Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0937
Venters, East Street, Rusper, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 4RH

DESCRIPTION:

Permission in Principle for the conversion of an existing building to form 1no dwelling.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

No relevant planning history

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The application site is the parcel of land forming the residential curtilage serving the main dwelling Venters, a Grade II Listed Building. Within the red line boundary is a tennis court and a deep single storey garage. The application site is located to the north of East Street in a rural location outside of any built-up area. The site is therefore located within the countryside in policy terms.

The proposal would involve the conversion of the timber garage to a dwellinghouse and it is not detailed within the application if the tennis court would be removed. There are a small number of sporadic residential dwellings in the locality, mostly set within large plots. The development would utilise the existing vehicular access serving the neighbouring properties and have a modest associated residential curtilage to provide amenity space for the new dwelling. The application site is within a red zone for the Great Crested Newt. The proposal is in close proximity to a Public Right of Way 1499.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The submitted plans are indicative given the nature of the application. The application seeks permission in principle for the conversion of an existing building to form one dwelling. It is noted that there is no building within the site apart from a single storey garage and a tennis court which currently serves Venters.

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 17 - Exceptions Housing Schemes
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 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 – Parking

Rusper Neighbourhood plan 2018-2031
Policy RUS1: Spatial plan
Policy RUS3: Design
Policy RUS4: Local Heritage assets

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 11: Environmental Protection
Strategic Policy 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Strategic Policy 14: Countryside Protection
Strategic Policy 16: Protected Landscapes
Strategic Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Strategic Policy 19: 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 41: Rural Exception Homes

Supplementary Planning Guidance:
Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD (2017)
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2017)

Planning Advice Notes:
Facilitating Appropriate Development
Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

The Local Plan is currently at examination, where the Inspector's letter dated 30.10.2026 concludes that the plan is sound, subject to the proposed main modifications and the limited number of further changes discussed within the letter. The final report from the Inspector is anticipated to be received in January 2027, where changes to the draft Schedule of Main Modifications will need to be published for consultation. Given this letter and the status of the Local Plan, the policies contained within the Horsham District Local Plan 2023-2040 (HDLP) are considered to be of significant weight.

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:

WSCC Highways: Advice

The site is located off of East Street, an unclassified road subject to a speed restriction of 40 mph.

As per the application type which seeks permission in principle, only limited information has been provided. It would be assumed that the existing access from East Street will be utilised, with the existing private access tracks linking the maintained highway to the application site.

From inspection of WSCC mapping, there are no apparent visibility concerns with the existing point of access on East Street. The LHA does not anticipate that the proposed conversion to a single residential dwelling would give rise to a significant material intensification of use of this existing access point.

At Technical Details Consent stage, the LHA would expect details to be provided demonstrating the scale of the proposed dwelling (number of bedrooms), proposed vehicular access arrangements to the site and sufficient space for the parking and turning of vehicles in accordance with WSCC Parking Standards. To promote sustainable travel, details of secure and covered cycle parking provision would also be expected.

HDC Conservation officer: No objection

Satisfied the site has no direct functional or visual relationship with the listed building, Venters.

Southern Water: Comment

Water can be supplied to the development

Public Rights of Way: Advice

Having reviewed the available online documentation, the public rights of way appear to fall outside the red line boundary of the development. However, it is assumed that access would be via the existing access from East Street, which runs alongside Public Footpath 1499.

Therefore, at the Technical Details Consent stage, further information will be required to clarify how Public Footpath 1499 would be accommodated, protected and maintained during and following the proposed development.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:

Representations:

6 objections from three addresses. I am writing to object to the proposed development on the following material planning grounds.

- Harm to the Setting of Listed
- Impact on Character due to open character being infilled.
- Overdevelopment and Overcrowding
- Access issues as the private driveway already serves five dwellings
- Detrimental Impact on Residential Amenity (Noise, Light, Disturbance and Privacy)
- Traffic increase
- Infrastructure and Utility Strain

Parish Comments: No Objection

Subject to Horsham District Council being satisfied that the development complies with all relevant planning policies, highway safety requirements and residential amenity standards.

