PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

DATE:	1st December 2026
DEVELOPMENT:	Demolition of existing buildings and the redevelopment of the site to provide 150 dwellings, including affordable housing, land for the community land trust, works to public right of way and associated landscaping, open space and infrastructure.
SITE:	Thakeham Mushrooms, Storrington Road, Thakeham, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 3DY
WARD:	West Chiltington, Thakeham and Ashington
APPLICATION:	DC/26/0266
APPLICANT:	**Applicant Name:** Bellway Homes Ltd (Strategic Land) **Address:** Woolsington House, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE13 8BF **Agent Name:** John Ainsworth, Savills **Address:** 74 High Street, SevenoaksTN13 1JR

NATIONAL SCHEME OF DELEGATION:

In accordance with the Council's constitution and the National Scheme of Delegation this application has met the criteria for consideration for referral to the Planning Committee for determination for the following reason(s):

- The application represents a departure from the development plan
- More than eight persons in different households or bodies have made written representations within the consultation period raising material planning considerations that are inconsistent with the recommendation of the Head of Development and Building Control.

Reason for referral to the Planning Committee:
The Nominated Officer and Nominated Member (neither of whom have an interest in the application and/or are the local ward member for the application site) have reviewed the application and this report and have determined that the proposals raise matters of economic, social and/or environmental significance and/or significant planning matters insofar that development is proposed outside of a settlement boundary that does not in principle comply with the adopted development plan leading to significant environmental, economic and social considerations including the loss of employment floorspace, provision of 150 homes and provision of significant public open space for the benefit of the community. These are of sufficient significance as to warrant determination by the Planning Committee.

RECOMMENDATION:
To approve full planning permission subject to appropriate conditions and the completion of the necessary section 106 agreement within four months of the decision of this Committee, or such longer period as is agreed by the Director of Place acting reasonably and properly.

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

1.1 To consider the planning application.

Contact Officer: Sam Whitehouse **Tel: 01403 215206**

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

1.2 The application site relates to approximately 25ha of land located to the north western part of the village of Abingworth. The site sits to the west side of Storrington Road outside of the defined build up area boundary of Abingworth and south of the village of Thakeham. The site comprises the former Monaghans Mushrooms (now known as the 'Thakeham Mushrooms site') and a large area of undeveloped agricultural land and woodland.

1.3 The former Thakeham Mushrooms site is approximately 13.45ha and includes a range of buildings used for the former factory, now closed. The buildings are mainly to the eastern side of the site fronting Storrington Road. The buildings vary in height including a 3 storey administration block and large industrial buildings used for mushroom growing. These buildings are mostly comprised of red brick with corrugated steel sheet roofs. The northern part of the site slopes upwards and is an open area. The site includes a vehicle access from Storrington Road with hardstanding throughout much of the eastern half of the site. The factory has been vacant since 2022. The agricultural land is on the western half of the site set over 4 core field parcels with mature woodland boundaries. This land is approximately 11.6ha and is located to the west of footpath 2474 which divides the site in half.

1.4 To the east of the site on the opposite side of Storrington Road is the Abingworth Meadows development site of which phases 1, 2 and 3 are now complete and occupied amounting to some 209 dwellings. The football pitch, changing rooms, cricket pitch, cricket pavilion, Village Hall, LEAP, attenuation pond, shop/café and vets have all been completed and are in use. Officers note that the allotments have not yet been delivered in full and the nursery is currently being used as a Community Children and Family Hub run by the Parish.

1.5 To the immediate south east boundary of the site is Massey Close. This cul-de-sac was also granted permission under the original Abingworth Meadows permission as local worker units. The land to the south of the application and north of High Bar Lane was granted consent for 28 dwellings in 2025 with work not yet having commenced. (DC/23/2152).

1.6 To the north east of the site lies Thakeham Village. The village includes Thakeham Conservation Area and several listed buildings fronting The Street. The boundary with the South Downs National Park is a significant distance to the south, beyond Storrington and Sullington. Storrington includes an Air Quality Management Area. Further to the west of the site, separated by fields, lies the village of West Chiltington Common.

1.7 The whole area is within a 'Bat Sustenance Zone'. This is a consideration for ecological impacts for developments related to The Mens Nature Reserve and Ebernoe Common Nature Reserve, which are both classed as Special Areas of Conservation within the district of Chichester to the west. One of the special qualities of these areas is that they host protected species, including the Barbastelle and Bechstein's bats, which use the bat sustenance zone.

1.8 Officers note the application site excludes a parcel of approximately 4.4ha of the former Thakeham Mushrooms site located to the west of footpath 2474. This area comprises made ground / derelict buildings and Is entirely enclosed by the application site.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

1.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of 150 dwellings including affordable housing, land for the community land trust, works to public right of way and associated landscaping, public open space, a storage building, ancillary parking and all associated infrastructure.

Access.

1.9 Access would be via would be a priority junction with right hand turn ghost lane onto Storrington Road. Pedestrian access would also be available via a secondary emergency

access into Storrington Road, a pedestrian access onto Storrington Road and via the PRoW footpath 2474.

Layout and Design

1.10 The site would be set out as an extension to the village with a main primary street leading west from Storrington Road from which a hierarchy of secondary and shared surface roads stem. This layout is residential in character and would be broadly reflective is reflective of Abingworth to the south and Abingworth Meadows to the east. This layout is broadly similar to the scheme previously considered under DC/24/0021, however it would have a substantially lower density of 19 dph rather than 32 dph.

1.11 The dwellings would be a mix of two storey detached, semi-detached, short rows of terraces and maisonettes. No flat blocks are proposed. The designs would be rural and residential in character with red and brown brickwork with dark weatherboarding and hanging tiles dispersed through the site.

Affordable Housing / Housing Mix:

1.12 The proposal would provide 150 dwellings, of which 35% would be affordable housing with 46 of the affordable dwellings would be provided to M4(2) standard for accessible and adaptable dwellings whilst 4 affordable dwellings would be provided as 2-bedroom M4(3) dwellings suitable for wheelchair users. The following affordable and market housing mix is proposed:

Open Market (97 units):

	No. Units
1-bed	0 (0%)
2-bed	20 (21%)
3-bed	49 (51%)
4+ bed	28 (29%)

Affordable housing (53 units):

	No. Affordable Rent	No. Shared Ownership	Total Units
1-bed	6	0	6 (11%)
2-bed	15	6	21 (40%)
3-bed	14	8	22 (42%)
4 + bed	2	2	4 (8%)

Open Space

1.13 A village green and play area (LEAP) is proposed to the west of the proposed dwellings. The LEAP would have a total area of approximately 400sqm. An area of BNG / green space is proposed to the north of the proposed dwellings and approximately 11.6a of agricultural land is proposed to be provided to the parish as part of the development to form public open space.

Community Land Trust (CLT)

1.14 The proposal also includes an area of land (1.1 ha) proposed to be transferred to the local Community Land Trust (CLT). This land is located to the east of the site and would be suitable for the development of approximately 6 additional dwellings. Any development within this land would be subject to a future planning application.

<u>Amendments since the application was submitted:</u>

1.2 Since the application was first submitted, the following amendments have been secured:

- Alterations to the application site boundary to include the provision of 11.6ha of open space west of footpath 2474.
- Provision of an additional affordable unit.

- Minor amendments to the site layout including adjacent to Massey Close.
- Changes to the sustainable transport strategy.
- Minor changes to the surface water drainage

2 INTRODUCTION

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

2.1 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

2.2 The following Policies are considered to be relevant to the assessment of this application:

National Planning Policy Framework (Dec 2026)
S3: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
S4: Principle of development within settlements
S5: Principle of development outside settlements
S6: Neighbourhood plans and the presumption
CC2: Mitigation of climate change
CC3: Adaptation to climate change
HO7: Meeting the need for homes
HO8: Providing affordable homes
L2: Making effective use of land
L3: Achieving appropriate densities
DP3: Key principles for well-designed places
DP4: The design process
TR3: Locating development in sustainable locations
TR4: Street design, access and parking
TR6: Assessing transport impacts
TR8: Public rights of way
HC3: Community facilities and public service infrastructure serving new development
HC4: Proposals for new and improved community facilities, public service infrastructure and development providing public health benefits
P2: Ground conditions
P3: Living conditions and pollution
P4: Impact of development on existing activities
F4: Assessing flood risk for decision-making
F7: Ensuring development is safe from flooding
F8: Sustainable drainage systems and watercourses
N2: Improving the natural environment
N3: Trees in new development
N6: Areas of particular importance for biodiversity and geodiversity
HE4: Securing the conservation of heritage assets
HE5: Assessing effects on heritage assets
HE6: Proposals affecting designated heritage assets
HE7: Decisions on non-designated heritage assets
HE9: Conservation areas

Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF 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 9 – Employment Development
Policy 10 – Rural Economic Development

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 27 - Settlement Coalescence
Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles
Policy 34 - Cultural and Heritage Assets
Policy 35 - Strategic Policy: Climate Change
Policy 36 - Strategic Policy: Appropriate Energy Use
Policy 37 - Sustainable Construction
Policy 38 - Strategic Policy: Flooding
Policy 39 - Strategic Policy: Infrastructure Provision
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking

Thakeham Parish Neighbourhood Plan (January 2017)
Thakeham1: A Spatial Plan for the Parish
Thakeham3: Horticultural Land off Storrington Road ('Mushroom Site')
Thakeham6: Design
Thakeham10: Green Infrastructure & Valued Landscapes

Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19)
Policy 1: Sustainable Development
Policy 2: Development Hierarchy
Policy 3: Settlement Expansion
Policy 6: Climate Change
Policy 7: Appropriate Energy Use
Policy 8: Sustainable Design and Construction
Policy 9: Water Neutrality
Policy 10: Flooding
Policy 11: Environmental Protection
Policy 12: Air Quality
Policy 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 14: Countryside Protection
Policy 15: Settlement Coalescence
Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 19: Development Quality
Policy 20: Development Principles
Policy 21: Heritage Assets and Managing Change within the Historic Environment
Policy 23: Infrastructure Provision
Policy 24: Sustainable Transport
Policy 25: Parking
Policy 27: Inclusive Communities, Health and Wellbeing
Policy 28: Community Facilities and Uses
Policy 29: New Employment
Policy 30: Enhancing Existing Employment
Policy 37: Housing Provision
Policy 38: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Policy 39: Affordable Housing
Policy 40: Improving Housing Standards in the District

West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (2018)
Policy M9 - Safeguarding Minerals

Other Relevant Guidance and Policies:

- HDC Planning Advice Note: Shaping Development in Horsham
- HDC Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2017)
- HDC Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2017)
- WSCC Supplementary Planning Guidance (September 2020) - revised county parking standards and transport contributions methodology
- Air Quality and Emissions Mitigation Guidance for Sussex (2020)
- HDC Planning Advice Note: Biodiversity and Green infrastructure (2022)
- HDC Sports, Open Space and Recreation Assessment (2014)
- HDC Open Space, Sport & Recreation Review (2021**)**
- HDC Play Strategy 2017-2027
- HDC Site Specific Allocations of Land Development Plan Document (2007)
- HDC Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan

PLANNING HISTORY AND RELEVANT APPLICATIONS

DC/07/1629	Use of building and adjacent land for coach storage and maintenance	Permitted on 09.01.2008
DC/08/1064	Temporary change of use of 2 x agricultural offices to Parish offices for a period of 5 years	Permitted on 17.07.2008
DC/10/0860	Fuel storage building	Permitted on 31.08.2010
DC/11/1236	Prior notification relating to the installation of solar panels onto the roofs of buildings on the Chesswood site	Permitted on 12.07.2011
DC/12/1028	Change of use of building from Fuel Store Building (DC/10/0860) to Tray and Crate Storage and Filling involving external alterations to the building	Permitted on 28.01.2014
DC/12/0841	Demolition of existing growing rooms and surrounding ancillary buildings, removal of compost production on site. Erection of new growing rooms (farms) required for the cultivation of mushrooms, a replacement office building, staff cafeteria, pack house building, ancillary plant structures and provision of open space and landscaped areas (including re-directed footpaths). Refurbishment and extension of existing production and package buildings including alterations to entrance of the site.	Permitted on 19.04.2013
DC/13/1327	Extension of temporary change of use of 2 x agricultural offices to parish offices pemitted under DC/08/1064 for a further period of 2 years	Permitted on 16.08.2008
DC/15/2417	Erection of a pump house and associated covered water storage tank	Permitted on 27.11.2015
DC/19/0350	Alteration of an existing access, associated engineering operations and landscaping	Permitted on 14.06.2019
DC/24/0021	Demolition of existing buildings and the phased redevelopment of the site as a residential led development comprising	Application Refused on 31.07.2024

	247 dwellings and flexible non-residential floorspace (Use Class E), with works to public right of way and associated landscaping, open space and infrastructure.	
APP/Z3825/W/24/3350094	Appeal to application DC/24/0021 for 'Demolition of existing buildings and the phased redevelopment of the site as a residential led development comprising 247 dwellings and flexible non-residential floorspace (Use Class E), with works to public right of way and associated landscaping, open space and infrastructure.'	Appeal Dismissed on 13.06.2025

3 OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

3.1 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

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

3.2 **HDC Environmental Health** - No Objection
[Summary] The HDC Environmental Health Team have provided 6 comments during the course of the application dated 13/03/2026, 26/03/2026, 29/04/2026, 09/09/2026, 12/10/2026, and 13/10/2026. The Officer's latest comments can be summarised as follows:

Air Quality
Following an initial request for amendments to the submitted Air Quality Assessment (Cass Allen, February 2026) the Officer is satisfied with the calculated damage sum of £41,406. This is agreed a final detail of cost mitigation is requested via condition.

Noise
A scheme of noise and vibration attenuation and ventilation is requested via condition.

Land Contamination
In an initial comment the Officer raised a number of matters including a request for confirmation that the RSK Environment Limited Geo-environmental and Geotechnical Investigation, dated 10.10.22 remains accurate and consideration of the potential for polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) on site historic fires where firefighting substances have been used. A subsequent comment confirms that these details can be secured via condition.

Construction Management
A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) is requested via condition.

3.3 **HDC Housing Officer –** Further Information
[Summary] The Housing Officer has provided 3 comments during the course of the application dated 27/08/2026 and 27/08/2026. The latest comment confirms that the proposal would provide 53 affordable dwellings, however, further information is requested regarding engagement with a Registered Provider.

3.4 **HDC Arboricultural Officer:** Advice
The Arboricultural Officer has provided 3 comments during the course of the application dated 18/03/26, 02/09/26 and 07/10/26

The Officer has raised concern regarding the routeing of the foul drain connection within the RPAs of the boundary Oak trees. The Officer has therefore recommended that this drainage run is relocated outside RPAs, or if minded to approve, a condition is placed to ensure trenchless installation. The officer further confirms a trenchless method is viable. The officer also note the row of Lombardy poplars is proposed to be removed given their condition, this is not disputed however would result in landscape impacts. This should be mitigated for with new planting.

3.5 **HDC Waste and Recycling**: No Objection
No Objection is raised regarding the proposed refuse strategy, however, the officer notes that block paving is susceptible to staining.

3.6 **HDC Landscape Architect:** No Objection
[Summary] The Landscape officer has provided 6 comments during the course of this application dated 17/03/2026, 20/03/2026, 28/04/2026, 09/09/2026, 30/09/2026 and 26/10/2026.

Initial comments from the officer raised no objection to the principle of the scheme in landscape terms and noted that the site has capacity for the proposal without significant adverse landscape and visual effects on the wider landscape. The Officer noted the site's topography and requested details of levels across the site in addition to a number of amendments including amendments to internal pedestrian routes, boundary treatments, SUDS, plants and minor amendments to site the site layout. These amendments have subsequently been provided and found acceptable.

Following the amendments to the application red line boundary the Officer additionally requested configuration of how retained land would be accessed. This has subsequently been provided and found acceptable.

3.7 **HDC Heritage Officer:** No Objection
[Summary] The development site is adjacent to Thakeham conservation area, however, this would not be visible from the site. Increased noise, light and perceived could undermine the tranquillity of the historic village core and cause harm to the character of the conservation area, however the distance and degree of separation is such that the Officer is satisfied there will be no harmful impact to the character of the conservation area and this character will be preserved. The impacts on Old House Farm on High Barn Lane are also considered with the Officer noting the degree of separation from the development.

3.8 **HDC Ecology (BNG):** No Objection
HDC's BNG Officer has provided 5 comments during the course of the application dated.

The Officers latest comment confirms no objection is raised and that the development will have an overall +11.38% net gain (+13.18 units) in area habitat and an +29.28% net gain (+2.06 units) in hedgerows. The officer has noted a number of minor clarification that remain outstanding, however, has outlined that these can be addressed prior to discharging the deemed biodiversity gain condition and S106 obligations. In addition, the proposal constitutes significant on-site BNG and therefore is therefore required to be secured via S106 agreement.

