



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0504

Black Cherry Farm, Bashurst Hill, Itchingfield, West Sussex, RH13 0PB

DESCRIPTION:

Conversion of a disused agricultural building to a single dwellinghouse with associated residential curtilage.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/24/0668	Conversion of a disused agricultural building to a single dwelling house with associated residential curtilage	Application Refused on 30.07.2024
------------	--	-----------------------------------

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The subject building of this application is one of a collection of buildings that make up Black Cherry Farm, a site that lies outside of a defined built-up area boundary and is therefore considered to be in a countryside location for planning purposes. The site is accessed via a private lane shared with several neighbouring properties which stems from Bashurst Hill and is also designated as a PRow (ref. 1474 & 1475). The surrounding area is characterised by large detached residential dwellings, agricultural and equestrian development.

The wider site appears to be set up primarily for equestrian use, with a sand school located adjacent to the subject building on its north boundary and several stable buildings across the site. However, during the site visit it was noted that many of these buildings were either disused or being utilised for other purposes (i.e. storage).

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

This application seeks to convert the disused former livestock building to the north-east of the site to a chalet style 4-bed dwelling.

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 4 - Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion

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 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
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking

Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan (2024):

Policy 12 - Design of housing
Policy 15 - Off-street parking

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 12: Air Quality
Strategic Policy 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Strategic Policy 14: Countryside Protection
Strategic Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Strategic Policy 19: Development Quality
Strategic Policy 20: Development Principles
Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport
Policy 25: Parking
Policy 32: Conversion of Agricultural and Rural Buildings to Commercial, Community and Residential Uses
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)

Planning Advice Notes:

Shaping Development in Horsham District
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 Environmental Health: Comment

A preliminary risk assessment including a site walkover should be provided to ensure the site can be made safe and suitable for the development. Information is also required on the impacts of the adjoining commercial or agricultural uses on the amenity of the proposed dwelling as the

recommencement of intensive agricultural or commercial use (lawful activity) may be prejudiced by the introduction of a residential property in close proximity.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

Ecology Consultant: No Objection subject to conditions.

We are satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination of this application. We have no objections on ecology matters (excluding Great Crested Newt as we have been instructed to leave comments on this EPS to the NatureSpace partnership).

Southern Water: Insufficient Information Provided

Construction of the development shall not commence until details of the proposed means of foul drainage disposal have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Southern Water.

WSCC Highways: No Objection

Vehicle access from the public highway is to be via the existing access to the farm and no changes are proposed. Visibility from the access is acceptable and traffic generated by the proposal is likely to be lower than existing.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:

Representations:

None.

Parish Comments:

Itchingfield Parish Council: Cannot Recommend for Approval

No indication has been given as to whether the building can achieve current thermal efficiency standards nor how it will be heated. No foul drainage scheme has been proposed, no place to keep domestic refuse/recycling bins allocated and no provision made for cycle storage. This results in a low-grade rural dwelling that should be better separated from current or future agricultural or commercial undertaking.

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

Background:

The agricultural building has previously been the subject of a similar planning application for a conversion to a single dwellinghouse (DC/24/0668), which was refused in July 2024 on the following grounds:

1. *The development would enable a residential use within a countryside location outside of the*

built-up area boundary of any settlement, on a site which has not been allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework or an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. The development would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchical approach of concentrating development within the main settlements and is not essential to its countryside location. There are no material considerations which outweigh this harm, and the proposal represents unsustainable development contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 2. It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that future occupiers of the dwelling would not be adversely impacted upon by any activities taking place on surrounding land by reason of noise, odour and general disturbance. The proposal would therefore create accommodation below the standard which the council would reasonably expect, contrary to Policy 32 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), and the National Planning Policy Framework.*
- 3. Insufficient information has been submitted to establish the protection of the ecological and biodiversity interests of the site and whether suitable mitigations or enhancements are necessary and achievable, contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).*

The applicant has submitted further information under this current application providing clarity on the use of the surrounding farm buildings as well as on the ecological and biodiversity interest at the site. While the proposed building has remained largely the same in terms of scale and design, biodiversity enhancements to the curtilage have been proposed including new neutral grassland and native hedging.

Principle of Development:

Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF, 2015) Policies 2, 3 and 4 collectively seek to ensure that development is appropriately sited to retain the districts distinctive settlement pattern and rural landscape character. Policy 3 designates a series of built-up area boundaries (BUAB) where development is acceptable in principle, with development on land outside of these boundaries more strictly controlled. The proposal is located outside of a defined BUAB meaning that Policy 4, which outlines the circumstances where development outside of a BUAB will be supported, is relevant.