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 Permission in Principle consent route is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for residential development. It separates the consideration of matters of "principle" for the proposed development, from the "technical details" of the development. As such, the Permission in Principle route has two stages: the first being the "Permission in Principle" stage (subject of this current application), which establishes whether the site is suitable in-principle; and the second being the "Technical Details consent" stage which is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. The PPG 020 (Reference ID: 58-020-20180615) states that:

'It is not possible for conditions to be attached to a grant of permission in principle and its terms may only include the site location, the type of development and amount of development. Local planning authorities can inform applicants about what they expect to see at the technical details consent stage.'

The scope of the Permission in Principle application (being the first stage) is limited to location, land use, and amount of development, as explained in Paragraph 012 of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (Permission in Principle):

'The scope of permission in principle is limited to location, land use and amount of development. Issues relevant to these 'in principle' matters should be considered at the permission in principle stage. Other matters should be considered at the technical details consent stage. In addition, local authorities cannot list the information they require for applications for permission in principle in the same way they can for applications for planning permission.'

Location:

The application site lies outside any defined Built-Up Area Boundary, and therefore in planning policy terms forms part of the countryside, where new development is strictly controlled. The proposal seeks permission in principle for the conversion of one building to residential use.

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

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

Policy 10 of the HDPF states that proposals for the conversion of rural buildings to business and commercial uses will be considered favourably over residential in the first instance.

Strategic Policy 2 of the Horsham District Local Plan (HDLP) states that development will be permitted within towns and villages that have defined built-up area boundaries, as defined on the Policies Map, including on any suitable previously developed land. Development will be permitted in secondary settlements, provided also that it falls entirely within the secondary settlement boundary as defined on the Policies Map, and meets a specified criteria.

Strategic Policy 3 of the HDLP states that the growth of existing settlements across the District will continue to be supported in order to meet identified local housing. Outside defined built-up area boundaries or secondary settlements, the expansion of existing settlements will be supported where all of the following criteria are met: the level of expansion is appropriate to the scale and function of the settlement type; the development is demonstrated to meet the identified local housing needs; the impact of the development individually or cumulatively does not prejudice comprehensive long-term development in order not to conflict with the development strategy; the development is contained within an existing defensible boundary and the landscape and townscape character features are maintained and enhanced.

Strategic Policy 14 of the HDLP states that outside built-up area boundaries, secondary settlements and development plan allocations, the rural character and undeveloped nature of the countryside will be protected against inappropriate development having regard to national policy. In addition, all proposals must be appropriately integrated within the landscape and be of a scale appropriate to its countryside character and location. Development will be considered acceptable where it does not lead, either individually or cumulatively, to a significant increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside, and protects, conserves, and seeks to enhance, the key features and characteristics of the landscape character area in which it is located.

Strategic Policy 24 of the HDLP outlines that development will be supported provided that the layout, design and location of facilities and infrastructure prioritise the ability of residents and workers to safely and conveniently walk and cycle to meet their day-to-day work, shopping and leisure needs. Walking, cycling and wheeling routes serving the development, both on and off-site, should be safe, attractive, direct and legible, and where feasible, provision should be made for bus travel and infrastructure to serve the development.

Policy 32 of the HDLP relates to the conversion of agricultural and rural building to residential uses. Outside defined built-up areas and secondary settlements, conversion of redundant agricultural and forestry buildings to residential use will be supported where all of the following criteria are met:

1. The building is in established agricultural or forestry use and it can be demonstrated that:
    a) the current use is no longer necessary, or
    b) the proposal would secure the future of an existing heritage asset or a building worthy of retention.
2. The building is appropriate for conversion given its existing scale, architectural merit, character and setting, including its relationship with surrounding uses.
3. The existing building is not so derelict as to require substantial reconstruction, significant alteration or extension.
4. The site is served by an existing metalled road or other suitable access to the local road network.
5. The proposal would not result in a property with an overly domesticated or urban character, nor adversely affect the character, appearance or visual amenities and the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside of the wider area.
6. It is demonstrated that the proposal will enhance the immediate setting through its design and appearance, landscape design and materials.