3.9 **HDC Economic Development:** Objection
[Summary] HDC Economic Development have provided 2 comments during the course of the application dated 13.03.26 and 24.08.26.

The most recent comment confirms no objection is raised in principle to the loss of the existing commercial premises, however, the Officer notes the limited supply of modern, fit-for-purpose commercial premises within the District and the loss of commercial floorspace

and employment space. The Officer maintains disappointment that there is no employment-generating element within the scheme.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

3.10 **Ecology Consultant:** No Objection
HDC's Ecology consult has provided 3 comments during the course of the application, each of which raise no objection.

An initial comment notes the presence of an unidentified bat and Common Pipistrelle in building B8 and a summer day roost for a Soprano Pipistrelle in building B11a and that the is foraging and commuting habitat on site. The Officer supports the mitigations measures and highlights the need for a Bat Mitigation Class Licence.

The Officer also considered the potential impact on Hazel Dormouse and mobile protected and Priority species concluding that with appropriate mitigation measures secured, the development can be made acceptable.

Consideration is also given the potential impaction internationally protected sites concluding that h with mitigation, there will be no Adverse Effect international sites. A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has also been undertaken.

The Officers second comment confirms the officer's comments following amendments to the red line boundary.

The Officers latest comments specifically addresses the potential impact to Black Redstart on site. The Officer concludes that the mitigation measures proposed within the Ecological Method Statement for Black Redstart (Aspect Ecology, November 2026) are appropriate and should be secured via condition.

No objection is therefore raised subject to the following conditions:

- Accordance with Ecological Appraisal and Black Red start mitigation measures
- Confirmation of a bat licence
- Confirmation of Hazel Dormouse licence
- Construction environmental management plan for biodiversity
- Biodiversity enhancement strategy
- Wildlife sensitive lighting design scheme

3.11 **Natural England:** Standing Advice
Standing Advice has been provided.

3.12 **Environment Agency (EA):** No Objection
[Summary] Comments have been provided related to the potential for groundwater contamination owing to the sites historic agricultural use, the site's location within Source Protection Zone 2 and upon secondary aquifer A overlying a principal aquifer and the precents of existing boreholes on site which may present a preferential pathway for potential contamination. The EA have therefore requested 7 conditions to secure:

- Contamination remediation strategy
- Remediation verification report
- Monitoring
- Investigation and a remediation of Previously Unidentified Contamination
- Restriction on surface water drainage
- Future management of boreholes
- Restrictions on Piling

3.13 **NatureSpace**: No Objection

NatureSpace have provided 3 comments during the course of the application dated, 19/03/2026, 16/07/2026 and 27/10/2026. The Officers latest comment raises no objection subject to the submission of a Precautionary Working Methods statement produced a suitably qualified ecologist and either submitted to the LPA prior to determination or secured via a pre-commencement condition. Specifically, this statement should include measures on material and waste storage, ditch management, and steps taken should GCN be discovered onsite.

3.14 **Southern Water:** Advice

[Summary] Southern Water have provided 3 comments during the course of the application. The latest comment clarifies that Southern Water can facilitate fresh water supply to the site, however, there remains inadequate capacity in the foul network. The comment clarifies that Southern Water has undertaken a capacity check of the impact that the additional foul sewerage flows from the proposed development will have on the existing public sewer network. This study indicates that these additional flows may lead to a minor increased risk of impact on the sewer network. A condition is therefore requested to require that occupation of the development to be phased and implemented to align with sewerage network reinforcement.

3.15 **WSCC Highways:** Objection

[Summary] WSCC Highways have provided 3 comments during the course of this application dated 16/03/2026, 21/09/2026 and 20/10/2026. The Officer's latest position is summaries as follows:

Access

Site access would be a priority junction with right hand turn ghost lane; this has been subject to a Stage 1 RSA and is considered acceptable.

Trip generation and junction modelling

TRICS has been utilised to demonstrate the scheme would result in an estimated 121 AM peak vehicle movements and 106PM peak movements with a daily total of 982 vehicle movements. Junction modelling has been undertaken demonstrating no highways capacity concerns subject to proportional contribution to improvements at the Buck Barn and Washington Junctions (£41,472).

Internal layout

The officer requested amendments to the internal layout to ensure suitable vehicle tracking for fire tender and refuse vehicles. These have subsequently been provided and are considered acceptable.

Parking

A total of 360 Parking spaces are to be provided, in excess of the WSCC parking demand calculator indicated provision of 321 and the 10% acceptable variation of this (353). Garage parking is also under reported.

Sustainable Transport

The Officer considers the developments location to be unsustainable and contrary to NPPF 2026 policies TR3 and TR6 and it would not encourage and enable an increase in environmentally sustainable means of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport and thereby minimise the impact of car journeys.. The Officer notes no vision has been developed for the site. Improved pedestrian connections are to be provided and there would be no dedicated cycle provision. The bus service would have a limited service with a single trip per day (M-F) between Horsham and Storrington on the 74A and the 74B and 71 services providing a single trip on a single day.

The officer notes a number of sustainable transports are proposed:

- A Mobility Hub incorporating an electric bike hire scheme, delivery hub and car club. The Officer requested further details of this noting that electric vehicles would still result in vehicle traffic, and e-bikes are unlikely to result in any significant uptake.
- Traffic calming along the B2139 Storrington Road. The Officer notes this could improve the perception of safety within the village and to a small extent encourage trips to be undertaken on foot or by bike these would be limited to facilities within the village. The officer notes this is proposed as a financial contribution of £45,000 to the parish council and as such there are no timescales for implementation or certainty that the scheme would be delivered.
- PRoW Improvements. The Officer notes that these are unlikely to significantly reduce traffic.

Appeal Decision DC/24/0021 / APP/Z3825/W/24/3350094
The Officer notes the inspector's previous decision on application DC/24/0021 which concluded the site would not be sustainably located' and 'would not robustly secure appropriate realistic or attractive alternative travel choices' and that the scheme did not overcome the 'locational disadvantages of the site or materially reduce the reliance on private vehicles'.

3.16 **WSCC Lead Local Flood Authority:** No Objection
[Summary] WSCC LLFA have provided 5 comments during the course of this application dated 20/03/2026, 15/06/2026, 01/09/2026, 02/10/2026 and 27/10/2026.

During the course of the application WSCC LLFA have requested further information / amendments including survey work to demonstrate the suitability of downstream connection, consideration of exceedance events including the submission of an exceedance flow routing plan, and reduction in drainage drain times.

Following amendments to the scheme which would amended the outfall from an existing drainage pipe to a new connection, the LLFA have additionally requested clarifications to drainage calculations and clarification that the proposed discharge location is deliverable.

The Officers latest comment confirms that this connection is considered acceptable where the applicant can confirm they have the appropriate permissions to allow the construction of this outfall. The Officer has additionally raised no objection to the original outfall proposal, provided that the existing pipe can be surveyed for onward connectivity.

3.17 **WSCC Rights of Way:** No Objection
The WSCC Public Rights of Way Officer has provided 2 comments during the course of the application, dated 18/03/2026 and 02/09/2026. The Officer has raised no objection subject to obligations under S106 agreement to secure upgrade works and financial contributions.

3.18 **WSCC Education:** Advice
[Summary] At this time West Sussex Education Services do not have any concerns with the proposed development. Should the application be approved, it will be CIL liable. CIL will be sought by the County Council as local education authority from the charging authority to provide the necessary education mitigation for the proposed development. (For the avoidance of doubt, Education covers all children from 0-18 and up to 25 for SEND pupils)

3.19 **WSCC Minerals and Waste:** No Objection
[Summary] On behalf of the MWPA, please be advised that we have no objection to the proposed development from a mineral safeguarding standpoint, (noting the majority of the application site comprises previously developed land, and is only partially located within the mineral safeguarding consultation area).

3.20 **Archaeology:** Advice

[Summary] The site is partly within an Archaeological Notification Area due to the previous discovery of Early Medieval settlement remains. The application does not propose development within the area of the ANA but there is still potential for archaeological remains on the remainder of the site and so archaeological investigations are required.

3.21 **WSCC Fire and Rescue Service:** Comment
A comment has been provided advising conditions to secure fire hydrants.

3.22 **Sussex Police Designing Out Crime Officer:** Comments
Secured by Design Residential Guidance is provided. The Officer notes the proposal has good active frontage provided with street and public areas overlooked. Advice is given regarding Parking and EV charging, natural surveillance for play areas, footpath and bicycle route design, cycle storage, lighting and construction.

3.23 **Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner:** Objection
Sussex Police have outlined the proposal would result in an increased population of 360 persons resulting in an additional 64 incidents per year for Sussex Police to attend and 19 additional recorded crimes. A 'cost' of policing new growth has been provided equating to £13,000. It is outlined that the installation of an ANPR camera along Thakeham Road. In the absence of this contribution the Officer objects to the proposal.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

3.24 **Representations:**

A total of 380 letters have been received from 287 addresses.

371 letters have been received from 278 addresses objecting to the Planning Application, raising the following matters:

Quantum of development
- Thakeham is already overdeveloped and cannot take more development.
- Second major development in the area.
- A number of new development has been built in Thakeham in the last 10 years.
- 4 existing sites in Thakeham with approval for 180 houses already still to be built
- Thakeham already has enough houses / it's fair share of houses / growth in Thakeham has been too rapid.
- Cumulative impact of development in Thakeham should be considered
- Homes are not needed.
- The current development in Thakeham is not yet complete.
- Number of dwellings proposed should be decreased and development should be less dense.
- Homes would be too expensive
- Level of development will imbalance housing market.
- New houses are being built in Billinghurst
- Alternative sites are available.
- Thakeham should remain a small village / the village will be ruined
- Development of the site is being salami sliced

Land to the west of the application site (Second consultation / post-amended plans)
- Community benefit of public open space is recognised
- There would be landscape harm from introducing a recreational use
- The developer is wanting to add a further 85 homes on the western side of the site at a later date.
- Concerns over the retained land and potential for a further 85 / future development

- Resident's objections should be considered irrespective of the parish council's comment
- What would happen to retained land, this should not degenerate into an eyesore

Land to the west of the application site (First consultation / pre-amended plans)
- Land to the west is owned by the developer
- No legally binding proposal for the unused area of the site.
- Additional housing will be sought on remainder of the land
- Land to the west could be gifted to the community / used for community such as play parks, tennis courts, allotments etc
- Remainder of site should be used by the parish as a nature reserve.
- A master plan should be provided for the whole development.
- The developers want 600 homes on the site.
- The development of the entire site should be assessed now to avoid piecemeal development

Redevelopment / Alternative use of the site
- Something needs to be done with the land.
- Redevelopment should be for commercial and leisure.
- Redevelopment should be for a Solar farm
- Area should be used as a reservoir
- Land should be returned to agriculture, horticulture or use as a vineyard.
- Land should be re-wilded and used for walking and cycling

Community Land Trust (CLT) land
- It should be clearly set out how this land would be used or what the CLT would develop.
- CLT is new and has no track record and concerns over level of experience to deliver a development.
- Any transfer of land should be necessary in planning terms and assessed on it's merits.

Employment
- Loss of employment land
- Loss of substantial agricultural/horticultural facility from the economy.
- Proposal would not provide jobs lost from the Mushroom Farm.
- There is no employment within the village
- Where are the business units behind the old-pre school

Wildlife and Ecology
- The site has an abundance of wildlife which would be impacted
- Fauna and flora and habitat severely impacted / destroyed.
- Increased pollution, including light pollution would impact wildlife.
- Tree removal will impact bats
- Bats live in mushroom buildings
- Foxes and fox dens would be impacted
- The site has habitat for dormice
- Two barn owl nests in the older buildings
- Endangered bird species including Linnets and Black Redstarts have been sited on the site
- Loss of hedgerows and mature tress which cannot be adequately replaced
- BNG would be in deficit due to lass of grassland.

Sustainability
- Thakeham is not a sustainable location.

- Thakeham and future residents would be dependent on cars / all facilities and services would require car to travel too.
- Previous appeal was dismissed as the site was not sustainable. Refusals reasons remain valid.
- Degree of parking demonstrates sites unsustainability.
- Only elderly people would use a minibus and dial a ride only allow 1 trip per week.
- Roads are not safe for cycling with blind bends
- Roads are unsuitable for children cycling to school.
- Home working is decreasing, increasing commuting
- Sustainability mitigation would not overcome sustainability concerns / reduce reliance on cars

Public Transport
- Any development should improve public transport.
- Proposals for enhanced bus services are not guaranteed and would be time limited.
- Railway station is approximately 8.2km away
- Public transport is infrequent and bus service is limited with 1 bus a day

Previous appeal
- Reducing the number of dwellings does not address the underlying concerns identified by the inspector.
- Proposal does not address appeal decision or reasons for refusal.

Highways
- Local roads are in poor condition and inadequate to serve the development, pot holes, narrow, undercut and in poor condition, do not have street lighting.
- Roads should be widened
- A potential additional 1500 to 2000 additional car journeys into and out of the village each day.
- Traffic should be considered cumulatively
- Traffic is already a problem at nearby junctions of Buck Barn, Washington and Storrington / increased traffic and increased congestion.
- Increase in traffic along Storrington Road which is the only road through the village.
- Increased traffic will erode local roads.
- Parking on site is insufficient and would lead to overspill parking / overspill parking blocks footpaths.
- High bar lane needs to be resurfaced
- Thakeham is used by HGVs to avoid the Washington roundabout.
- There is no pedestrian crossing.
- Lack of pavements means people walk in the road.
- The speed limit should be 20mph
- Increased risk of accidents
- No alternative access to Thakeham other than Storrington Road
- Existing traffic calming allows traffic to speed into the village.
- Potential conflict between site access and existing field access
- WSCC Highways object to the proposal.

Infrastructure / local facilities
- There has been a reduction in public services in the area
- There are insufficient local infrastructure / facilities / amenities in Thakeham
- There will be an increase in antisocial behaviour without increase in policing.
- No new services or investment in local infrastructure proposed
- Only one shop in the village and no new shops proposed
- Local need for youth club and gym.

- The Coffee shop is reaching capacity.
- Water companies cannot maintain pressure
- Insufficient internet locally
- Local power cuts would increase and no evidence sufficient supply in the grid
- No medical facilities in the village
- Development would place increased pressure on healthcare
- Insufficient GP facilities which is full an no hospital beds.
- No pharmacy
- Dentist is oversubscribed
- A doctors surgery should be provided in Thakeham
- Allotments are popular locally
- There is a lack of facilitates for teenagers, pump track or skate park should be considered for the older children
- Allotments have not been handed over from Bellway

Flooding, drainage and sewage
- Waste and foul water disposal will be an issue
- Sewage system is struggling and is nearing / beyond capacity.
- Development would overload the sewage system.
- There has been an increase in flooding locally including along Massey Close.
- Rain runs down Storrington Road
- SuDS would be too small and rain water would get into the sewers
- SuDS are shown at the height point in the development
- There are outstanding flooding and drainage issues.
- The level of development in Thakeham has increased surface water run off

Education
- Insufficient education facilities and school places with no nurseries or schools in the village
- Primary school has been moved to Sullington / primary school children will need to travel by car
- Steyning Grammar School is being redeveloped with no school capacity locally.
- Children will have to travel out of the area of education increasing traffic.
- The nursery pre-school has closed down
- Where will children go to school

Amenity Impacts
- Overlooking into Massey Close and limited buffer between Massey Close dwellings
- Loss of light, loss of privacy and increased noise
- Loss of a view for residents of Massey Close
- Green space should be adjacent to Massey Close to avoid amenity impacts
- Dwellings would have a lack of privacy

Neighbourhood / Development Plan
- Development does not accord with HDPF Policy 3 and 4.
- Conflict with the Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2031 which still has legal status
- Development is not allocated within the Neighbourhood Plan
- Proposal would be contrary to the NPPF which still has legal status

Environmental Impacts
- Increased light pollution within a dark skies zone
- Increased pollution from traffic including noise pollution

- Water neutrality and the area is under water stress
- The development is against environmental improvements
- There are errors in the air quality assessment
- Dwellings would not have solar panels

Design and layout
- Proposal should be of a high-quality design and respect local character.
- The use of materials is not sympathetic to the local character
- Suburban-style expansion that is out of keeping with the rural setting
- Flats should be banned in rural settings
- The first phase of Abingworth is not in keeping with village
- Recent Bellway development is of a lower design quality
- Where is the street lighting?
- Insufficient facilities for children
- Over dense development contrary to rural character / out of keeping
- The site entrance would be next to the park.
- A larger village green should be provided.
- There should be an emergency access into the site.