The proposal does not meet the criteria for Policy 4 as the site is not allocated in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan and the site does not adjoin an existing settlement edge. There are some allowances made for a certain level of development in the countryside under Policy 26 of the HDPF, for example if it supports rural enterprise or recreational activity. However, this proposal does not meet any of the criteria stated and is therefore not compliant with Policy 26.

It is noted that the applicant has referenced HDPF Policy 10 within their Supporting Statement, highlighting that this policy makes some allowance for the conversion of rural buildings to residential dwellings. Though this is correct, the requirements of Policy 10 are geared more towards shaping rural economic development and are not considered particularly relevant to the provision of a market dwelling.

It is also acknowledged that the applicant has referenced paragraph 84c of the NPPF, which permits the development of isolated dwellings in the countryside if it would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting. However, when considering the interpretation of 'isolated homes in the countryside' in *Braintree District Council v SSCLG* [2017] as a home "far away from other places, buildings, or people; remote" Officers do not consider the proposal to meet this definition. This is because the application site is located within close proximity to a number of residential dwellings and other buildings and is therefore not considered to be 'isolated' in the truest sense of the word.

It is therefore considered that the proposal directly conflicts with the overarching hierarchy and locational strategy of the development plan and therefore fails to establish a principle for development. Whether this conflict with Policies 2, 4 and 26 of the HDPF is outweighed by other material considerations is discussed in the Planning Balance at the end of this report.

Design and Appearance:

Policy 32 and 33 of the HDPF 2015 require that all development in the district be of high quality and complimentary to locally distinctive character. The policies also seek to ensure that the scale, massing and appearance of new development is appropriate as well as that a high standard of building materials, finishes and landscaping are used. In addition, Policy 12 of Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan (INP) asks that development incorporates the use of local materials and positively responds to the local vernacular of the Parish.

The subject building is situated on existing hardstanding and is of breezeblock construction, with wooden boarding on the western and eastern elevations which looks to have been added to secure the building once it ceased housing livestock. The roof is made from corrugated metal and there are two existing windows at the northern end, as well as wooden doors on the north and south elevations. Overall, the building is typical of agricultural use and appears to be of a condition that could enable a conversion though it is noted that no structural survey has been submitted.

The application does not proposed changes to the scale or form of the existing building and will be utilising existing features and openings as far as possible to retain the character of the building. As mentioned, the existing roof will be retained as well as the breezeblock walls, with wooden cladding installed to the upper half of the building to echo the design at Black Cherry Farmhouse. The western elevation will include a series of floor to ceiling windows, white bi-fold doors will be added to the south.

While the retention of the existing features of the building is considered positive with regard to ensuring the character of the area is maintained, the combination of breezeblock and wood cladding may lead to an unfinished appearance which would detract from the overall design merit of the building. A change of materials could however be secured via planning condition, which would enable an acceptable standard of design.

Residential Amenity:

Policy 33(2) of the HDPF (2015) requires development to ensure that it is designed to avoid unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupiers/users of nearby property and land through loss of privacy, outlook, light, noise, or general disturbance. Similarly, Paragraph 198 of the NPPF requires development to be appropriate for its location and avoid impacts upon living conditions.

Neighbouring Amenity

The closest residential property to the proposal is Black Cherry Farmhouse at Lower Toat Farm located approx. 100m to the east. The proposal is not visible from Black Cherry Farmhouse due to intervening vegetation, therefore there is unlikely to be a significant impact with regard to loss of privacy or outlook. Given that the proposed use is residential, it is unlikely that there will be significant changes in the level of noise, odour or general disturbance when compared to the existing use. There are no other neighbouring properties thought to be impacted by the proposal.

Amenity of Future Occupiers

The previous refusal at the site (DC/24/0668) cited an unacceptable impact upon the amenity of future occupiers on the basis that the proposed dwelling would be surrounded by agricultural land which had clear potential for disturbance. The applicant has provided further narrative around the uses of the various buildings across the site, which include stables, storage, an office building and straw barn, stating that they are largely disused. Limited agricultural activity was observed during the site visit undertaken by officers, with several goats housed in an open sided barn but no other animals found.

While it is recognised that there is limited agricultural and equestrian activity currently occurring at the site, this could recommence at any time on the land outside of this application's red line boundary (i.e. land that is outside of the future occupier's control). This could potentially result in amenity impacts relating to noise, odour and/or general disturbance, including from vehicles passing the building to reach the land to the rear. No new permissions have been granted to secure the use of the wider site

as anything other than agricultural/equestrian use and therefore there is limited scope to prevent this occurring in future. This potential for conflicting uses has been highlighted by the Council's Environmental Health Officer in their comments.