No detailed information has been provided in respect of the subject building, but following the site visit, it is understood that the building is likely to have previously been in an incidental use. The building does not appear to be of any particular architectural merit, and no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the current use is no longer necessary. As such, it is not considered that the proposal would fully comply with Policy 32 of the HDLP, where the weight to be afforded this policy would be limited.

As the site is located outside of any defined built-up area boundary, Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF are of significant weight in the determination of the application. As stated within Policy 3 of the HDPF, development will be permitted within towns and villages that have defined built-up areas; with development in the countryside more strictly controlled through the provisions of Policy 4. This policy states that development outside of built up areas will only be supported where the site is allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan and adjoins a settlement edge.

At this stage, the proposed development would not accord with the spatial strategy as set out in Policies 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the HDPF and would therefore be unacceptable in principle. It is however recognised that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, where the most relevant policies directing growth across the District are out of date. Given the housing shortfall identified, the conflict afforded with these policies must be afforded reduced weight.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2026) was published on 17 August 2026 and is a material consideration in decision-making from the date of publication. Annex A of the NPPF sets out that development plan policies (or parts of policies) which are materially inconsistent with national decision-making policies in the Framework should be given very limited weight.

NPPF Policy S3 establishes a permanent presumption in favour of sustainable development and states that development outside settlement boundaries should be assessed in accordance with Policy S5. NPPF Policy S5 identifies specific forms of development outside settlements that should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects. The forms of development which are relevant in this instance include:

(c) The reuse, extension, alteration or replacement of an existing building, provided that the existing building is of permanent and substantial construction, is lawful in planning terms, and any extension or alteration will not result in a disproportionate increase in size compared to the existing building . In the case of proposals for a replacement building, it should be for the same use and not disproportionately larger than the one it replaces;

(d) The redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed-use including residential);

(j) Development which would address an evidenced unmet need (including, but not limited to, development proposals involving the provision of housing where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites or scores below 75% in the most recent Housing Delivery Test, and where the development would:

i. Be physically well-related to an existing settlement (unless the nature of the development would make this inappropriate) and be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure

NPPF Policy S5(4) further outlines that development which falls outside of a settlement boundary and does not fall within one of the categories set out in Policy S5 should only be approved in exceptional circumstances where the benefits of the proposal would substantially outweigh the adverse effects, including to the character of the countryside and in relation to promoting sustainable patterns of movement.

Policy HO11 of the NPPF states that development proposals for isolated homes in the countryside should only be supported where one or more of the following circumstances apply:

a. There is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;

b. The development would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets in accordance with policy HE4;
c. The development would reuse a redundant or disused building and enhance its immediate setting, including proposals which would secure the long-term reuse of a vacant or underused listed building;
d. The development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential building; or
e. The design is of exceptional quality, in that it:
    i. Is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and
    ii. Would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

The term “isolated” is not defined within the National Planning Policy Framework, but case law has confirmed that it should be given its ordinary objective meaning of remote and far away from other places, buildings and people, and separate or remote from a settlement, services, and facilities. It was concluded in the Braintree Judgement that a settlement would not necessarily exclude a cluster of dwellings. The application site is located within close proximity to a number of residential dwellings and other buildings, and given this spatial context is not considered to be “isolated” in its truest sense. The development is not however considered to be located within a group of houses as the application site is positioned to the north of the small cluster of buildings.

Policy CC2 of the NPPF states that development proposals, should where relevant, accord with policies TR3 and TR4 so that sustainable patterns of movement are prioritised, opportunities are taken to improve walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport, and infrastructure is provided to support the transition to zero-emission vehicles. Development should support good access to facilities in order to limit the need to travel, whether through the development’s location, through development densities which improve catchment populations for local services, or by incorporating community facilities and premises to support local employment opportunities.