Landscape
- Loss of village charm and damage to village life
- Loss of the countryside / suburbanisation of the countryside contrary to rural character.
- Increase urban sprawl in rural village
- Erosion of green gap between Thakeham and Storrington
- Coalescence between the historic village and new development.
- Proper landscape is not prioritised.
- Loss of walking routes in the countryside
- close to the South Downs National Park
- This land is A grade Agricultural Farm land and loss of agriculture

Construction Impacts
- Contamination, asbestos and dust impacts during demolition and removal of buildings.
- Construction traffic will create a hazard and erode the roads.
- Development would result in an increase in HGVs
- Amenity impacts from construction noise
- Residents have already put up with years of building in the village / Build out of more dwellings would take years.

Community
- Increased development would change character of the village / impact on community
- New residents would commute from the village.
- Loss of rural tranquillity
- Impact on community cohesion.

Other
- Bellway do not keep promises and have not finished the allotments
- The site would require expensive management companies
- Outstanding concerns within Abingworth Meadows should be resolved prior to a new development
- HDC cannot monitor developers
- Development is profit led
- There has been a rise in crime and anti-social behaviour
- Community views are disregarded
- Potential contamination on the site from previous use
- Land should be developed by a developer local community trust

5 letters have been received from 5 addresses supporting the Planning Application, raising the following matters:

- Previously developed / brown field sites are preferable to greenfield sites.
- Proposal would be good for the community
- Construction jobs would be generated on the site.
- Design
- Current site is an eye saw.

4 letters have been received from 4 addresses neither objecting to nor supporting the Planning Application, raising the following matters:

- There is a need for more housing
- Mushroom buildings need to be removed.
- Road is inadequate to serve the development and for construction traffic.
- Increase in traffic during construction and from residents.
- Lack of amenities including schools, green space and shopping.
- How would sewage system cope.
- Residents should be required to use the bus service.
- 150 houses would be a good use of the land if it includes habitat for wildlife, recreation facilities for families such as playgrounds and seating areas.
- Overdevelopment remains a worry.
- No objection from the parish was due to developers offer of open space.

3.21 Parish Comments:

Thakeham Parish Council: No Objection
TPC met on 15.09.2026 to consider the application.

TPC have found themselves in a position where, as part of the revised application, the Parish could be the recipient of vast amounts of Community Greenspace – by means of mitigation to the development. Therefore the Council had to way up the benefits to the Parish against any other material considerations.

TPC has long rejected unsustainable development within the area and originally objected to applications on the site, DC/24/0021 and the first version of DC/26/0266. One of the primary reasons being that the development(s) would not address any issues of any further development on the site known as the Mushroom Farm. Bellway Homes had previously indicated a phased approach which could see up to 400 homes on the site in many years to come (previous marketing from Storrington Road Engagement Plan).

It was after this objection that the Parish was approached by the developer with the offer of the Greenspace and a newly revised plan to reflect this. TPC requested that this plan be submitted to the LPA so everyone can see the proposals and have the opportunity to respond to the application presented and no other plan.

Therefore, if TPC Objected to the site, it could be seen as trying to leverage more concessions through the S106 route. Likewise, to Support the Application could be seen as accepting an offering in return for a favourable decision.

No Objection: A neutral stance, often submitted by statutory consultees (like highway authorities or environmental agencies), means the body has reviewed the plans and found no reason to block or alter them based on their specific remit.

TPC considers its remit to limit the amount of development in the Parish in line with its decision of No Objection. By means of the agreements listed above, TPC can acquire a green belt around the development which, by means of being the owner, can implement its remit to the community of capping unsustainable development over the longer term whilst enhancing the community with green recreation and activities.

The committee also considered previous material concerns such as increased traffic, lack of transport structures and flooding. It was noted that the revised application had addressed potential flooding issues. It was also noted that there was no plan for public transport – but recognised that this would be hard to deliver through the private sector and that any future residents would be car users.

TPC expressed concerns that the development would add considerable numbers of vehicles to the road which was dangerous in the vicinity. However, TPC noted that WSCC Highways offered No Objection to the scheme and that Bellway Homes, in the revised application, had included plans to adopt the TPC Highways scheme as a means to slow traffic and make it safer. Should the application be successful, TPC wish to expand on the road scheme and entrance with HDC, WSCC and the developer to help deliver the goals of a slower safer B2139, being cognisant of the fact that is a potential farm traffic increase around the junction/entrance.

TPC also acknowledged other infrastructure need and discussed the sums of funding to go to HDC and WSCC to mitigate these.

Ultimately, the Parish Council found itself having to weigh up these considerations in light of the current planning situation at the LPA. A legal trigger called the "Tilted Balance" has been turned on – and the LPA must grant permission unless the harm of the project heavily outweighs the benefit. HDC have a 1.5 year housing supply against a target of 5 and has a 62% housing delivery rate against a requirement of 75%. This has probably been the result of previous Water Neutrality issues etc – but HDC does not have a legal Local Plan yet to fully protect areas from Countryside development. Therefore, TPC considered a site of 150 homes vs a future site of potentially 400+ as part of its decision making process. TPC offer No Objection to 150 homes in this application and would not support any additional variations or changes to this particular application which would increase this number to the East of the PROW.

Finally, TPC contends that it will be the LPA that will be the final decision makers and effectively the arbiter's of TPC's decision making process – given the unique situation the application process has put us in so far.

3.22 Member Comments:
None received.

4 HOW THE PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION WILL PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS

4.1 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.

4.2 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.

5 HOW THE PROPOSAL WILL HELP TO REDUCE CRIME AND DISORDER

5.1 It is not considered that the development would be likely to have any significant impact on crime and disorder. The comments received from Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner are considered in full under the heading: S106 Agreement and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

6 PLANNING ASSESSMENTS

Background:

6.1 A previous application for 247 dwellings on this site (DC/24/0021) was refused under delegated powers in July 2024 for the following reasons:

1 *The application site is in an unsustainable location for the quantum of development proposed, which is not appropriate to the scale and function of the settlement of Thakeham (Abingworth) which is classed a 'Smaller Village' with limited facilities, accessibility and services. Active travel infrastructure to sustainably support the proposed quantum of development in this location is not achievable given the proposed routes for active travel to a range of key amenities are not suitable or attractive for general everyday use in terms of usability, safety and personal security, such that occupiers of the development will have an unacceptably high reliance on motorised vehicles even for short journeys. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the national policy requirement to promote sustainable patterns of development as set out in NPPF paragraphs 108, 109, 114, 115, 116 and 128, and Policies 2, 3, 4, 26 & 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).*

2 *It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Local Highway Authority, that the development would not result in severe residual cumulative impacts specifically at the junctions of A24/A272 Buck Barn Crossroads, the A24/A283 Washington Roundabout, and the A283 Washington Road/Water Lane/Sullington Lane crossroads. The proposed development is therefore in conflict with paragraph 115 of the NPPF and Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).*

3 *The proposed development has not been accompanied by a completed s106 Legal Agreement, thereby does not secure the 35% of units required to be provided as affordable housing units or other obligations required to make the development acceptable. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 16 and 39 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), as it has not been demonstrated how the infrastructure needs of the development would be met.*

6.2 An appeal against the refusal of this decision (APP/Z3825/W/24/3350094) was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate on 13th June 2025. In this appeal the Inspector concluded that the scheme would conflict with the spatial strategy of the HDPF and TNP in relation to its nature, substantial scale and poor relationship to facilities and services, particularly by sustainable modes of travel. The Inspector additionally noted that there are sequentially preferable sites in flood risk terms (see: Drainage and Flood Risk). The benefits of the appeal were acknowledged as the provision of 247 dwellings, affordable housing provision, Class E provision, the delivery of open space, PRoW improvement and BNG. The Inspector ultimately concluded however that the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

6.3 This current application therefore represents an alternative scheme for the development of the site, comprising of an amended red line boundary, reduced quantum of development, reduced density of development, increased open space provision and the addition of land provision toward a Community Land Trust (CLT)

6.4 This appeal decision is a material consideration in assessing the current application and is considered throughout the below report. Reference is also made where the current proposal differs from the appeal scheme and where planning policy has varied or been updated since this determination.

PLANNING ASSESSMENTS

Principle of Development- Policy Background

6.5 As it stands, the development plan relevant to the proposed development comprises the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF, 2015), the 'made' Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan (TNP, 2017) and the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (2018). In accordance with planning law, these documents form the statutory development plan and the starting point for the assessment of the development proposals. The National Planning Policy Framework (2026) and accompanying Planning Practice Guidance are material considerations relevant to the development proposals. Officers note that the NPPF has been updated since the inspector's previous consideration of housing development on this site.

6.6 The Horsham District Local Plan 2023-40 (the emerging Local Plan or 'eLP') has recently concluded a third round of examination hearings. Following these hearings the Local Plan Inspector, Jonathan Bore, has written to the Council setting out that his view the plan is sound subject to 'relatively few' main modifications and a limited number of further changes. The Inspector's letter concludes that an examination report can be expected in January 2027 which would likely allow the plan to be formally adopted in early 2027.

6.7 The Horsham District Local Plan 2023 - 2040 is therefore the emerging Local Plan (eLP) in the context of NPPF Policy DM4 and constitutes a material consideration. Given the late stage of the examination process and the limited modifications now required it is it is considered that the HDLP development management policies now carry significant weight and should be applied in the determination of this application.

Development Plan Policy

*Horsham District Planning Framework (*2015) *and the Horsham District Local Plan (*2023)

6.1 HDPF Policies 1 (Sustainable Development), 2 (Strategic Development), 3 (Development Hierarchy), and 4 (Settlement Expansion) along with emerging HDLP Policies 1 (Sustainable Development) and 2 (Development Hierarchy) set out the settlement hierarchy of the district and establish the Council's main strategy for the location of development across the district. HDPF Policy 3 and HDLP Policy 2 specifically establishes that development will be permitted within defined built-up area boundaries (BUABs).

6.2 HDPF Policy 4 (Settlement Expansion) supports the growth of settlements outside built-up area boundaries to meet identified local housing where;

1. A site is allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan and adjoins an existing settlement edge;
2. Where the level of expansion is appropriate to the scale and function of the settlement;
3. Where the development would satisfy identified local housing (or employment) need or would assist with the retention and enhancement of community facilities/services;
4. Where development would not prejudice long-term strategic development and;
5. Where development is contained within an existing defensible boundary and would maintain features of landscape and townscape character.

6.3 HDLP Policy 3 mirrors HDPF Policy 4, however, does not require the site to be allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan.

6.4 HDPF Policy 26 and HDLP Policy 14 seek to protect areas outside settlements boundaries against inappropriate development. HDPF 26 requires an essential need for a countryside location whilst HDLP Policy 14 requires development to accord with national policy. HDLP Policy 14.2 additionally outlines that development should not lead, either individually or cumulatively, to a significant increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside, and should protect, conserve, and seek to enhance, the key features and characteristics of the landscape character area in which it is located.

6.5 In this instance, the site is located adjacent to, but outside of, the Thakeham (High Bar Lane) BUAB and has not been allocated for residential development within the HDPF, HDLP or TNP. In addition, whilst the proposal would be contained within a defensible boundary, would meet an unmet housing need, and would not prejudice comprehensive long-term development, the scale of the proposed development would be at odds with the scale and function of the existing settlement. Residential development is additionally not considered to have an essential need for a countryside location.

6.6 As a result, development in this location would be contrary to the requirements of HDPF Policies 2, 3, 4 and 26. HDLP Policy 2, 3 and 14. The proposed proposal is therefore not considered in accordance with the spatial strategy set within the HDPF and HDLP.

Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan (TNP, 2017)

6.8 TNP Policy 1 (A Spatial Plan for the Parish) defines the BUAB of Thakeham and Storrington and outlines that proposals outside of these boundaries should conform to development plan policies in respect of the control of development in the countryside, namely HDPF Policy 4 and Policy 26 set out above. As set out above, the application site is located outside of a defined BUAB, is not residential development within the HDPF or TNP, and is not considered to present an essential need for a countryside location. The proposal would therefore also be contrary to TNP Policy 1.

6.9 However, TNP Policy 3 (Horticultural Land off Storrington Road ('Mushroom Site') allocates the entirety of the site for redevelopment stating:

Provided that it can be demonstrated that all reasonable efforts have been made to secure an agricultural and horticultural use of the site, redevelopment for one or more of the following uses will be permitted:

- *a. a D2 recreational use compatible with the countryside location;*
- *b. a solar array use; or*
- *c. B1 light industrial/commercial use and/or tourism use within the existing developed area of the site with the remainder returned to an open agricultural use.*

6.10 The supporting text further expands that '*This Policy for the important, established horticultural site on the edge of Thakeham village seeks to promote the continuation of that use but it also defines what would be acceptable should the existing business leave*.' Whilst Officers note the agricultural use of the site to grow mushrooms ceased in May 2022, TNP Policy 3 does not include any provision for residential development. The proposal would therefore not benefit from the support of TNP Policy 3.

National Planning Policy Framework (2026*)*

6.11 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2026) was published on 17th August 2026 and states that it is a material consideration 'of critical importance' 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.

6.12 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:

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

(i) The development of land allocated for that purpose in the development plan (where this lies outside settlements); and

(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; or

ii. Comprise major development for freight and logistics purposes which accords with policy E3.

6.13 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'*. An assessment of the relevant NPPF Policy S5(1) criteria is set out below:

Part 'd' – Previously Development Land (PDL)

6.14 The application site was most recently used as a mushroom factory, the primary purpose of this being the growing of mushrooms to be sold for consumption. This was undertaken in large windowless buildings throughout the site. The site also housed various administration and office buildings for this use. The site also previously included temporary offices for Thakeham Parish Council, who subsequently moved into the new village hall at Abingworth Meadows.

6.15 Whilst classed as an employment use, the growing of mushrooms is classed as an agricultural use associated with a rural location. The NPPF 2026 definition of Previously Development Land (PDL) excludes "land that is or was occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings'' Therefore, as an agricultural use, the site is not classed as 'previously developed land'. This matter is also considered within paragraph 62 of the Inspector's report for DC/24/0021 which states:

"The appeal site and buildings were previously used for the production of mushrooms which is an agricultural operation and which is excluded from the Framework's definition of PDL."

6.16 It is noted that the NPPF 2024 definition of PDL, as considered by the Inspector, remains consistent with the NPPF 2026 in regard to the specific exclusion of "*land that is or was last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings*". As such the application site is not considered to constituted PDL and the proposal would not benefit from NPPF Policy S5(1) part 'd.'

Part 'i' – Allocated Development

6.17 As set out above, TNP Policy 3 allocates the site for a recreational use compatible with the countryside location; a solar array use; a light industrial/commercial use and/or tourism use

within the existing developed area of the site with the remainder returned to an open agricultural use. The allocation does not, however, include any provision for residential development. As such, the residential development of the site is not considered to benefit from support under NPPF Policy S5(1) part 'i'.

Part 'j' - Evidenced unmet housing need

6.18 For residential development to gain in-principle support from NPPF Policy S5(1) part 'j' it should be demonstrated that:

- The development 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) (HDT);
- The development would be physically well-related to an existing settlement; and
- The development would be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure.

6.19 The Council's latest Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) (December 2025) demonstrates the Council currently has a housing land supply of 1.7 years against current targets. In addition, Horsham's 2025 HDT measurement (published on 17 August 2026) was 44%. It is therefore acknowledged that the Council is unable to demonstrate a full 5-year housing land supply and that the Council's most recent HDT is below 75%. The proposal would provide 150 dwellings, including 53 affordable dwellings (35%) and is therefore considered to contribute towards meeting an identified local housing need.

6.20 The application site is located directly north of the existing Thakeham BUAB and to the east / south east of the recent Abingworth Meadows development which is proposed to form part of the Thakeham BUAB within the emerging HDLP. The site could be accessed via the existing PRoW which dissects the site, or from Storrington Road / Abingworth Meadows to the east. The application site is therefore considered to be physically well related to the existing settlement of Abingworth.

6.21 The final matter for consideration under from NPPF Policy S5(1) part 'j' is whether the development would be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure. In consideration of this matter, Officers are mindful of the previous appeal decision in which the Inspector considered the functionality of Thakeham (Abingworth), including the available provision of services and facilities, the quantum of development in relation to this functionality, and the availability of sustainability transport and public transport infrastructure.

6.22 The Inspector's report outlines that the then proposed increase of 247 dwellings would be *'very significant increase in scale'* to Thakeham '*particularly in the context of the scale of expansion that the village has already undergone in recent years.'* In addition, following consideration of the available services and facilities within the village the Inspector found the development to be '*grossly out of scale with the settlement of Thakeham and its limited existing functionality'.* The Inspector's report gives specific considered of the availability of sustainable transport and public transport infrastructure, finding that whilst bus stops are well located in relation to the site, these are served by only one service a day operating in each direction.