Furthermore, a chalet building is located approx. 1 metre from the proposed dwelling and stretches across a significant portion of its western elevation. Access to this chalet building looks to only be achievable using the pathway to the rear of the proposed dwelling, with no screening or separation provided. Given that there are floor-to-ceiling windows proposed on the rear elevation, there exists a potential for loss of privacy and overlooking including into the main amenity space. In addition, the chalet is likely to lead to an oppressive and overbearing impact upon occupiers with regard to outlook and light.

Therefore, it is considered that the proposal does not comply with Policy 33(2) of the HDPF with regard to amenity impacts.

Highways Impacts:

Policies 39 and 41 of the HDPF seek to ensure that both sufficient capacity in the existing infrastructure exists prior to the release of land for development and that adequate parking facilities are provided to meet the needs of anticipated users.

The submitted Location Plan shows that vehicular access will be gained via an existing access point on Bashurst Hill and along the private road that serves the site. A separate access point is proposed to that utilised by existing residents of Black Cherry Farmhouse; however, this is not anticipated to lead to adverse impact. From the Proposed Site Biodiversity Plan (drawing no. KCC3603/09) it appears that space has been allocated for 3 vehicles on hardstanding to the front of the proposed dwelling however there is no mention of cycle storage. Suitable cycle facilities can though be secured by condition.

WSCC Highways has been consulted on the application and advised that they have no objections, given that vehicular access is remaining largely the same and sufficient parking is to be provided.

Ecology:

Policy 25 of the HDPF (2015) seeks to protect existing biodiversity and green infrastructure in the District by ensuring no net loss, while Policy 31 looks to encourage the provision and enhancement of new habitats as well as outlining requirements for areas of particular importance (SPAs, SACs, SSSIs etc.). This is in line with paragraphs 187-188 of the NPPF (2024).

Upon initial review of the site there are no statutory designated sites in close proximity, the nearest being Slinfold Stream and Quarry SSSI some 2km to the north. However, the site is located within the 12km zone for The Mens SAC, a site designated for its species of barbastelle and Bechstein's bat and will therefore require a Habitats Regulations Assessment to be undertaken. There is an area of ancient woodland located approximately 100m to the northwest of the proposed dwelling, however this is unlikely to be impacted by the proposal. The area where the agricultural barn is located is considered to be the most suitable habitat for great crested newts (Red IRZ), which will require further consideration.

The Council's Ecology Consultant has provided comment on the submitted Bat Emergency Survey (Wychwood Environmental Ltd. August 2025) and Preliminary Ecological Appraisal/Roost Assessment (aLyne Ecology Ltd. October 2024) and agree that a licence for bats will be required prior to the commencement of any works and recommended that this is secured by condition. Overall, subject to the suggested mitigation and enhancement measures being secured, they are satisfied that the proposed development will not lead to an adverse impact upon ecological receptors.

Great Crested Newts

As mentioned, the proposal is in a red zone for great crested newts which denotes areas containing the most suitable habitat for the species. However, NatureSpace only requires consultation on minor

applications in the red zone if there is a pond within 250m of the development site and if suitable habitat is likely to be impacted.

The site does contain an ornamental pond approx. 100 meters to the east of the proposal however the development is being constructed entirely on existing hardstanding and will not facilitate the loss or damage of suitable GCN habitat. It is therefore concluded that the potential for impact upon GCN is low and no further consideration of this issue is necessary.

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.

Drainage and Flood Risk:

Policy 38 of the HDPF states that development should follow a sequential approach to flood risk management, giving priority to development with the lowest risk of flooding and making required development safe without increasing flooding elsewhere. Development proposed will: take a sequential approach to ensure most vulnerable uses are placed in the lowest risk areas; avoid the functional floodplain except for water-compatible uses and essential infrastructure; only be acceptable in Flood Zone 2 and 3 following completion of a sequential test and exceptions test if necessary; and require a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment for all development over 1 hectare in Flood Zone 1 and all proposals in Flood Zone 2 and 3.

Paragraph 170 of the NPPF discourages inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding by directing development away from the areas at highest risk, while Paragraph 173 states that a

sequential risk-based approach should be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding.

The application site lies within Flood Zone 1, which is land defined by the Planning Practice Guidance for the NPPF for Flood Risk and Coastal Change as having a low probability of flooding. The site is also not at risk from surface water flooding nor is it located within a groundwater vulnerability area.

It is noted that the applicant has not provided information relating to foul or surface water drainage however this can be secured via a pre-commencement condition, should the application be permitted.

Other Matters:

Contaminated Land:

Agricultural buildings and land can be subject to significant contamination risks arising from their use, previous land uses, construction and storage of machinery, equipment, fuels, or other chemicals. Potentially hazardous materials may also be incorporated in made grounds, yards, and hardstanding. Risks arising from the use therefore require evaluation by the applicant.