Policy TR3 of the NPPF states that so that development is located where it can support sustainable patterns of movement, enable good accessibility for different users and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure, development proposals should reflect certain principles, taking into account the vision for the site, the type of development and its location. These principles include, among others, where development proposals could generate a significant amount of movement, in the context of the area within which they would be situated, situating development in areas that are sustainable (or which can be made so, taking into account planned improvements, including any provided as part of the development itself). This means the location should limit the need to travel, particularly by private car, and offer a genuine choice of transport modes for residents and users, unless the nature of the development would make this impractical.

The location of the application site for a dwellinghouse would gain support from (d) of NPPF S5. No evidence has however been submitted to demonstrate that the subject building would be of a permanent and substantial construction. It is not therefore possible to confirm compliance with (c) of NPPF S5. Notwithstanding this, while it is recognised that the site would represent previously developed land, where the development would contribute modestly to housing need within the District, the development would not be well related to an existing settlement and would not be in an appropriate and sustainable location as future occupiers of the development would not have good access to facilities where sustainable patterns of movement are available and prioritised. The proposal would therefore be in conflict with policies CC2 and TR3 of the NPPF.

The applicant advocates that the site constitutes previously developed land and the site itself would comprise residential amenity space including an insubstantial timber garage. Even so, the site is located in an unsustainable rural location, remote from day-to-day services and public transport connections. Any residential redevelopment would be heavily dependent on the private car and would not represent a sustainable pattern of growth. In this context, the proposal would constitute unsustainable residential development in the countryside, contrary to Policies 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy S5, CC2, and TR3 of the NPPF.

Whether there are any material considerations that would outweigh the conflict as identified, will be discussed in the Planning Balance and Conclusions section below

Land Use:

In the context of the Permission in Principle application, the consideration of 'land use' is taken to relate to whether the proposed land use change to residential is acceptable.

As outlined within this report, while it is recognised that the site would represent previously developed land, where the development would contribute modestly to housing need within the District, the development would not be well related to an existing settlement and would not be in an appropriate and sustainable location as future occupiers of the development would not have good access to facilities where sustainable patterns of movement are available and prioritised. The proposal would therefore be in conflict with policies CC2 and TR3 of the NPPF. In this context, the proposal would constitute unsustainable residential development in the countryside, contrary to Policies 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy S5, CC2, and TR3 of the NPPF.

Whether there are any material considerations that would outweigh the conflict as identified, will be discussed in the Planning Balance and Conclusions section below

Amount of Development:

Policies 25, 32, and 33 of the HDPF promote development that protects, conserves, and enhances the landscape character from inappropriate development. Proposals should take into account landscape characteristics, with development seeking to provide an attractive, functional and accessible environment that complements the locally distinctive character of the district. Buildings should contribute to a sense of place, and should be of a scale, massing, and appearance that is of a high standard or design and layout which relates sympathetically to the landscape and built surroundings.

Policy 19 of the HDLP relates to development quality and seeks to ensure that all development is of a high-quality and inclusive design, informed by an understanding of the local context, in order to conserve and enhance the natural and built environment and deliver sustainable buildings and places. The Policy also seeks to ensure development makes efficient use of land, responds sympathetically to its surroundings, protects the amenity of existing and future occupiers, and provides safe, accessible environments that promote sustainable travel and reduce opportunities for crime and antisocial behaviour.

Policy RUS3 of the Rusper Neighbourhood Plan states that proposals for new development, including extensions to existing buildings, must be of the highest design standards, and will be required to reflect the character and scale of surrounding buildings.

Within the context of a Permission in Principle application the consideration of 'amount' is limited to whether the number of dwellings proposed is appropriate in relation to the size of the site, having regard to the site's countryside location and position outside the defined settlement boundary.

The proposed development would introduce 1no dwelling onto the site, contained within a converted building. While the applicant has provided an indicative Location Plan identifying the building and lan, no detailed information has been provided.

submitted plan demonstrates that a single dwelling could be accommodated on the site. A single dwelling is not considered excessive having regard to the size of the site and there is no evidence to suggest that one dwelling could not be physically accommodated. As such, the amount of development is considered acceptable.

Other Matters:

The matters of scale, design, layout, and access for the proposed development are reserved for consideration under the subsequent "Technical Details" application.