6.23 In considering the current proposal, the development seeks to provide open space, drainage and pedestrian connections within Thakeham (Abingworth) to serve the needs of the development. The provision of foul water, fresh water, education and highways network capacity are each considered elsewhere in this report; however, it is noted that no unacceptable capacity constraints have been identified where necessary conditions and obligations are secured. In addition, Officers note the development would be liable to pay Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which would support wider infrastructure such as health

care and emergency service provision. The above considerations are constant with inspector's considerations.

6.24 It is noted that the previous scheme included additional elements aimed at improving the functionality of Thakeham (Abingworth) and the capacity of the village to accommodate development. These included improvements to the local bus service via a financial contribution of £869,660 and the provision of a local centre comprising a retail unit and/or a small number of units of varied commercial uses. Neither of these elements are proposed within the current application. Notwithstanding this, the Inspector's report outlines that *"The proposed means of altering the function of the settlement are not certain to succeed", and as* such, these elements were not considered to have materially impacted the functionally of Thakeham (Abingworth) or the provision of public transport infrastructure. As such, the omission of these elements is not considered to materially impact the overall functionality of Thakeham in the context of the current proposal.

6.25 Officers note that 150 dwellings are now proposed as opposed to 247 previously. The quantum of development is therefore significantly reduced, and this somewhat reduces the level of infrastructure and facilities required to serve the development. Nonetheless, 150 dwellings would remain a significant development in the context of Thakeham (Abingworth) and the provision of services and facilities within the village has not materially changed since the Inspector's consideration. This includes the bus provision which remains as extremely limited. Thakeham (Abingworth) as a settlement is therefore not considered to be any more cable of accommodating a significant quantum of development at the time of writing, than at the time of the inspector's considerations.

6.26 When the above is considered, Officers conclude that the development of 150 dwellings would remain of a scale disproportionate to the available infrastructure within Thakeham; this is principally down to the lack of connecting public transport infrastructure. It is noted, however, that the degree to which the development would be out of scale to Thakeham would be to a lesser degree than considered in the previous appeal scheme. Nonetheless, the proposal is considered to fail to accord with NPPF Policy S5 part 'j'.

NPPF Policy S6 / Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan (TNP, 2017)

6.27 NPPF Policy S6 addresses how the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be considered where a proposal would conflict with a neighbourhood plan, noting that the benefits of approving development are likely to be substantially outweighed by the adverse effects where:

a. The neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan five years or less before the date on which the decision is made; and
b. The neighbourhood plan contains allocations to meet its identified housing requirement (see policy HO2).

6.28 In this instance, the Thakeham Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) was formally made on 24th April 2017 and is therefore well over five years old. As such, whilst the TNP remains a part of the adopted development plan, the TNP does not benefit for the additional protections afforded within NPPF Policy S6. This remains consistent with the previous appeal decision.

<u>Loss of Employment Use</u>

6.29 HDPF Policy 9 sets out that proposals for the redevelopment of employment sites outside Key Employment Areas must demonstrate that the site is no longer needed and / or viable for employment use. The policy seeks to balance the need to ensure protection of valued employment and commercial sites to ensure there are sufficient employment opportunities to meet the needs of the district, whilst enabling sites which are no longer economically viable to be considered for other appropriate uses.

6.30 To address this requirement, the applicants have re-submitted the marketing report considered previously under application DC/24/0021. This report details that marketing of the site was undertaken between May 2023 and September 2024 for agricultural uses and policy compliant uses of the site, including those uses set out in TNP Policy 3. The report summary outlines the responses received and why they were not considered viable offers. Officers note that this marketing exercise was considered acceptable by Officers and the HDC Enterprise team under application DC/24/0021, whereby officers concluded that the marketing undertaken was acceptable and evidenced that the site is not viable for policy compliant uses given its condition and location.

6.31 Following the resubmission of this information HDC Enterprise have confirmed their view that that the marketing exercise undertaken in relation to the existing premises was sufficient to demonstrate that there is no reasonable prospect of their continued commercial occupation in their current form. Notwithstanding this, HDC Enterprise have maintained their objection on the basis that the proposal would result in the permanent loss of commercial floorspace and does not include any form of commercial development.

6.32 Whilst the absence of a commercial element is noted, it remains the view of Officers that the marketing undertaken is acceptable and has evidenced that the site is not viable for policy compliant commercial uses given its condition and location. This was additionally not an area of concerns raised by the Inspector under the previous appeal. As such, the scheme has met the requirement of Policy 9 of the HDPF.

Development Viability

6.33 This application is accompanied by a viability assessment which indicates the proposed development would result in a deficit of £3.7m. This assessment is dated March 2026 and was undertaken based on the development of 150 dwellings within the original red line boundary as initially submitted.

6.34 This assessment has been reviewed by HDC's viability consultants who have also found the proposal to be technically unviable, however, to a lesser degree with a deficit of £815k rather than £3.7m. The variation between these figures is primary due to the applicant adopting a profit on Gross Development Value (GDV) of 20% for market housing, whilst HDC's consultants have adopted a profit of 17.5%. Whilst officers note the discrepancies between these figures, both HDC and the applicant find the proposal to be in deficit. HDC's viability consultants have additionally concluded that that '*150 units proposed represent the minimum quantum required to produce a deliverable scheme'*.

6.35 Officer's note that the development proposal has evolved since the viability assessment was undertaken and reviewed. This includes provision to transfer 11.6ha of agricultural land to Thakeham Parish Council for use as public open space and the removal of financial contributions to the bus service. When these amendments are taken into consideration the overall deficit would decrease from a deficit of £815k to a deficit of £225k. The scheme would therefore remain technically unviable in planning terms with the above deficit in effect reducing the overall profitability of the scheme.

6.36 Officers are therefore satisfied that the HDC's viability consultant's assessment remains accurate that the proposal remains technically unviable in planning terms. As such, it remains accurate that the development of 150 dwellings within the site would be the minimum quantum of development required to produce a deliverable scheme whilst delivering a policy compliant provision of 35% affordable housing. This is key distinction between the current proposal and appeal scheme where a significantly greater quantum of development was proposed.

Retained land

6.37 The application site, as enlarged during the course of consideration to include the fields to the west, excludes an area of 'retained land' to the west of the historic mushroom site. This

land is enclosed on all sides by the expanded application site boundary with the main housing site area to the east and the proposed open space to the north, west and south. This excluded land is approximately 4.4 ha and comprises of made ground, dilapidated agricultural buildings and areas of hardstanding.

6.38 Officers note that this 'retained land' falls outside of the application site boundary and no development is proposed beyond works to improve its visual appearance by undertaking the demolition and removal of the existing above-ground structures, general clearance and tidying of the land and re-seeding where appropriate ground conditions allow and placing fencing around the land. These works are discussed elsewhere in this report and would be secured via Section 106 agreement.

6.39 In addition, Officers note that the applicant has clearly outlined future ambitions for the land to be promoted within a future Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan processes for the development of up to 85 homes and / or alternative uses. In the interests of clarity, this development does not form part of the current proposal and no works are proposed to this land beyond the above visual improvements. Any future promotion of this land and/or planning application would be fully assessed on its own merits at the time of submission and under the relevant national and local planning policy at that time.

Principle Summary

6.40 In summary, the siting of the proposed development conflicts with the requirements of HDPF Policies 2, 3, 4 and 26 and TNP Policy 1 as the site falls within a countryside location, is not allocated for the proposed development and is not considered to have an essential need for a countryside location. In addition, the proposed siting of residential development is not considered to accord with the TNP site allocation within TNP Policy 3. The principle of development is therefore not supported by the adopted development plan.

6.41 The proposal is additionally not considered to accord with NPPF Policies S3 or S5 and by extension emerging HDLP Policy 14. As such, NPPF S5(4) sets out that the proposal should only be approved in '*exceptional circumstances, where the benefits of the proposal would substantially outweigh the adverse effects'*.

6.42 In regard to the loss of the application site as an employment use, whilst the development would result in the loss of an employment site the submitted marketing has evidenced that the site is not viable for policy compliant commercial uses given its condition and location. In addition, the submitted viability assessment demonstrates that the proposed quantum of development is the minimum quantum of development required to produce a deliverable scheme whilst also providing a policy compliant provision of 35% affordable housing.

6.43 The following sections of this report consider all other detailed planning considerations, with the final section considering all of these matters in the overall Planning Balance.

Site Connectivity and Sustainability

6.44 HDPF Policy 40 supports developments that promote an improved and integrated transport network, with a re-balancing in favour of non-car modes as a means of access to jobs, homes, services, and facilities. Development should be appropriate and in scale to the existing transport infrastructure and should be located in areas where travel distances are minimised and where there would be a choice of transport modes. HDLP Policy 24 seeks to ensure the provision of sustainable transport modes including minimising the need to travel and promoting walking, cycling and wheeling connectivity,

6.45 NPPF Policies TR3 and TR4 outline that development should be located where it can support sustainable patterns of movement, enable good accessibility for different users and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure and offer a genuine choice of transport modes for residents and users. NPPF Policy TR3(1) part (a) outlines that proposals which could generate a significant amount of movement should be in sustainably sited to

limit the need to travel, particularly by private car, and offer to a genuine choice of transport modes. NPPF Policy TR3(1) part (e) outlines that opportunities to improve walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport should be taken in rural areas.

6.46 NPPF Policy CC2 further outlines that to help address climate change proposal should accord with policies TR3 and TR4 so that sustainable patterns of movement are prioritised, and opportunities are taken to improve walking, wheeling, cycling, and public transport.

6.47 HDPF Policy 3 and HDLP Policy 2 define Thakeham (The Street and High Bar Lane) as a 'Smaller Village' with 'limited services, facilities, social networks but with good accessibility to larger settlements (e.g. road or rail) or settlements with some employment but limited services facilities or accessibility. Residents are reliant on larger settlements to access most of their requirements.' The services within Thakeham are considered to remain commensurate with this classification, including the village shop / café, village hall, cricket ground, Community Hub and playing fields. The settlement remains reliant, however, on larger settlements to meet most of the daily needs of residents including education and employment.

6.48 In considering connectivity to larger settlements, Officers note that whilst the Massey Close bus stops are located immediately east of the site, bus provision remains extremely limited with route 71 providing a once weekly service between (Storrington to Chichester) and routes 74A and 74B (Storrington to Horsham) providing a single service per day Monday to Friday in each direction, with an additional 2 services on a Thursday only. In addition, the closest railway stations are Pulborough railway station approximately 8km away and Billingshurst 9.5km. Public transport and walking connections to these stations would not be viable in practice, however, access could be made by link car or taxi.

6.49 In assessing the sustainably of this location Officers have utilised the gov.uk 'Connectivity Tool' as per NPPF policy TR3(2). The tool indicates that the area of the site proposed for built development would have an overall connectivity score of between 29 and 31. This connectivity score falls within the 50th percentile when compared with other sites located within the 'Village' classification. This is the second lowest / most rural classification within the matrix. Officers note this tool seeks only to compare connectivity with other sites within the same classification and does not seek to take account of the scale of the proposed development, or the sustainability credentials of that development. As a result the Connectivity Tool is only to be used to help inform decision making.

6.50 Regarding active travel, whilst walking within the village itself would be practical, connectivity further afield into the neighbouring settlements of Storrington and West Chiltington Common along sunken lanes would not be a practical, realistic or safe for most pedestrians and cyclists given the lack of a pedestrian footways or cycling facilities. Pedestrians and cyclist would therefore be reliant of the PRoW network including the PRoW THA-2473 which runs west towards West Chiltington Common. The suitability of these routes was considered by the Inspector in the previous appeal who concluded that:

"a limited number of journeys would be made using these routes on foot or bicycle for purposeful journeys to work, to shops, leisure destinations or to school. The reasons for the lack of take up would be due to a combination of the journey times along lengthier, indirect routes; undulations along the routes which present a difficulty for some users; the absence of street lighting; and related safety concerns due to their largely rural contexts."

6.51 WSCC Highways have objected to the proposal and reiterated the above concerns, outlining that the proposal would not encourage and enable an increase in environmentally sustainable means of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport and thereby minimise the impact of car journeys.

6.52 These conclusions reflect the Inspector's appeal decision which outlines that "*the current connectivity is almost exclusively through residents using private vehicles given the very limited bus service and poor walking and cycling routes*".

Travel Plan and mitigation measures

6.53 As outlined previously, the proposal is no longer seeking to provide a financial contribution towards bus service enhancements. The withdrawal of this obligation is principal due to the view of HDC, WSCC and the planning Inspector that these contributions would be unlikely to meaningfully or materially impact the long-term provision of public transport infrastructure. As such, the omission of these elements is not considered to materially impact the overall functionality of Thakeham in the context of the proposal. The proposal does, however, include a package of measures aimed at promoting sustainable transport patterns, active travel within the settlement and improving the overall sustainability of the site:

Mobility Hub

6.54 The proposal seeks to provide an onsite 'mobility hub' comprising of electric bike hire, cycle maintenance point including basic tools and pumps, a car club scheme including space and charging spot for the vehicle, and parcel lockers (I.e. Amazon Lockers). The mobility hub would be located to the east of the site adjacent to the site entrance and emergency access point. Final details and delivery of the each element of the mobility hub would be secured via a suitably worded planning condition, including a scheme outlining the delivery of the mobility hub for the lifetime of the development.

6.55 These measures have been reviewed by WSCC Highways Authority who have noted that these measures are unlikely to result in a significant uptake in cycling which, given road conditions would remain suitable for experienced cyclists only.

Pedestrian Link and Public Right of Way improvements

6.56 The proposal additionally seeks enhancements to the PRoW network and to the footway along Storrington Road to the south of the site. These measures have been reviewed by WSCC Highways who have highlighted the Inspector's decision and consider these measures would result in a limited number of journeys to destinations outside of Thakeham (Abingworth). Notwithstanding this, Officers note that these improvements would enhance walkability within the village including providing enhanced connectivity between Thakeham and Abingworth, and would have some limited sustainability benefits in addition to recreational benefits further afield. The enhancements have also been reviewed by WSCC Public Rights of Way who have raised no objection subject to secure the necessary obligations via S106 agreement. The enhancements proposed are as follows:

- Bridleway 2483 to the east of the site: Improvements to the surface of a 250 metre section of Bridleway 2483. Any works should ensure wildlife is safeguarded. Works should be undertaken by the applicant.

- Footpath 2405 in the north east of the site: Widening and upgrading such that it meets a suitable specification for a bridleway. Works should be undertaken by the applicant in the first instance, or failing this, a financial contribution of £15,000 should be provided to WSCC PRoW to undertake the works.

- Footpath 2448 including resurfacing and any other works necessary to upgrade Footpath 2448 such that it meets a suitable specification for a bridleway. WSCC have requested to undertake the work, and a financial contribution of £9,000 should be provided.

- Footpath 2463_1: Extension of the footpath up to the track heading westwards off the B2139 opposite Abingworth Hall.

- Footpath 2474 within the site boundary: physical improvement to bridleway standard and conferral of bridleway rights over FP2474 within the site boundary. WSCC Public Rights of Way have additionally requested the developer obtain permission from the landowner of the site south of the red line boundary and High Bar Lane to also confer bridleway rights. Works to be delivered by the applicant.

- Storrington Road footway Improvements: Provide two footways within Abingworth to the south of the site, as shown in Drawing Number 2206671-D010A within the travel plan.

- Improvements to PRoW Accessibility and Signage: A financial contribution of £10,000 to improve signage within 5km of the site.

Traffic Calming measures

6.57 The proposal additionally seeks to make a financial contribution of £45,000 to Thakeham Parish Council to allow the delivery of traffic calming measures along Storrington Road: These measures are based on:

- Extending the 30mph zone north of North Town Farm north of the application site; and
- The provision of four Flat Top Road Humps through the village along with the provision of a 20mph speed limit within the village.

6.58 These traffic calming measures derive from survey work and local consultation undertaken by the Parish Council. WSCC Highways have noted within their latest comments that these works would require a successful Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and as such there are no timescales for implementation or certainty that the scheme would be delivered in full.

6.59 It is noted, however, that these measures are not a requirement to make the scheme acceptable in highway safety terms and the delivery of the scheme would therefore not be reliant on the successful outcome of a TRO. Nevertheless, reducing the speed of traffic within the village would provide clear benefits in favour of the scheme by promoting walking within the village itself including pedestrian access across Storrington Road to access the village facilitates.

Travel Plan

6.60 A Travel Plan has additionally been provided and reviewed by WSCC Highways. As outlined above WSCC Highways have objected to the proposal are not satisfied that the proposed development including the measures would encourage and enable an increase in environmentally sustainable means of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport and thereby minimise the impact of car journeys. Notwithstanding this, should the application be granted a final travel plan and necessary monitoring fee of £4,110 should be secured via S106 agreement.

Summary

6.61 In summary, the application site is located adjacent the Thakeham (High Bar Lane) BUAB which has a limited service provision commensurate with the settlement classification as a 'small village'. As such, future residents would be largely reliant on larger settlements to meet their day-to-day needs, with a resultant reliance on the private car.