The Council's Environmental Health team has been consulted on the application and recommended that information relating to the above matters and a preliminary risk assessment (inc. site walkover) be provided to ensure that the site can be made safe and suitable for the development. The provision of this information can be secured via planning condition.

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 does not make reference to any measures to build resilience to climate change and reduce carbon emissions. Therefore, conditions will be attached 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

Subject to these conditions the application will suitably reduce the impact of the development on climate change in accordance with local and national policy.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG):

Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021) mandates that every development must achieve at least a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) (unless the development qualifies as exempt under the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024) and that every planning permission granted for the development of land in England shall be deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that development must not be begun unless a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority and the planning authority has approved the Plan.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must show how the development will achieve the required minimum 10% BNG using the statutory biodiversity metric tool and must demonstrate how the habitats will be managed and maintained for 30 years, starting from the date the development is completed. Off-site gains (on unregistered sites) and significant on-site enhancements will be secured over this period by way of a Legal Agreement.

The Applicant has submitted a Biodiversity Metric which demonstrates a 40% net gain in area habitat units and 24% gain in hedgerow units is achievable on site (significant gain), though it should be noted that the baseline biodiversity value on site is zero and therefore the development could therefore qualify for the *de minimis* exemption. Should the application be permitted a legal agreement will be required to secure the maintenance and monitoring of onsite gains given that a significant gain is being proposed.

Conclusions and Planning Balance:

It is acknowledged that the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a full 5-year housing land supply, and the NPPF Paragraph 11d presumption in favour or ‘tilted balance’ is therefore engaged. This balance requires permission to be granted, unless the adverse impact of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Neither footnote 7 nor paragraph 14 of the NPPF apply in this case.

As the site is not allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) or a made neighbourhood plan, the principle of development in this location is contrary to Policies 1, 2, 4 and 26 of the made Local Plan, as well as paragraphs 2, 11, 12 and 47 of the NPPF (2024) owing to the site’s location outside of the built-up area boundary. This conflict with the spatial strategy is afforded significant weight, though the weight is diminished by paragraph 11d being engaged. Overall, this conflict is awarded *moderate weight*.

As the Council currently cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, the provision of a dwelling towards this supply is afforded *significant weight*. However, the Council considers this benefit *limited* given the negligible contribution of one dwelling to the overall supply. The proposal is capable of achieving a 10% net gain for biodiversity and has not generated significant concerns relating to ecology or highways. These benefits are afforded *moderate weight*.

As discussed, concerns have been raised around the potential for amenity impacts as a result of surrounding agricultural and equestrian activities at the site. Though it is acknowledged that this activity is currently limited, there is nothing to prevent it from recommencing at any time where it would be considered incompatible with the proposed residential use. This conflict with Policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF (2015) is afforded *significant weight*.

Therefore, when considered against the requirements of the NPPF and the development plan, the fact that this proposal conflicts with the spatial strategy and continues to raise amenity concerns significantly and demonstrably outweighs the limited benefit of one addition dwelling. Accordingly, even when applying the tilted balance under paragraph 11d, the proposal does not constitute sustainable development. The application is therefore refused.

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
	281.25	281.25	0
		Total Gain	0
		Total Demolition	0

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 development would be located beyond a defined built-up area on a site not allocated within the Development Plan and would not be essential to this countryside location. The development would therefore be contrary to the overarching spatial strategy and hierarchy approach of concentrating development within defined settlements and advocating a planned approach to settlement expansion, contrary to policies 1, 2, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015). Notwithstanding the absence of a five-year land housing supply, and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) at paragraph 11(d), it is not considered that there are any material considerations in this instance which would outweigh harm arising from conflict with Local and Neighbourhood Plan policies in these regards.
2. The proposed development, by reason of its close proximity to other agricultural and equestrian land uses, would result in an unacceptable standard of accommodation vulnerable to noise, odour and general disturbance. Furthermore, the relationship between the proposed dwelling and the adjacent chalet building is considered to result in a loss of privacy, a degree of overlooking and an oppressive and overbearing impact with regard to outlook and light. The proposal would therefore create accommodation below the standard which the Council would reasonably expect, contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and paragraph 198 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

NOTE TO APPLICANT

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/26/0504

(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
Supporting Docs	PRELIMINARY ECOLOGICAL APPRAISAL AND PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT REPORT	NONE 001	24.03.2026
Supporting Statement	SUPPORTING STATEMENT	NONE	24.03.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	EXISTING	KCC3606/03 04/24cb	24.03.2026

