or where a site-specific policy applies. Across the wider neighbourhood area, development that would harm valued open spaces, heritage assets, local green spaces, or areas of biodiversity importance will not be supported.

The proposal is for the erection of a single-storey dwelling as an 'infill' development within the built-up area of Upper Beeding. The development would accord with the development policies above and would therefore be considered acceptable in principle, subject to other material considerations.

Design and Appearance:

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting; establish a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit; optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development; and create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible.

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 sky-line and important views.

Policy 8 of UBNP runs in accordance with HDPF Policies 32 and 33, seeking scale, density, massing, height, layout, materials and landscaping of new development be aware of the surrounding area. Development will be supported where the Parish Design Statement is reflected in a proposal and takes into account the vernacular and character of Upper Beeding Parish.

The development would see the introduction of a bungalow dwelling on the corner of Newland Road and Manor Road to the east of 40 Newland Road, currently used as front / side garden. The property would be adjoined to 40 Newland Road and stepped back to the south to continue the ribbon development already established by the stepped bungalows. This involves the subdivision of the curtilage of 40 Newland Road to facilitate the creation of the bungalow.

The bungalow shape itself is of irregular design to the prevailing character of Newland Road when viewed from the north elevation, being double stepped compared to the existing bungalows which consist of one principal elevation with one step between them. When viewed from the east elevation along Manor Road, the property shows a stepped notion though gives the illusion of two dwellings due to the double step and the proposal being designed with two gable ends to respect the curtilage. When viewed from the immediate surrounds of Manor Road, the design is juxtaposed by the immediate neighbouring properties which consist of two storey dwellings with gable ends at 90° to that of the proposed. The side elevation of the proposed dwelling would be built forward of the build line present of the west side of Manor Road.

The bungalow itself is small compared to the prevailing character of bungalows present on Newland Road with a footprint of around 50m² compared to other bungalows at around 65m². The proposed benefits from some garden space with parking provided for one vehicle to the rear of the garden.

The proposed dwelling is sited on the corner of Newland Road and Manor Road to the east of 40 Newland Road. The plot currently is the front / side garden of 40 Newland Road which is a pleasant green space, contributing to an open / spacious character to the area which is particularly notable as a corner plot. This creates a wider aperture when moving between streets and contributes to the open character to the area. This character of spaciousness is evident with other dwellings having modest front gardens and being well separated from the road. Whilst the proposal would have a belt of greenery to soften the visual impact on the side elevation, the proposal advances the build line and erodes the open nature to the corner from Manor Road to Newland Road both from northerly and southerly approaches.

In addition, when approaching the proposed from the north, the building would have a notable prominence which would be juxtaposed to the existing open nature of the opposite corner and set back nature of development on both Newland Road and Manor Road. It is considered that the proposal would erode a meaningful contribution of open spacing to the area and would be of detriment to the neighbouring amenity.

A similar application, DC/15/2710 \ APP/Z3825/W/16/3144340 (Erection of a single, two storey detached dwelling) was refused on similar grounds owing to the potential of the aforementioned

development to erode the open character of the amenity. The reason for refusal within the delegated report reads:

“Having regard to the siting of the proposed dwelling and its relationship with the pattern of surrounding development, it is considered that the proposed development would appear incongruous within the fairly uniform character of the street scene, particularly in terms of its design and position within the plot and would result in the loss of the open character of the area...”

The proposal was appealed and refused. The Inspector acknowledged “[undeveloped plots] make[-] an important contribution to the identity of the local area by its green and undeveloped nature”. As the Inspector details “[the area includes a] number of small areas of undeveloped space [which] contribute to local distinctiveness and assist with navigation around the area” which is considered to be applicable in the context of Newland Road and Manor Road. Further the Inspector notes that the development site of the DC/15/2710, due to its corner context, contributes to the character to both roads. It would be considered this would be applicable under DC/25/2072 as again the development plot is a corner plot on undeveloped land. Development of this land would erode the open nature of the area.

It is considered that the design of the proposed is constrained and hampered by the curtilage of 40 Newland Road, in effect deteriorating the execution of the proposed. The dwellings and the area in general are characterised by a sense of openness that is eroded by the presence of the proposal. In addition, the proposal fails to emulate the built form and prevailing character of the street, being hemmed by the curtilage of the existing dwelling.

The bungalow as designed is being built to the maximum extent to provide a modest living space which results in a cramped addition to Manor Road and Newland Road. The proposal does not sit comfortably within its confines and results in an increased built presence observable from Manor Road. The proposal though emulating design cues from the immediate vicinity is considered incompatible with the prevailing character of the area and would result in a cramped addition which does not reflect the quality of openness to the surrounding area.

It is therefore considered that the proposal fails to meet above development policies.