6.62 The proposal includes a number of measures aimed at improving the take up of active travel and the overall sustainability of the site. Whilst these measures have a modest impact and would improve the connectivity of the site to immediate service and facilities in Thakeham, these measures are not sufficient to overcome the unsustainable location of the application site or the resulting reliance on private cars.

6.63 Given the above it is not considered that the application site is suitably located to promote sustainable patterns of movement, to limit the need to travel or that the proposal provides a genuine choice of transport modes for residents and users. The proposal therefore fails to

accord with NPPF Policies TR3, TR4 and CC2, HDPF Policies 2, 3, 4 and 40 and HDLP Policy 24.

Highways Impacts:

6.64 HDPF Policy 40 states that development will be supported if it is appropriate and in scale to the existing transport infrastructure, including public transport; is integrated with the wider network of routes, including public rights of way and cycle paths, and includes opportunities for sustainable transport. HDPF Policy 40.2 requires proposal to maintain and improve the existing transport system whilst HDPF Policy 40.9 requires proposals to provide safe and suitable access for all vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists, horses riders, public transport and the delivery of goods. HDLP Policy 251 seeks to ensure provision of adequate parking and EV charging points.

6.65 NPPF Policy TR6 requires proposals that are likely to generate significant amounts of movement to be supported by a transport statement / assessment and a travel plan. These should be proportional to the development and should reflect the transport vision for the development and the transport strategy for the area in which it is located.

6.66 NPPF Policy T6.4 further sates that development proposals should be refused if they would have a severe adverse impact on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion, including cumulative impacts), or an unacceptable impact on highway safety; taking into account any mitigation measures proposed as well as any wider network improvements, including measures to support sustainable patterns of movement.

Site Access / Visibility Splays

6.67 The site is proposed to be accessed via a priority junction onto Storrington Road with a right-hand turn ghost lane. The access would be a 5.5 metre wide with a 12 metre kerb radii. A 3 metres wide footway/cycleway is proposed on the northern side of the carriageway and a 2 metres wide pedestrian footway located on the southern side of the carriageway. A tactile crossing is also proposed across the access junction and a pedestrian refuse island with tactile paving is proposed to the south of the site access. WSCC Highways Authority note that the access has been subject to a Stage One Road Safety Audit and as such is considered acceptable. Should permission be granted the site access should be delivered prior to first occupation (Condition 29).

6.68 A second emergency access is also proposed to the south. This would have a single carriage way (3.7m) and would be restricted for use in emergencies and for use by pedestrians and cyclists.

6.69 Storrington Road has a posted speed limit of 40mph which changes to 30mph to the south of the site access. A speed survey indicating 85th percentile of 35.2mph northbound and of 34.4mph southbound. Necessary visibility splays of 57 metres to the south and 55 metres to the north can be achieved.

6.70 Concerns have been raised within a public representation regarding the proposed access's impact on a historic field access adjacent to PRoW 2479. Officer note that there is a fence line opposite the site access which leads into a field. A review of available historic imagery shows no clear signed that this boundary has been used as an access within approximately last 15 years, whilst the field has been worked / grazed in this time, presumably via an alternative access. Notwithstanding this, the impacts to the indicated access have been considered by WSCC Highways authority who note that the field access would be used irregularly have with very limited vehicle movements. No concerns are raised on its proximity/interaction with the site access.

Traffic / Network Capacity

6.71 Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICS) has been undertaken demonstrating that the proposal would generate up to 121 two-way trips in the AM peak (08:00am-09:00am)

and 106 two-way trips in the PM peak (17:00pm-18:00pm) with a daily total of 982 two-way trips. The submitted Transport Assessment Addendum notes that the provision of visitor parking adjacent to the public open space may be increase by up to 20 two-way vehicle movements during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours in the worst case scenario.

6.72 The distribution and dispersal of trips have been modelled within the network to the year 2036. WSCC Highways have noted that, as per this modelling, no highways capacity concerns are raised subject to a proportional contribution of £41,472 towards improvements at the Buck Barn and Washington Junctions. Officers note that improvements to these junctions have been factored into network modelling. It is noted that this financial contribution first proposed during the previous appeal on this site and is considered suitable to overcome previous concerns raised regarding the cumulative junctions impacts. The proposed increase in vehicle movements is therefore considered to be acceptable subject to securing the above financial contribution via S106 agreement.

Internal Layout and parking

6.73 The site's internal layout has been reviewed by WSCC Highways Authority who, following some minor amendments, have raised no further concerns. Officers note that vehicle tracking for a fire tender and refuse vehicle has been provided and is considered acceptable.

6.74 The main body of the development includes the provision of 334.5 parking spaces comprising of 288 allocated spaces 85 (42.5) garages spaces, 4 unallocated spaces and 30 visitor spaces. This has been considered acceptable by WSCC Highways in line the WSCC parking guidance. An additional 10 spaces are proposed adjacent to the public open space to be transferred to the parish. It is also noted that HDLP Policy requires at least 20% of communal off-street parking provision to have active charging facilities. This can be secured via a suitably worded planning condition and would be applicable to all non-allocated spaces (Condition 23). It is noted that part S of the Building Regulations requires the remainder of visitor spaces to include a cable route / ducting to facilitate future EV points.

6.75 Secure cycle parking is proposed to be provided for each dwelling within either private garden sheds or garages. The proposed cycle storage is therefore considered acceptable, and subject to the above condition, would provide secure and acceptable cycle storage for residents in accordance with HDPF Policy 40.

Summary

6.76 In summary, the proposal has been reviewed by WSCC Highways Authority who have objected to the proposal due to concerns regarding the sustainability of the application, however, no concerns have been raised on highways safety grounds and the proposal site access, internal layout and increase in vehicle movements is not considered to have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, in accordance with HDPF Policy 40 and NPPF Policy TR6.

Housing Mix and Affordable Housing:

6.77 HDPF Policy 16 requires proposals for 15 or more dwellings to deliver 35% of dwellings to be affordable with a tenure split of 70% affordable rented and 30% intermediate tenure. HDLP Policy 39 also requires the provision of 35% affordable housing on greenfield sites with a tenure split of 70% affordable rented and 30% intermediate tenure. It is noted that whilst the site contains existing development from the historic agricultural use, as explained above the site is not considered to be 'previously developed land'.

6.78 HDPF Policy 16 and HDLP 38 requires the delivery of open market housing and affordable housing to provide a mix of housing sizes, types, and tenures to meet the needs of the district's communities as evidenced in the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA, November 2019). Notwithstanding this, NPPF Policy HO8(3) requires a flexible approach to open market housing mix where proposals either meet or exceed affordable housing provision.

6.79 HDLP Policy 39 also requires the provision of 35% affordable housing on greenfield sites with a tenure split of 70% affordable rented and 30% intermediate tenure.

6.80 In this instance the proposal is seeking 97 Open Market dwellings (64.5%) and 53 affordable dwellings (35.5%). Affordable dwellings would be provided as 37 affordable rent (70%) and 16 shared ownership (30%). The proposal therefore provides a policy compliant provision of affordable dwellings with an appropriate tenure split of 70% affordable rented and 30% intermediate tenure.

6.81 The submitted tenure plan and tenure schedule set out a proposed housing which is compared with the recommended SHMA mix in the table below:

Affordable Rented	***SHMA 2019***	**Proposal (units)**	**Over / under supply**
1-bed	12.9	6.0	-6.9
2-bed	11.0	15.0	4.0
3-bed	9.2	14.0	4.8
4+ bed	3.7	2.0	-1.7

Shared Ownership	***SHMA 2019***	**Proposal (units)**	**Over / under supply**
1-bed	3.9	0.0	-3.9
2-bed	6.3	6.0	-0.3
3-bed	3.9	8.0	4.1
4+ bed	1.6	2.0	0.4

Open Market	***SHMA 2019***	**Proposal (units)**	**Over / under supply**
1-bed	5	0	-5
2-bed	29	20	-9
3-bed	39	49	10
4+ bed	24	28	4

6.82 The Council's Housing Team has commented that the Housing Register in Thakeham currently has 129 households waiting for housing, of which 41 households (32%) require a 1-bedroom property, 16 households (12%) require a 2-bedroom property, 53 households (41%) require a 3-bedroom property, 19 households (15%) require a 4-bedroom or larger property. The Council's Housing Officer has noted that the greatest level of need within the parish is for family-sized accommodation, particularly three-bedroom homes, which account for almost half of all households on the Housing Register.

6.83 Whilst it is noted that the affordable rental mix provides an undersupply of 1-bed and 4-bed dwellings, this is balanced by an oversupply of 2 and 3 bed dwellings resulting in an overall weight towards larger dwellings, particularly the much needed 3-bed dwellings. Similarly, whilst the shared ownership housing mix provides an undersupply of 1 and 2 bed dwellings, an oversupply of 3 and 4 bed dwellings is proposed to offset this. Therefore, whilst the overall affordable mix is not strictly proportionate to the SHMA, the oversupply of the much needed larger 3-bed affordable rent homes would go some way to address local housing need.

6.84 In addition, it is highlighted that 46 of the affordable dwellings would be provided to M4(2) standard for accessible and adaptable dwellings whilst 4 affordable dwellings would be provided as 2-bedroom M4(3) dwellings suitable for wheelchair users.

6.85 Regarding open market housing, the proposed mix is also weighed towards larger dwellings with an oversupply of larger 3 and 4 bed dwellings. Whilst this is not strictly in accordance with the SHMA, NPPF Policy HO8(3) calls for increased flexibility where an acceptable affordable provision is proposed. Within this context the open market housing is also considered acceptable.

6.86 The applicant has additionally provided a letter outlining their engagement with Registered Providers (RPs). The letter outlines that 20 RPs have been approach with expressions of interest from a number of providers. It is outlined that the applicant is confident of securing a RP to take on affordable units following the granting of planning permission.

6.87 In the event that planning permission is granted, a Section 106 legal agreement would need to be provided to secure this on-site affordable provision and tenure, and a registered provider who will take on the units. With this obligation in place the proposal is considered to accord with the requirements of HDPF Policy 16, HDLP Policy 39 and the accompanying Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD.

Community land Trust (CLT)

6.88 A Community land Trust (CLT) is a local community group / organisation which can own and develop land and community assets for the benefit of their communities and on a not-for-profit basis. This can include the provision of affordable housing.

6.89 The proposal including an approximately 1.1 ha area of land to the south east of the site to be transferred to a local CLT, Chanctonbury Community Land Trust, for the development of 100% affordable housing, or alternatively, affordable housing with a compatible ancillary retail/community use. Officers note that preliminary discussions have indicated potential suitability for approximately 6 affordable dwellings.

6.90 Officers are satisfied that this development would be principally acceptable when considered as part of the wider development site and could be realistically delivered without unacceptable landscape or amenity impacts to existing or future residents. All technical mattes including a final proposal, quantum of development, design and layout would be assessed within a separate planning application to be submitted by or on behalf of the CLT.

6.91 The transfer of this land would be secured via the S106 agreement to require the land to be transferred to the CLT as a serviced plot for a nominal sum (£1) once planning permission and funds for delivery have been obtained by the CLT. If the CLT was not to gain appropriate planning permission or funding, then a cascade mechanism would be employed to prioritise the land for affordable housing / community development with a final contingency of the land being retained by the land owner (currently Bellway).

6.92 The provision of this land is considered an additional benefit of the development and would support the delivery of community led affordable housing within the village. Chanctonbury Community Land Trust have been engaged in this matter and are positive on taking forward development on the land, and indeed have been engaging with Bellway on how the development could be best delivered.

Design, Appearance and Landscape Impact:

6.93 HDPF Policies 25, 32, and 33 and HDLP Policy 19 seek to promote development that protect, conserve and enhance the townscape character from inappropriate development. Proposals should take into account townscape 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. HDLP Policy 14 additionally

requires all development to be integrated within the landscape and be of a scale appropriate to its countryside character and location.

6.94 HDPF Policy 31 and HDLP Policy 17 seek to support development where it demonstrates that it maintains or enhances the existing network of green infrastructure. Development proposals will be required to contribute to the enhancement of existing biodiversity and should create and manage new habitats where appropriate.

6.95 HDLP Policy 28 requires all residential development to contribute to the provision and improvement of the quality, quantity, variety and accessibility of public open space and public indoor meeting and sports halls.

6.96 TNP Policy 6 further requires housing to be well-designed with a scale, density, massing, height, landscape design, layout, and materials appropriate to the architectural and historic character and of the site. TNP Policy 6 further requires regard to be had to the Thakeham Parish Design Statement.

6.97 NPPF policy DP3 seeks to ensure well-designed places that respond to their context and integrate with and enhance their surroundings, and sets out principals of design pertaining to Liveability, Climate, Nature, Movement, Built Form, Public Space. DP3 further clarifies that proposals should be refused where they conflict with DP3 1 or 2.

6.98 As existing, the application site comprises of hard standing and disused agricultural buildings within the east of the site, with an area of amenity grassland to the north east and approximately 11.6ha of open agricultural and woodland to the west. An area of land containing made ground / derelict buildings also falls to the west of the site, however, this land is excluded from the red line boundary and does, does not form part of the proposal.

6.99 The application has been reviewed by the Council's Landscape Officer who has raised no objection. The Officer's comments outline that there is capacity for the proposed development within the former mushrooms site without significant adverse landscape and visual effects on the wider landscape. The Officer therefore raised no concerns with the principle of the development in landscape terms.

Site Layout and Density

6.100 The site would be set out as an extension to the village with a main village street leading west from Storrington Road from which a hierarchy of secondary and shared surface roads stem. This layout residential in character and would be reflective is reflective of Abingworth to the south and Abingworth Meadows to the east.

6.101 Development would be retained within existing areas of hard standing as per the previous appeal scheme, this is acknowledged and supported by the Landscape Officer. The number of dwellings proposed has however been reduced to 150 dwellings with an overall density of approximately 19 dwellings per hectare (dph) within the developable area (NB the previous scheme was for 247 dwellings at a density of approximately 32 dph within the equivalent developable area). The proposal is therefore of an overall lower density which would be appropriate within the context of Thakeham (Abingworth).

6.102 The dwellings would be a mix of two-storey detached, semi-detached, short rows of terraces and maisonettes. No flat blocks are proposed. The dwellings would have red and brown tiled gable and half-hipped roofs with use of front gables, porches and decorative brickwork. Chimneys would also be dispersed throughout the site, including external gable-end chimney breasts. The proposed material pallet incorporates red and brown brickwork with dark weatherboarding, hanging tiles dispersed through the site. The design of dwellings is therefore considered to be acceptable and would be reflective of residential character found within rural Sussex. Final details of materials can be secured via a suitably worded planning condition.

6.103 Boundary treatments are proposed to comprise of 1.8m larch-lap fencing and close board fencing to rear garden boundaries, 1.8m brick walls along prominent boundaries, and a mix of hedgerow and timber knee high railings enclosing public space and street trees / grass verges along internal roads. Final details of boundary treatment, materials, and hard and soft landscaping and underground services would be secured via suitably worded planning condition (Conditions 14, 18, 26).

6.104 As stated, the proposal includes a mobility hub located to the east of the site, a pumping station located to the south east of site and a parish council store room located to the south west. These buildings would be located prominently in relation to dwellings and public networks and should therefore be of a quality design reflective of the wider development. Final details of the of these buildings should therefore be secured via a suitably worded planning condition (Conditions 16 and 18).

Site levels / Topography

6.105 The existing site has significant variation in levels from 41m AOD in the south-west to 69m AOD in the north-east. The existing agricultural buildings and hardstanding are, however, sited on a large area of levelled ground that has been cut in to the landscape. This results in a 6m grass bank transitioning between the existing agricultural buildings and the grassland to the north east of the site.

6.106 A levels strategy has therefore been provided which demonstrates the site would be re-contoured to remove the grass bank and form a gradual slope from north to south. Whilst this strategy does result in the use of retaining walls to the rear of some residential gardens, these would be largely below 1m in height with only limited use of 1.5m tall retaining walls. This strategy has been reviewed by the Landscape Officer and is considered acceptable.

Open Space and Play Space

6.107 A village green and play area (LEAP) is proposed to the west of the proposed dwellings. The LEAP would have a total area of approximately 400sqm and would be well related to and overlooked by dwellings. Final details of the equipment provision, future management of the LEAP and any necessary maintenance sum would be secured via a S106 agreement.

6.108 An area of green space is also proposed to the north of the proposed dwellings. This area would form part of the site's Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) delivery, however public access would be available along a network of paths. The area would comprise of species-rich wildflower / grassland meadow interspersed with tree planting, areas of woodland, hedgerow and a community orchard. This area would be transferred to the Parish Council who would own and manage the land in the first instance; however, future management could also be secured within a management company. The transfer of land and / or arrangement for future maintenance would be secured via S106 agreement.