Drainage and Flood Risk:

The Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning identifies the entire application site as being located within Flood Zone 1, which represents land at the lowest probability of fluvial or tidal flooding. In addition, the updated Surface Water Flood Risk mapping confirms that the site is at very low risk of surface water flooding, with no identified flow paths or ponding areas affecting the developable area. Having regard to the flood risk policies contained within Chapter 18 of the NPPF (2026), the site is located within an area of lowest flood risk and no further flood risk assessment is required under Policy F4(2) of the NPPF (2026).

Ecology

Given the outline nature of this Permission in Principle application, detailed ecological information has not been submitted at this stage. Should the principle of development be supported, ecological survey work and appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures would be required at the Technical Details Consent stage to ensure compliance with Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), the NPPF (2026), and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).

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.

A minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity value will be required to be demonstrated at the Technical Details Consent stage, through submission of a habitat baseline assessment and Biodiversity Metric calculation in accordance with the Environment Act 2021 and the Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (General) Regulations 2024.

Conclusions:

The proposal seeks permission in principle for the conversion of a building to 1no. residential dwelling on a site outside of any defined built-up area and within the countryside.

The Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, where the most relevant policies directing growth across the District are out of date. The weight to be afforded to the relevant policies within the HDPF are therefore afforded reduced weight.

The Council have published a guidance document titled "Shaping Development in the Horsham District" where it is recognised that there are likely to be applications submitted outside of defined built-up area boundaries and on unallocated sites. Given the lack of a 5-year housing land supply, and the principles behind Policy 4 of the HDPF, the guidance document outlines that applications which meet the following criteria will be considered positively:

- The site adjoins the existing settlement edge as defined by the built-up area boundary;
- The level of expansion is appropriate to the scale and function of the settlement the proposal relates to;

- The proposal demonstrates that it meets local housing needs or will assist the retention and enhancement of community facilities and services;
- The impact of the development individually or cumulatively does not prejudice comprehensive long-term development; and
- The development is contained within an existing defensible boundary and the landscape character features are maintained and enhanced.

The application site does not adjoin a settlement edge as defined by the built-up area boundary, and the development would not therefore meet all of the above criteria. The proposed development would not therefore be fully compliant with the guidance document, and no weight would be attributed to this.

It is recognised that the proposal would result in the redevelopment of previously developed land, where this is supported by Policy S5 of the NPPF. Compliance with this aspect of the policy would attract significant weight in the consideration of the application.

The development would however be distanced from facilities, services, and amenities, being located approximately 1km (as the crow flies) from the defined village of Rusper. The site does not benefit from a dedicated footway or public footpath, where the street itself is not lit; and in this context, the site would not be served by by viable or attractive footpaths, and the site would thereby have poor access for walking, wheeling, and cycling. Furthermore, there would be poor access to public transport options. Future occupiers would therefore be heavily reliant on private vehicles for their day-to-day needs, and the proposed development would conflict with Policies CC2 and TR3 of the NPPF which seeks to promote sustainable patterns of movement.

While the proposed development would contribute to an identified housing need, on previously developed land and within an existing building, the contribution of 1no. dwelling to the housing supply would be modest. The benefits arising from the scheme would, when considered overall, be of moderate weight.

For the reasons outlined above, the application site would be an inappropriate site for residential development, where the proposal would fail to comply with the overarching spatial strategy contained within the HDPF and emerging HDLP and the policy directive contained within the NPPF.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason for Refusal:

1 The development would be sited within an unsustainable location in the countryside, outside of a defined built-up area boundary, and on a site not allocated for housing development within the Horsham District Planning Framework or Rusper Neighbourhood Plan. It is not considered that there are any material considerations which would outweigh this harm, with the development contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Policy 1 of the Rusper Neighbourhood Plan, and Policies S5, CC2 and TR3 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026).

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/26/0937

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

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location plan		TQRQM26141230559027	05.06.2026
Supporting Statement	Planning	P-099a	05.06.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Hannah Darley Date: 19.11.2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial Tamara Dale Date: 19.11.2026