Residential Amenity:

Policy 32 of the HDPF states that development will be expected to provide an attractive, functional, accessible, safe, and adaptable environment that contribute a sense of place both in the buildings and spaces themselves. Policy 33 continues that development shall be required to ensure that it is designed to avoid unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupiers/users of nearby property and land.

The proposed dwelling would extend 5m to the rear of the 40 Newland Road. Whilst noted that the dwellings would be separated by fencing and that an extension under permitted development to 40 Newland Road would reduce the step between properties at the rear to 2.2m, this is not built. It would be considered that the rear would be built up to 5m against the existing rear elevation which would contribute to an unacceptable level of overbearing impact and loss of light. If the extension was built, the proposed would be over 1.5m taller than the extension and would still overbear 40 Newland Road though the step would decrease to 2.2m. It is considered that this too would have an overbearing impact, and would detract from the amenity of the occupiers at 40 Newland Road.

The proposed dwelling, due to its siting and extent, would therefore result in unacceptable harm to the amenities of the neighbouring property of 40 Newland Road, contrary to the above policies.

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 supports 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 appropriate 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.

The existing dwelling does not benefit from off-street parking provision. The proposed development would general a requirement for 2no. parking spaces, in addition to the existing demand. The Proposed Site Plan indicates that 1no. off-street parking space would be provided, where this would result in a shortfall of 1no. space for the proposed dwelling. The development would also not account for the needs of the existing dwelling of 40 Newland Road. As such, it is recognised that there would be a shortfall of off-street parking for the development.

Following consultation with WSCC Highways, it is recognised that on-street parking is established within the locality, where there are no parking restrictions in place. The Local Highways Authority are not aware of any existing parking stress within the locality.

The application site is located within a sustainable location, where walking and public transport would provide a viable option for occupiers. On this basis, and given that there are no known limitations with regard to on-street parking, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in a significant and material increase in parking pressure to justify a reason for refusal. In addition, the proposal is not considered to result in a material increase and intensification in traffic movements to have an adverse impact on the function and safety of the highway network.

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.

Climate Change:

Policies 35, 36 and 37 require that development mitigates to the impacts of climate change through measures including improved energy efficiency, reducing flood risk, reducing water consumption, improving biodiversity and promoting sustainable transport modes. These policies reflect the requirements of Chapter 14 of the NPPF that local plans and decisions seek to reduce the impact of development on climate change. The proposed development would be subject to conditions if approved to secure the following:

- Water consumption limited to 110litres per person per day
- Requirement to provide full fibre broadband site connectivity
- Refuse and recycling storage
- Cycle parking facilities
- Electric vehicle charging points

Subject to these conditions the application will suitable 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 Biodiversity Net Gain Plan has been calculated at a deficit. The proposal therefore does not meet the minimum 10% increase.

The proposal includes a biodiversity statement that outlines “Given the spatial constraints of the Site, achieving BNG targets through on-site habitat creation and enhancement measures is considered unrealistic”. The biodiversity statement then goes further to advise that offsite offsetting should be consider and failing that, credits as a last resort. No indication in the form of other supporting documents suggests that this has been enquired about or carried out. As such insufficient information has been provided. Though the BNG statement outlines the potential purchase of credits, it is advised that Biodiversity units purchased from a third-party habitat bank should be explored first.

Conclusions:

The application site is located within the built-up area boundary of Bramber, where there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The proposed development would therefore be acceptable in principle.

The proposal would however be of a design, scale, layout and siting that would in a cramped form of development that would fail to reflect the build pattern of the settlement and would erode the sense of openness within the street scene. The development is not therefore considered to relate sympathetically to the prevailing character of the locality, and would result in adverse harm to the visual amenity and townscape character of the site and surroundings.

In addition, the proposed siting and depth of the proposed development, given its relationship with the existing dwelling of 40 Newland Road, would result in an unacceptable overbearing impact that would adversely affect the amenities of the neighbouring property.

The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites therefore for the purposes of decision making the presumption in favour of sustainable development within Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF applies. Paragraph 11(d) states that where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

While the proposed development would contribute to the identified housing need, the benefits of a single dwelling would be modest. It is not considered that the benefits of the dwelling would outweigh the harm to the character and amenity of the locality and the amenities of neighbouring properties. The development is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

- 1 The proposed development would be of a scale, siting, layout and design that would result in the loss of the open character of the area and would fail to respect the build pattern and prevailing character of the locality. The proposal would fail to relate sympathetically to the townscape character and visual amenity of the street scene, and would therefore be contrary to Policies 25, 32, and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
- 2 The proposed development, due to its siting and extent, would have an unacceptable overbearing impact on the adjoining neighbouring property of 40 Newland Road and consequently result in an unacceptable loss of light. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

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/25/2072

(The approved plans will form Condition 1 on the Decision Notice of all Permitted applications)

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