6.109 The proposal additionally includes the provision of an expansive area of open space (11.6ha) to the west of the PRoW which is to be transferred to Thakeham Parish Council (NB Thakeham Parish Council are keen to take on this land). This is currently undeveloped agricultural land and is indicatively shown as open space, planting, community play space, a habitat pond, a 'lookout' and a circular walking route. In order to secure this land as part of this application, a draft land transfer would be provided to the Council prior to the determination of this application, with its final transfer to take place within 6 weeks of the commencement of demolition on site. This transfer point is considered appropriate to ensure the public benefits of the open space would be realised early within the development process in the event the development was to be progressed. It is noted that S106 obligations for the transfer of this land would be finalised in consultation within the Parish Council and the submitted draft transfer documents would additionally require the input and agreement of the Parish Council. This is considered to provide sufficient certainty that the Parish Council are in a position to formally accept the open space provision. Nonetheless, in the scenario

whereby the Parish chooses not to accept the open space at the point of transfer, then the land should cascade to an alternative community organisation to be retained as accessible to the public in perpetuity.

6.110 Officers note that the land would be transferred in its current condition and it would be for Thakeham Parish Council to design, deliver and manage the final arrangement of the open space and including footpaths, community provision and play space on what would be their land. This is with the exception of the necessary statutory BNG enhancements which would be delivered by Bellway, and the detached storage building and the adjacent parking area which would be delivered by Bellway in full prior to transfer to the Parish Council.

6.111 To facilitate this, Officers consider it appropriate to secure final landscaping details for this land within a separate planning condition to the remainder of the site (Condition 37). This would allow the Parish Council to discharge this condition independently to provide final confirmation of the open space arrangements. Final elevations and plans of the storage building can be secured via condition (condition 16) and final details of the parking area and access road can be secured within the hard and soft landscaping condition (Condition 28) and the transfer of these elements would take place once delivered.

6.112 Officers note that the above open space provision has the potential for landscape impacts. Whilst this is noted, the open space is well enclosed by existing vegetation and is not prominent over long views. In addition, any development in this area would be minimal with final details to be secured and approved via planning condition.

6.113 The benefit afforded from this open space would also be beneficial to the wider community within Thakeham as the land would fall within public / parish ownership to serve the needs of the community.

Site restoration and Retained Land

6.114 Officers note that the application site currently vacant and has not been operational since circa May 2022. This is acknowledged in the Inspector's report where they outline the existing site has "*some brownfield characteristics and there would be some aesthetic enhancements from the removal of the buildings and replacement the new scheme*". As set out above, the proposed site layout, design and building density is considered appropriate to the rural setting of Thakeham and would therefore also result in a betterment / aesthetic enhancement.

6.115 As stated, the application site excludes an area of 'retained land' to the west of the historic Mushroom site comprising made ground, dilapidated agricultural buildings and areas of hardstanding. As previously outlined, no development is proposed within this area. Notwithstanding this, this land would remain prominent from the proposed dwellings and from the open space which encircles the 'retained land'.

6.116 The applicant is therefore proposing to improve the visual appearance of the 'retained land' by undertaking the demolition and removal of the existing above-ground structures, general clearance and tidying of the land and re-seeding where appropriate ground conditions allow and placing fencing around the land. Fencing should be visually permeable, rural in character and of sufficient height to restrict access to the public. Final details and implementation of these works can be secured within a S106 Agreement. This agreement should additionally ensure the land is maintained in that condition thereafter. Officers note that the demolition of existing structures will itself require a future planning application which should be secured prior to the undertaking of works.

6.117 Access to the retained land is proposed from within the site layout with an access point located to the west of plot 66. Final details of the access gate can be secured within the above S106 obligation. Officers note that this access would require crossing PRoW (Footpath 2474), however, given access into this land is expected to be a highly limited and

irregular during the operational phase of the development this does not raise any significant concerns. In the event a future application seeks development within the land, the provision of a site access and the acceptability of this would be considered at that time.

Arboriculture:

6.118 The application submission includes a Tree Survey & Impact Assessment which has been reviewed by the Council's Arboricultural Officer. The area of site proposed to be developed does not contain any existing trees beyond mature boundary trees. This includes a belt of oak trees to the east of the site adjacent to the Storrington Road. The site does not include any areas of Ancient Woodland or any Tree Protection Orders.

6.119 It is noted that a row of Lombardy Poplars are proposed to be removed from the southern boundary. The Arboricultural Officer has noted the removal of these trees would result in a significant visual landscape impact on views from the public realm to the south, however, the Officer additional notes these trees have limited foreseeable safe useful life and are therefore not considered compatible with a housing development

6.120 The officer has also noted that a section of foul drainage is proposed to be installed within the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of the oak tree belt adjacent Storrington Road. These trees have significant landscape value and therefore should be protected. The Officer has requested that the site layout be revised to avoid this conflict, however, the Officer has noted that in the event approval is recommended this drainage could be installed using a trenchless system. The Officer has further clarified that this method is viable. It is therefore advised that final detail of underground services is secured via condition alongside the specific requirement for no excavations (trenchless installation methods only) within RPAs (Condition 14). The Officer has additionally requested planning conditions to secure accordance with the Tree protection plan and an Arboricultural Method Statement (Condition 7). With the above condition in place the arboricultural impact of the development is considered acceptable in accordance with HDPF Policies 25, 32, 31 and 33, TNP Policy 6 and NPPF policy DP3.

Heritage and Archaeology:

6.121 HDPF Policy 34 relates to Cultural and Heritage Assets and states that applications should make a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of the area and ensure that development in Conservation Areas is consistent with special character of the area. TNP Policy 7 seeks to protect the Thakeham Conservation Area.

6.122 NPPF Policy HE4 sets out that heritage assets, as an irreplaceable resource, should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Policy HE5 sets out that assessments of the potential effects on the significance of heritage assets should identify the degree of harm and Policy HE6 sets out that where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal.

Heritage Impacts:

6.123 In terms of nearby heritage assets, the Thakeham Conservation Area is located approximately 50m north of the site's red line boundary and approximately 150m from the closest built form. Thakeham Conservation Area comprises the historic core of the village with a number of listed buildings set along 'The Street. This includes the Mansion House (Grade II, LEN: 1027213) and Martins (Grade II, LEN: 1285062) both located close to junction of The Street and Storrington Road (B2139), around 250m to the north of the closest built form. The submitted Heritage Statement also identifies 'Old House' located immediately to the south-west of the Site as a non-designated heritage asset.

6.124 The Conservation Officer has reviewed the proposal noting that the site would not be visible from Thakeham Conservation Area due to the topography and existing tree belt. In addition, whilst the Officer considered the potential impact from increased noise, light and perceived

activity generated by the development it is concluded that there would be an adequate amount of distance to ensure clear separation between the new development and the historic village. This is supported by the siting of open space to the north and west.

6.125 In considering the impacts to 'Old House', the Officer further notes that the degree of physical separation between the historic farmhouse and the new development would allow for 'Old House' to be experienced separately from the development and within the historic character of Abingworth as a rural hamlet.

6.126 In the context of the revised NPPF 2026 the above impacts are not considered to result in harm to the significance of a heritage assets.

Archaeology

6.127 The Council's Archaeological Consultant has reviewed the proposal noting that that site falls partly within an Archaeological Notification Area due to the previous discovery of Early Medieval settlement remains, as confirmed by the supporting desk based archaeological assessment (Tetra Tech Consulting). The Officer has noted that areas of recorded archaeology would be retained as public open space ensuring archaeological remains are preserved in situ, as long as no intrusive landscaping or tree planting is proposed. The remainder of the site comprises the existing built form and archaeological remains are therefore have likely been previously disturbed.

6.128 Notwithstanding this, there remains potential for archaeological finds and a programme of archaeological work is requested to be secured via planning condition (Condition 9). With this condition in place, Officers are satisfied that the proposal would accord with HDPF Policy 34, TNP Policy 7 and NPPF Policies HE4, HE5 and HE6.

Residential Amenity:

6.129 Policy 33 of the HDPF requires development is designed to avoid unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupiers / users of nearby property and land. Policy 32 of the HDPF, further, seeks to ensure that development provides an attractive, functional, accessible and adaptable environment. NPPF Policy P3.2 sets out that development should protect the amenity of residents and sets out that developments should not result in the loss of light to neighbouring dwellings or any unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water, soil pollution.

Amenity of Neighbouring Dwellings

6.130 In this instance the closest and most affected residential dwellings are located within Massey Close, where the side elevations of plots 132 and 138 would front onto the rear gardens of 2 – 22 Massey Close. Plots 132 and 138 are proposed as two-storey dwellings (9.5m) and would be approximately 14-15 m from rear elevations along Massey Close. Given the arrangement of dwelling and the degree of separation proposed, this layout raises no unacceptable concerns of overbearing or overshadowing. It is also noted that plots 132 or 138 would not have windows on the facing elevations. No concerns of overlooking are therefore raised. Officers note this arrangement has been amended since the appeal scheme where dwellings were previously proposed as 2.5 storeys with a degree of overlooking. The current proposal therefore represents a betterment on the previous.

6.131 Old House Farm is a single detached dwellings located to the west. This dwelling sits within a large plot approximately 50m from the nearest built form and would be separated from the development by the existing PRoW and vegetation with open space proposed to the north. Dwellings along Hardbarrow Woods to the south would be approximately 45m from the closest built form and would also be separate by existing variation the PRoW. Dwellings to the east would along Storrington Road would be 60-70m from the closest built form and would be separated by the existing highway. Dwellings along Duke's Hill to the north would be separated from the development by approximately 150m of open space / BNG. The

proposed therefore presents no concerns over overlooking, overshadowing, or overbearing impacts.

Amenity of future residents

6.132 The site layout and arrangement of dwellings is not considered to result in any overlooking, overshadowing or amenity impacts to future residents. Officers are additionally satisfied that the proposal would have an appropriate relationship with those dwellings to the south granted under DC/23/2152.

6.133 The HDC Environmental Health Officer has additionally reviewed the potential noise from the B2139 within dwellings and residential gardens. The Officer has outlined that acceptable noise levels, both internally and in private amenity spaces, can be achieved via a scheme of noise and vibration attenuation and ventilation. In this instance the road noise does not significantly exceed BS 8233 guidance. It is therefore not consider it reasonable or necessary to require a noise impact assessment site wide, however, it is considered a scheme of noise attenuation should be secured for those dwellings fronting onto Storrington Road.

Construction Impacts

6.134 There remains the potential for some limited loss of amenity during construction, through increased noise, traffic movements, dust and pollution. Whilst these impacts would be temporary in nature it is considered appropriate to secure a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to manage these impacts. This could be secured an implemented via a suitably worded planning condition (Condition 4).

Summary

6.135 In summary, with the above conditions in place it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to any unacceptable amenity impacts and would therefore accord with HDPF Policy 33 and NPPF Policy P3.

Education Provision:

6.136 The proposal has been reviewed by West Sussex Education Services who have raised no objection and confirmed that, as the proposal is CIL liable, CIL can be sought by the County Council for any necessary education mitigation resulting from the proposal. This would include any increased demand for local school places. It is noted that this covers all children from ages 0-18 and up to 25 for SEND pupils.

Land Contamination

6.137 HDLP Policy 11 requires development to minimise to minimise exposure to, and the emission of, pollutants including noise, odour, vibration, air and light pollution arising from all stages of development.

6.138 The application site was previous use to manufacture mushrooms with oil storage presenting the potential for there to be land contamination. The site also falls within a Source Protection Zone 2 and is located upon secondary aquifer A overlying a principal aquifer. The proposal seeks to introduction of a residential use to the site which is sensitive to the presence of contamination necessitating the need to ensure the site is suitable for residential development.

6.139 The HDC Environmental Health team have reviewed the RSK Environment Limited Geo-environmental and Geotechnical Investigation submitted with the application. Whilst the Officers initial comment raised a number of areas where amendments and clarifications a required, the Officer has clarified that these details can be secured via condition in this instance, including consideration of PFAS contamination (Conditions 1). The Officer has additionally noted that the majority of the site investigation works will need to be undertaken post demolition, the Condition therefore requires discharging prior to the construction of the dwellings to allow this to take place.

6.140 The proposal has also been reviewed by the Environment Agency who have also considered potential land contamination specifically in relation to potential ground water contamination given the site's relationship to the principle aquifer and the presence of the existing boreholes on site. The Environmental Agency have no objection to the proposal subject to a number of conditions to secure a contamination remediation strategy (Conditions 19), remediation verification report (Conditions 25), ground water monitoring (Conditions 11), investigation and a remediation of Previously Unidentified Contamination (Conditions 32), restriction on surface water drainage (Conditions 3), and the future management of boreholes (Conditions 17), restrictions on Piling (Conditions 30). Where these conditions overlap with those requested by the Environmental Health Officer a single comprehensive condition is proposed.

6.141 Officers additionally note concerns raised in public representations regarding the demolition of existing buildings, potential for demolition dust and the removal of asbestos from the site. Given the proximity of buildings which likely contain asbestos it is considered appropriate for the CEMP (Condition 4) to additionally secure details of air quality and dust management and details for the demolition and removal of all asbestos containing materials by an appropriately licensed and competent contractor. These details will therefore be considered by HDC Environmental Health Officers prior to the commencement of demolition works.

Ecology:

6.142 HDPF Policy 31 and HDLP 17 require proposals to maintain and enhance the existing network of green and blue infrastructure and contribute to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, Nature Recovery Network, natural capital, ecosystem services and / or biodiversity. The Council will support new development which retains and / or enhances significant features of nature conservation on development sites. HDLP Policy 13 additionally requires developments to Maintain and enhance the Green and Blue Infrastructure Network, the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and national Nature Recovery Network and, where practicable, help to address any identified needs and deficiencies in these networks across the District.

6.143 NPPF Policy N2 outlines that proposals should minimise any adverse impacts on biodiversity and include features which support priority or threatened species and that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated or compensated for, then the development should be refused.

6.144 NPPF Policy N6 outlines that development proposals affecting sites of international importance should be refused unless an appropriate assessment has concluded that the proposal will not adversely affect the integrity of the site, the derogation tests have been satisfied, and/or the impact of development is being addressed through an Environmental Delivery Plan.

6.145 The proposal has been reviewed by the Council's Ecologist and NatureSpace who have reviewed the application alongside the submitted Ecological Appraisal (Aspect Ecology Ltd., January 2026).

<u>Bats and International Sites</u>

6.146 The site lies approximately 9km southeast of The Mens Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and 4.2km east of Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar site. The site does not fall within the wider conservation area for the Ebernoe Common SAC. Given this siting, all potential impacts on the Barbastelle bat must be assessed including severance to flightlines.

6.147 The application site, as existing, contains a number of disused buildings, including large industrial buildings used for mushroom growing. All buildings are proposed to be removed from the site and have therefore been reviewed for potential roost features. The site also contains woodland, trees and scrub which has been assessed for foraging and commuting bats.

6.148 The Ecological Appraisal confirms the presence of summer day roosts for Soprano Pipistrelle, an unidentified bat and Common Pipistrelle in building B8 (Disused office space) and a summer day roost for a Soprano Pipistrelle in building B11a (Disused industrial Building). All other buildings have negligible bat roost potential and that all trees within the site would be retained. The presence of foraging and commuting bats has also been confirmed, including the Barbastelle which is the qualifying feature for the Mens SAC.

6.149 These details have been reviewed by HDC's Ecologist who supports the mitigation measures set out within the Ecological Appraisal and has confirmed that a Bat Mitigation Class Licence is required prior to the commencement of any works. It therefore considered appropriate to secure accordance with the Ecological Appraisal mitigation measures under Condition 31, and evidence of a bat mitigation licence under Condition 5. The Officer also notes that the majority of foraging and commuting habitat would be retained on site, with additional tree, hedgerow and shrub planting proposed.

6.150 The HDC's Ecologist has also considered the potential impact to the Mens SAC, noting that sections of hedgerows H1 and H2 are proposed to be removed on the eastern boundary to facilitate access. This hedgerow would, however, be compensated for with new native hedgerow around green space and within existing hedgerow gaps. The Officer is therefore satisfied that there would be no severance of flightlines, and that wider habitat connectivity would be maintained. Notwithstanding this, increase light spill has the potential for habitat fragmentation; the Ecology Officer therefore supports the recommendation for this to be mitigated via a Wildlife Friendly Lighting Strategy (Condition 26).

6.151 A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has been produced on behalf of the Council which screens in potential impacts to commuting and foraging habitat from new lighting, concluding that with mitigation in place "the project will avoid an Adverse Effect on the Integrity of the Habitats sites listed in this assessment, either alone or in combination with other plan and projects." Natural England have been consulted on this HRA and has responded to provide Standing Advice.

Dormice

6.152 The Ecological Appraisal identifies Hazel Dormouse on site. The Council's Ecologist notes that short sections of hedgerows H1 and H2 will be removed. It therefore considered appropriate to secure accordance with the mitigation measures within the Ecological Appraisal (Condition 31) and to secure evidence of a Nature England Dormouse licencing prior to the commencement of works (Condition 6).

Protected and Priority Species

6.153 HDC's Ecology Officer supports the implementation of the Precautionary Method Statement for mobile protected and Priority species which can be secured via condition (Condition 31).

6.154 Further to this, public representations have identified the presence of Linnets and Black Redstarts on the site. The Council's Ecologist has confirmed that the site has suitable habitat for use by nesting Linnets, and that the information provided for this species is sufficient and conditions such as a CEMP Biodiversity and landscaping would be sufficient to address any potential impacts.

6.155 Regarding Black Redstart, HDC's Ecology Officer has confirmed photos show a male and female near the site, including within the breeding season. Whilst stating that further survey work is considered disproportionate, the applicant has provided an Ecological Method Statement for Black Redstart (Aspect Ecology, November 2026) which outlines safeguards during construction. This includes requiring further undertaking demolition outside of nesting season in the first instance, and implementing buffer zones and ecological supervision in the event Black Redstart are recorded on site. These details have been reviewed by the Council's Ecologist who is satisfied these measures are sufficient and has requested these details are secured via condition (Condition 31).

6.156 With these conditions in place the HDC Ecologist is satisfied that the proposal suitably addresses the potential impacts to Black Redstarts.

Great Crested Newts

6.157 The proposal has also been reviewed by NatureSpace who have assessed the potential impact on Great Crested Newts. The NatureSpace Officer is satisfied that no further surveys are required in this instance. Nonetheless, the Officer has requested a Precautionary Working Methods statement is produced a suitably qualified ecologist to be submitted prior to determination or secured via a pre-commencement condition. It is requested that this specifically includes measures on material and waste storage, ditch management, and steps taken should GCN be discovered onsite. This is considered necessary given the increased suitability of the northern parcel for GCNs since previous surveys and the proximity of P1 to the development. This can be secured via a suitably worded planning condition (Condition 12).

Summary

6.158 Given the above, with the conditions in place, the proposal would accord with HDPF Policy 31, HDLP Policies 13 and 17, and NPPF Policies N2 and N6.

Drainage and Flood Risk:

6.159 HDPF Policy 38 and HDLP Policy 10 requires development to follow a sequential approach to flood-risk, giving priority to sites and layouts which minimise vulnerability to flood risk and without increasing flood risk elsewhere and to incorporate the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS).

6.160 NPPF Policy F4 requires a site-specific flood-risk assessment for development on land at risk of flooding, including surface water flooding. NPPF Policy F7 requires proposals to be refused unless the site is designed sequentially, siting the most vulnerable development in areas of lowest flood risk, the development would be safe throughout its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, any residual risk can be safely managed including the provision of safe access and escape routes, the development is appropriately flood resistant and the flood risk will not be increased elsewhere.

6.161 NPPF Policy F8 requires the appropriate use of multifunctional Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to control flow rates and reduce volumes of runoff.

Flood Risk / Sequential test

6.162 The latest EA flood risk mapping shows the site and site access falling entirely within Flood Zone 1 and are therefore not considered at risk of flooding from fluvial flooding, including when factoring for climate change to years 2070 - 2125. Mapping additionally shows a degree of sporadic surface water flooding (pluvial flooding) located around existing buildings, along Storrington Road. This flooding is modelled at an annual likelihood of 1:30 when factoring for climate change to years 2070 - 2125. Additional surface water is modelled to the south of the red line boundary adjacent to the existing drainage ditch on High Bar Lane.

6.163 Officers note that the previous appeal scheme was subject to a sequential test which found sequentially preferable sites in flood risk terms. This Inspector found that this weighed against the scheme. Officers note that the National Planning Policy (NPPF Policy S5.2) no longer requires the application of a sequential test for sites at risk of surface water flooding only and where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates clearly that no built form would be at risk of flooding from any source, now and in the future. Officers are therefore satisfied that a sequential test is no longer required in this instance, and presence of any sequentially preferable sites should not weigh against the proposal.

Surface Water

6.164 A Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy has been submitted and reviewed by WSCC Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). Surface water is proposed to be retained within two surface level retention basins, one of which is located within the public open space adjacent to the proposed LEAP, the second of which would be located to the south east of the site adjacent to the southern boundary. Surface water would be discharged into an existing open channel to the south of the site. The applicant has provided two potential outfalls to connect the site to the drainage open channel, both of which have been considered acceptable in principle by the LLFA.

6.165 The first potential outfall is an established outfall to the south of the site. The LLFA have confirmed they have no objection to this strategy, however, they have requested a surveyed for onward connectivity. The second outfall would be a new outfall through third party land; the LLFA have again raised no objection, however, they have asked the applicant to confirm they have the appropriate necessary easements in place. Given this, the LLFA have requested a final surface water drainage, including details of a surface water outfall arrangement, to be secured via condition (condition 3). In addition, the LLFA have requested a site-specific maintenance and management plan for all elements of the surface water drainage system (Condition 24) and a surface water drainage a verification report (Condition 27). Officers therefore considered that a proposed drainage scheme is capable of being acceptable to accord with NPPF Policies F4 and F8 and HDPF Policy 38.

6.166 The Environment Agency have additionally requested a condition to ensure any infiltration of surface water is assessed by HDC for potential contamination of controlled waters prior to first use (Condition 3). Whilst officers note that surface water is primarily proposed to be drained into an existing drainage ditch, this condition is recommended to remain in place so as to ensure any potential infiltration is fully assessed.

Foul Water Capacity

6.167 The development proposes to discharge foul water into an existing Southern Water sewer located along Storrington Road. Discharge of foul water would be gravity fed for much of the site, however a pumping station is also proposed to the south east of the site.

6.168 The proposal has been reviewed by Southern Water who have outlined that there is currently inadequate capacity in the foul network to accommodate the proposal. Southern Water have clarified this relates to capacity within underground assets / pipes, with the proposed flows potentially leading to a minor increased risk of impact on the sewer network. Southern Water have additionally outlined that works to upgrade network infrastructure may not align with the development's build out.

6.169 Southern Water Guidance to Local Planning Authorities outlines that Southern Water have a legal obligation under Section 94 of the Water Industry Act 1991 (WIA 1991) to provide developers with the right to connect to a public sewer regardless of capacity issues. In addition, Southern Water has a statutory duty under section 94 of the WIA 1991 to plan and implement any works that are necessary to ensure the network of sewers (and sewage treatment facilities) continue to operate satisfactorily once they have received notification that a developer intends to exercise their right to connect. When assessing planning applications, Southern Water assess whether there is infrastructure capacity to serve the development and if there would be adverse amenity impacts for existing or prospective users as a result. Whilst it is not possible to refuse planning applications due to limited network capacity, in some instances, Southern Water may advise that a phased development be delivered in line with improvements to the infrastructure, as identified.

6.170 Given the above Southern Water have requested the development is phased and implemented to align with the delivery of any network reinforcement. This can be secured via a suitably worded condition (Condition 15) and would ensure the occupation of the development does not exceed the capacity of the network.

Summary

6.171 In summary, subject to the above conditions the proposed surface water and foul drainage is considered acceptable and would not result in increased risk of surface water flooding elsewhere, and would not result in an increased risk of pollution and would accord with HDPF Policy 38, HDLP Policy 10 and NPPF Policy F4, F5, F7, and F8.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG):

6.172 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 may not be begun unless a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority and the planning authority has approved the Plan.

6.173 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.

6.174 The site's baseline and post-development habitat has been reviewed and agree by HDC's BNG Ecology Officer. The development would result in an overall +11.38% net gain (+13.18 units) in area habitat and an +29.28% net gain (+2.06 units) in hedgerows with BNG proposed to be delivered on site including within the land to the west. Enhancements are provisionally indicated to include areas of woodland, Open mosaic habitats, enhancement grassland, Heathland and shrub. Final details of this, including specific details of onsite species can be secured by way of the statutory BNG planning condition.

6.175 Officers are mindful that, in this instance, the applicant is seeking to transfer the entirety of the open space, including on-site BNG to Thakeham Parish Council. This would therefore result in the Parish Council being responsible for future monitoring and maintenance over the required 30 year period.

6.176 In practice, the applicant / developer would be responsible for submitting and discharging the final post-development habitats and a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) in line with the deemed biodiversity gain condition. It would then also be for applicant / developer to deliver all on-site BNG in line with final approved post-development habitats. The applicant will additionally be responsible for paying the £4,176.87 S106 monitoring fee which covers HDCs monitoring of the site and the assessment of monitoring reports.

6.177 Following the delivery of BNG on site Thakeham Parish Council will then take ownership of the land and assume full responsibility for managing and maintaining all BNG, in addition to responsibility for submitting monitoring reports to HDC in years 1,2,5,10,15,20,25 and 30 in line with s106 monitoring obligations. The applicant has therefore committed to providing Thakeham Parish Council with a sum of £35,000 to cover the costs of producing the monitoring reports over this monitoring period. It is proposed that the above is secured via S106 agreement.

6.178 As set out above, the S106 obligations and the draft transfer documents would be finalised in consultation with the Parish Council, thereby providing sufficient certainty that the Parish Council are in a position to formally accept the open space / BNG provision. Nonetheless, in the scenario whereby the Parish chooses not to accept the open space / BNG, then the land would cascade to an alternative community organisation, with the management of statutory BNG falling to a management company.

Minerals and Waste:

6.179 The application site is located partially within a Minerals Safeguarding Area for Building Stone (Hythe Formation) as defined in the WSCC Joint Minerals Local Plan 2018 Policy M9. The WSCC Minerals and Waste team have reviewed the application and have raised no objection on minerals safeguarding grounds. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with Policy M9 of the WSCC Joint Minerals Local Plan.

Climate Change

6.180 HDPF Policies 35, 36 and 37 require that development mitigates the impacts of climate change through measures including improved energy efficiency, reducing flood risk, reducing water consumption, improving biodiversity, and promoting sustainable transport modes.

6.181 HDLP Policy 6 (Climate Change) seeks to ensure that development supports the transition to net zero carbon emissions across the District by 2050 at the latest and requires development to adapt to the future impacts of climate change and reduce climate vulnerability. HDLP Policy 8 sets out requirements for Sustainable Design and Construction and HDLP Policy 9 requires residential development to utilise no more than 110 litres of mains supplied water per person per day.

6.182 The proposed development includes the following measures to build resilience to climate change and reduce carbon emissions:

- Passive design construction methods
- Integration of SUDS and green infrastructure to manage flood risk
- Requirement to provide full fibre broadband site connectivity (1000mbps) (Required under Part R of the Building Regulations)
- Dedicated refuse and recycling storage capacity
- Biodiversity Net Gain
- Cycle parking facilities and a Mobility Hub
- Improved pedestrian and cycle links within Thakeham.
- Electric vehicle charging points (Required under Part S of the Building Regulations)
- Air quality mitigation strategy
- Improved energy performance to meet/above Part L of the Building Regulations
- Mains water consumption of no more than 110 litres per person per day can be secured via a suitably worded planning condition (Condition 33).

Air Quality

6.183 HDLP Policy 12 requires consideration of direct effects air quality including potential habitat impacts within 7km of The Mens SAC. NPPF Policy P3 sets out the development should be consistent with the objectives of relevant Air Quality Action Plans. The application site is not located within or close to any of the district's defined Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs), however, on account of the quantum of development, comprising a 'major' development the Sussex Air (2021) Air Quality and Emissions Mitigation Guidance for Sussex requires an Air Quality Assessment (AQA) and Emissions Mitigation Statement to be submitted.

6.184 The Council's Environmental Health (Air Quality) Officer has reviewed the submitted Air Quality Assessment (Cass Allen, February 2026) and has accepted the damage cost calculation of £41,406. The Officer notes that whilst an Emissions Mitigation Plan has been provided, there remains some uncertainty as to how this cost would be offset. Nonetheless, it is considered these can be secured via a suitably worded planning condition (Condition 13) to including a total damage cost arising from the proposed development over 5 years and suitable mitigation measures to offset this damage cost. Officers note that provision of EV chargers is now part of Building Regulations under Part S, and covered by the WSCC standards, so a robust AQA must go over and beyond the standards in place under other legislations.

S106 Agreement and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL):

6.185 Horsham District Council has adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule which took effect on 1st October 2017. This development constitutes CIL liable development.

6.186 HDPF Policy 39 requires new development to meet additional infrastructure requirements arising from the new development. The provision of affordable housing must be secured by way of a Legal Agreement, as would contributions to infrastructure and off-site improvements including sustainable transport commitments and air quality mitigation measures.

6.187 A s106 legal agreement to secure the obligations necessary to make this application acceptable in planning terms is currently being drafted. The headline obligations are to include the following:

- 35% Affordable Housing (55 units)
- Provision of land to the Community Land Trust
- Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
  - On-site monitoring
  - Bellway to deliver BNG and discharge deemed BNG condition.
  - £35,000 to TPC to fund BNG Monitoring reports
- Retained Land Improvements
- Open Space
  - LEAP final details and maintenance sum if transferred to Parish Council - £34,176.00
  - Open space transfer of land within 6 weeks of demolition commencement.
  - Storage building and parking area delivered and transferred the parish
  - Future management of Open Space

- Highways
  - Financial contribution towards improvements at the Buck Barn and Washington Junctions (£41,472)
  - Travel Plan and Travel Plan auditing (£4,110)

- Public Rights of Way and footway improvements
  - Delivery of improvements to Bridleway 2483, Footpath 2463_1, Footpath 2474
  - Delivery of improvements to Footpath 2405, or alternative financial contribution (£15,000)
  - Financial contribution towards improvements to Footpath 2448 (£9,000)
  - PRoW / Bridleway Signage financial contribution (£10,000)
  - Provide two footways within Abingworth to the south of the site, as shown in Drawing Number 2206671-D010A within the travel plan.

- Parish Council traffic calming
  - £45,000 towards the making of a TRO and traffic calming features

Sussex Police – ANPR Cameras

6.188 Sussex Police are seeking a financial contribution to the capital 'cost' of policing new growth equating to £13,000 to facilitate a ANPR (Automatic Number Plate Recognition) Camera along Thakeham Road. The justification for this contribution appears premised on it being required in part to mitigate the increased population resulting from the development and in part to subsidise a reduction in grant funding for Sussex Police in recent years. The comments received from Sussex Police outline that the proposed development would generate an additional 64 incidents per year for Sussex Police to attend.

6.189 The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and CIL Charging Schedule sets out that funding for Public Services infrastructure and Community facilities infrastructure is covered by CIL in Horsham district, rather than individual contributions from individual development

sites. This includes funding for Emergency services infrastructure and Health care facilities. As such services can be funded directly via CIL, it is not reasonable to oblige the applicant to provide this additional funding for Sussex Police via the s106 agreement.

6.190 Officers further note that there is no direct evidence that the siting of an ANPR camera on Thakeham Road is necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms or that this particular development proposal will increase the risk of crime or disorder such that this bespoke contribution is necessary. As such, the request is not deemed necessary to mitigate the impact of the development, is not considered directly related to the development, or fairly and reasonably related in kind to the development, thereby failing to meet the tests for a planning obligation set out at paragraph 58 of the NPPF and at Reg 122 of the CIL Regulations.

Conclusions and Planning Balance:

6.191 The proposed development is not supported by the adopted development plan, and the proposal would fail to attract support from either site allocation TNP Policy 3, or NPPF Policy S5 pertaining to development outside of settlement boundaries given the proposed scale and availability of infrastructure. The principle of development is therefore considered to be contrary to HDPF Policies 2, 3, 4 and 26, emerging HDLP Policies 2, 3 and 14, TNP Policies 1 and 3 and NPPF Policies S3 and S5. As such, NPPF Policy S5 (4) sets out that the development should only be approved in '*exceptional circumstances, where the benefits of the proposal would substantially outweigh the adverse effects'*.

6.192 In this instance the adverse effects of the proposal would be the proposal's conflict with the adopted development plan, and that the site is not located to promote sustainable patterns of movement to limit the need to travel, or so that the proposal provides a genuine choice of transport modes for residents, contrary to NPPF Policies TR3, TR4 and CC2, HDPF Policies 2, 3, 4 and 40 and HDLP Policy 24.

6.193 The core benefits of the development are the provision of 150 dwellings including 53 affordable dwellings (35%) of which 46 would be M4(2) and 4 would be M4(3) dwellings, at a time when the Council has a 1.7 year housing land supply. The provision of 1.1ha of land to the CLT to support community-led development / affordable housing, the provision of a substantial degree of public open space providing a betterment to the wider community, public right of way enhancements, delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain across the site as a whole, and the visual and landscape betterment to the character of the countryside from the re-development of this vacant and increasingly derelict site.

6.194 These benefits should be considered within the development context that the application site has been vacant since 2022, has been demonstrated to be unviable for a continued commercial or alternative policy compliant use, and that it has been demonstrated that the proposed quantum of development is the minimum quantum required to produce a viable/deliverable scheme whilst also delivering a policy compliant provision of 35% affordable housing.

6.195 The remainder of the scheme has been found to be acceptable subject to conditions and a legal agreement including Highways Safety, Drainage and Flood risk, Air Quality and Climate Change, Minerals and Waste, Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain, Arboriculture, Contamination, Education Provision, Residential Amenity, Heritage.

6.196 When considered as a whole, whilst the proposal's conflict with the adopted development plan and NPPF Policy S5, and the lack of sustainable infrastructure, are taken within the balance, Officers consider that the circumstances set out above cumulatively result in an exceptional circumstance where the benefits of the proposal would substantially outweigh the adverse effects. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval subject to the conditions below, and subject to the completion of the necessary s106 legal agreement to

secure the affordable housing, CLT land, transfer of open space and other infrastructure as set out in the above Heads of Terms.

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
Residential	17,743 (exact figure tbc)	0	9888.4
Non-residential	0	25, 285 (exact figure tbc)	-25,285
		Total Gain	9888.4
		Total Demolition	25,285

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.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 To approve full planning permission subject to appropriate conditions and subject to the completion of the necessary section 106 agreement within four months of the decision of this Committee, or such longer period as is agreed by the Director of Place acting reasonably and properly.

Conditions

Conditions relating to the entire application site:

1. **Approved Plans**

2. **Regulatory (Time) Condition:** The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

   Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Conditions relating exclusively to land marked as areas 2, 3, 4, and 5 on plan Open Space Transfer Plan (Ref: OSTP 1.0)

3. **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development, including any works of demolition, shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme and construction method statement shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

   This shall include, but not be limited to:
   - An approved surface water outfall arrangement which can be secured for the lifetime of the development, including details of any necessary easements over third party land.
   - A "for construction" drawing detailing all easements, levels, pipe diameters, outfall details and any associated drainage infrastructure.
   - Details of any Ordinary Watercourse Consent required and evidence that the consents can be obtained
   - SuDS construction method statement, following industry recognised guidance referred to in the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems.
   - An assessment of the risks to controlled waters via any proposed infiltration.

   The scheme shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved construction method statement, approved FRA and Drainage Strategy and remain in perpetuity for the lifetime of the development. No alteration to the agreed drainage scheme shall occur without prior written approval from the Local Planning Authority.

   Reason: To ensure drainage provisions meet the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems and do not increase flood risk on or off site, and to comply with NPPF and Local Planning Policies.

4. **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development, including any works of demolition, shall commence until the following demolition and construction details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall be limited to the following measures:

   (a) Details of site management contact details and responsibilities;
   (b) A plan detailing the site logistics arrangements on a phase-by-phase basis (as applicable), including:
      i. location of site compound,
      ii. location for the loading, unloading and storage of plant and materials (including any stripped topsoil),
      iii. site offices (including location, height, size and appearance),
      iv. location of site access points for construction vehicles,
      v. location of on-site parking,
      vi. locations and details for the provision of wheel washing facilities and dust suppression facilities
   (c) The arrangements for public consultation and liaison prior to and during the demolition and construction works – newsletters, fliers etc, to include site management contact details for residents;
   (d) Details of any floodlighting, including location, height, type and direction of light sources, hours of operation and intensity of illumination.
   (e) Air Quality and Dust Management including:
      - Full implementation of all relevant IAQM High-Risk Site mitigation measures for demolition, earthworks, construction and trackout.
      - Identification of a named person responsible for dust and air-quality management.
   (f) Details for the demolition and removal of all asbestos containing materials by an appropriately licensed and competent contractor, including details of measures to prevent contaminated run-off, waste control, storage of materials and any other relevant environmental safeguards.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental in order to consider the potential impacts on the amenity of nearby occupiers and highway safety during construction and in accordance with Policies 33 and 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

5. **Pre-Commencement Condition**: Any works which will impact the breeding / resting place of bats shall not in in any circumstances commence unless the local planning authority has been provided with either:
    a) a licence issued by Natural England pursuant to Regulation 55 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) authorizing the specified activity/development to go ahead; or
    b) evidence of site registration supplied by an individual registered to use a Bat Mitigation Class Licence; or
    c) a statement in writing from the Natural England to the effect that it does not consider that the specified activity/development will require a licence.

    Reason: To conserve protected species and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

6. **Pre-Commencement Condition**: Any works which will impact the breeding / resting place of Hazel Dormouse shall not in in any circumstances commence unless the local planning authority has been provided with either:

    a) a licence issued by Natural England pursuant to Regulation 55 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) authorizing the specified activity/development to go ahead; or
    b) a statement in writing from the Natural England to the effect that it does not consider that the specified activity/development will require a licence."

    Reason: To conserve protected species and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

7. **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development, including any works of demolition, ground clearance, or bringing equipment, machinery or materials onto the site, shall commence until the following preliminaries have been completed in the sequence set out below:
    (a) All trees on the site shown for retention on approved drawing number 2142-KC-XX-YTREE-TPP01 Rev E (TREE PROTECTION PLAN), as well as those off-site whose root protection areas ingress into the site, shall be fully protected throughout all construction works by tree protective fencing affixed to the ground in full accordance with section 6 of BS 5837 'Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations' (2012).
    (b) Once installed, the fencing shall be maintained during the course of the development works and until all machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site.
    (c) Areas so fenced off shall be treated as zones of prohibited access, and shall not be used for the storage of materials, equipment or machinery in any circumstances. No mixing of cement, concrete, or use of other materials or substances shall take place within any tree protective zone, or close enough to such a zone that seepage or displacement of those materials and substances could cause them to enter a zone.

    Any trees or hedges on the site which die or become damaged during the construction process shall be replaced with trees or hedging plants of a type, size and in positions agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure the successful and satisfactory protection of important trees and hedgerows on the site in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

8. **Pre-Commencement Condition**: No development, including any works of demolition, shall commence until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
    a) The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following.
    b) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities
    c) A timetable for demolition works to avoid impacts to breeding birds, including Redstarts.
    d) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".
    e) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
    f) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
    g) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
    h) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
    i) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
    j) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

    The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

    Reason: To conserve protected and Priority species and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (as amended).

9. **Pre-Commencement Condition**:
    I) No development, including any works of demolition, shall commence until a programme of archaeological work has been secured in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

    II) The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until the archaeological site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under part [I] and that provision for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing.

    Reason: This matter is fundamental as the site is of archaeological significance and it is important that it is recorded by excavation before it is destroyed by development in accordance with Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

10. **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development, including any works of demolition, shall commence until a landscape management plan for a minimum of 5 years. has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority This should include:
    a) Drawing/s showing the extent of the LMP i.e. only showing the areas to which the LMP applies, areas of private ownership should be excluded.
    b) Written Specification detailing:

- All operation and procedures for soft landscape areas; inspection, watering, pruning, cutting, mowing, clearance and removal of arisings and litter, removal of temporary items (fencing, guards and stakes) and replacement of failed planting.
- All operations and procedures for hard landscape areas; inspection, sweeping, clearing of accumulated vegetative material and litter, maintaining edges, and painted or finished surfaces.
- Furniture (Bins, Benches and Signage) and Play Equipment.
- All operations and procedures for soft landscaping to SuDS features; inspection of linear drains, basins and swales, removal of unwanted vegetative material and litter, including inlets and outlets.

c) Maintenance task table which explains the maintenance duties across the site in both chronological and systematic order.
d) Mechanism for monitoring and review of the management plan and operations.

Reason - To support plant establishment and ensure appropriate management is carried out and to maintain functionality and visual aesthetic.

11. **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development, including any works of demolition, shall commence until such time as a detailed scheme for groundwater monitoring in respect of contamination has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the LPA.

    The scheme shall, where necessary, be supported by:
    - detailed sampling and analytical schedules
    - programme for future maintenance and decommissioning
    - schedule for submission of interim and final monitoring reports
    - contingency action plan including the list of potential mitigation measures that will be implemented, should unexpectedly changes in groundwater quality be noted as a result of decommissioning or redevelopment works.

    The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing/phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or any details as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the LPA.

    Reason: To ensure that the site does not pose any further risk to the water environment by managing any ongoing contamination issues and completing all necessary long-term remediation measures. This is in line with the NPPF.

12. **Pre-Commencement Condition** No development, including any works of demolition, shall commence until a Precautionary Working Methods Statement (PWMS) detailing reasonable avoidance measures for great crested newts has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This Method Statement. should be produced a suitably qualified ecologist amd include consider the storage of material and waste, ditch management, and any steps taken should GCN be discovered onsite. Works shall only be undertaken in accordance with the approved Method Statement.

    Reason: As these matters are fundamental to safeguard the ecology and biodiversity of the area in accordance with Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), and to enhance Protected and Priority Species/habitats and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority Habitats & Species).

13. **Pre-Commencement (Excluding Demolition) Condition:** No development, with the exception of demolition, shall commence until a detailed mitigation strategy establishing the on-site measures to improve air quality at both the operational and construction phases has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall be written in accordance with the Council's Planning Advice

Document: Air Quality & Emissions Reduction Guidance (2021), and shall detail the calculated damage costs that will be spent on practical mitigation measures. The approved detail within the strategy shall thereafter be strictly adhered to unless otherwise agreed to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To mitigate against the impact of the development in accordance with Policy 24 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Interim Air quality and Emissions Mitigation Guidance for Sussex (2026).

14. **Pre-Commencement (Excluding Demolition) Condition:** No development, with the exception of demolition, shall commence until full details of underground services, including locations, dimensions and depths of all service facilities and required ground excavations, have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The submitted details shall show accordance with the landscaping proposals and Arboricultural Method Statement and the specific requirement for no excavations (trenchless installation methods only) for any services within the minimum recommended root protection areas of retained trees. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

    Reason: As this matter is fundamental to the acceptable delivery of this permission, to ensure the underground services do not conflict with satisfactory landscaping in the interests of amenity in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

15. **Pre-Commencement (Excluding Demolition) Condition:** No development, with the exception of demolition, shall commence until a detailed foul drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall demonstrate that:

    1. Foul water Capacity exists off site to serve the development: or
    2. A development and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with the Local Authority in consultation with Southern Water. Where a development and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed, no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed development and infrastructure phasing plan: or
    3. All Foul water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows from the development have been completed, and
    4. Sufficient infrastructure exists on the proposed development to ensure that the site will be adequately drained.

    No dwelling shall be occupied until the foul drainage infrastructure required to serve that dwelling has been provided in accordance with the approved details.

    Reason: To ensure that the development adequately manages foul drainage without increasing food risk in accordance with NPPF.

16. **Pre-Commencement (Excluding Demolition) Condition:** No development, with the exception of demolition, shall commence until plans and elevations detailing the external design, compound, fencing, street furniture and ancillary planting for the pumproom and parish council storage building as shown on LANDSCAPE MASTERPLAN Ref: P24-2268_EN_0001C (Date 22/09/2026) and a timetable for their delivery, have been be submitted and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

    Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development that is sympathetic to the landscape and townscape character and built form of the surroundings, and in the interests of visual

amenity in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

17. **Pre-Commencement (Excluding Demolition) Condition:** No development, with the exception of demolition, shall commence until scheme for managing any borehole on site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall provide details of how redundant boreholes are to be decommissioned and how any boreholes that need to be retained, post-development, for monitoring purposes will be secured, protected and inspected. The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the scheme, or any changes as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the LPA.

    Reason: To ensure that redundant boreholes are safe and secure, and do not pose an unacceptable risk of groundwater pollution or loss of water supplies in line with NPPF Policy P2.

18. **Pre-Commencement (Excluding Demolition) Condition:** No development, with the exception of demolition, shall commence until final details of the proposed mobility hub, as shown on LANDSCAPE MASTERPLAN Ref: P24-2268_EN_0001C (Date 22/09/2026 and a timetable for its delivery have been submitted and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include a scheme for the provision and maintenance of electric bike hire, a cycle maintenance point, a car club scheme including space and charging spot for the vehicle, and parcel lockers in addition to plans and elevations detailing the external design, compound, fencing, street furniture and ancillary planting for mobility hub. The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

    Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development that is sympathetic to the landscape and townscape character and built form of the surroundings, and in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

19. **Pre-Commencement (Excluding Demolition) Condition:**
    No development, with the exception of demolition, shall commence until a remediation strategy to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site in respect of the development hereby permitted, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. This strategy will include the following components:

    1. Up to date Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) and conceptual model following the results of an exploratory investigation including consideration of potential contaminants associated with those uses (including, but not limited to, asbestos, hydrocarbon and PFAS contamination).
    2. A detailed site investigation scheme, based on the results from (1) to provide information for a detailed risk assessment to all receptors that may be affected, including those off-site.
    3. A tiered risk assessment using the results of the site investigation referred to in (2).
    4. An options appraisal including sustainability and treatability studies of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
    5. A remediation strategy and verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, mitigation, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

    Any changes to these components require the written consent of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure that no unacceptable risks are caused to humans, controlled waters or the wider environment during and following the development works and to ensure that any pollution is dealt with in accordance with Policies 24 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and the NPPF, and to ensure the development will contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated.

20. **Pre-Commencement (Slab Level) Condition:** Prior to any works above slab level commencing, a schedule of materials and finishes and colours to be used for external walls, windows and roofs of the approved building(s) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing and all materials used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall conform to those approved.

    Reason: As this matter is fundamental to enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail in the interests of amenity by endeavouring to achieve a building of visual quality in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

21. **Pre-Commencement (Slab Level) Condition:**
    Prior to any works above slab level commencing, a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy for protected, Priority and threatened species, prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist in line with the recommendations of the Ecological Appraisal (Aspect Ecology Ltd., January 2026), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
    The content of the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy shall include the following:

    a) Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed enhancement measures;
    b) detailed designs or product descriptions to achieve stated objectives;
    c) locations of proposed enhancement measures by appropriate maps and plans (where relevant);
    d) persons responsible for implementing the enhancement measures; and
    e) details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant).

    The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

    Reason: To enhance protected, Priority and threatened species and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under NPPF Policy N2 and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (as amended).

22. **Pre-Commencement (Slab Level) Condition:** Prior to the commencement of development above slab level within plots 150 - 146, plots 1 – 5 and plots 14-16 (as shown on SITE LAYOUT PLAN P24-2268_DE_010_I_029) a scheme of noise and vibration attenuation and ventilation for sufficient to prevent overheating and maintain thermal comfort within these dwellings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include acoustic performance details of the building facades and glazing and incorporate the recommendations detailed in the Cass Allen Noise Assessment dated February 2026 Ref: RP01-23295-R6. The scheme shall achieve the habitable room standards as detailed in BS8233:2014 and appropriate consideration of LAmax with suitable measures to ensure the thermal comfort of occupiers.

    The above mentioned scheme of ventilation shall be designed following a suitable overheating assessment in accordance with the CIBSE overheating position statement March 2020 using weather files DSY2 and shall ensure a suitable scheme to mitigate overheating and ventilate the premises hereby permitted and having due regard to installation and design standards of Acoustics Ventilation And Overheating: Residential Design Guide January 2020.

Reason: To ensure acceptable internal noise levels can be achieved.

23. **Pre-Occupation Condition:** The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied/bought into use until minimum of 20% of all un-allocated communal off-street parking spaces are equipped a fast charge electric vehicle charging. As a minimum, the charge point specification shall be 7kW mode 3 with type 2 connector. The means for charging electric vehicles shall be thereafter retained as such.

    Reason: To mitigate the impact of the development on air quality within the District and to sustain compliance with and contribute towards EU limit values or national objectives for pollutants in accordance with Policies 25 of the Horsham District Local Plan (HDLP).

24. **Pre-Occupation Condition:** The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied/bought into use until a site-specific maintenance and management plan for all elements of the surface water drainage system and any ordinary watercourses/culverts within the development in accordance with National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include the name and contact details of any appointed management company.

    Reason: To ensure that the development is maintained and managed to ensure continued effectiveness in accordance with National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems, and would not increase flood risk on or off site.

25. **Pre-Occupation Condition:** The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied/brought into use until a verification report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall demonstrate that the surface water drainage system has been built and is operating in accordance with the approved scheme as approved under condition 24. If the verification report indicates that the drainage system is not built and/or operating as intended, within three months, a scheme of modification/rectification shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the modification/rectification scheme shall be implemented in full in accordance with a timetable to be set out in the scheme.

    Reason: To ensure that the development is maintained and managed to ensure continued effectiveness in accordance with National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems, and would not increase flood risk on or off site.

26. **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be first occupied until full details of all hard and soft landscaping works for the area marked as areas 2, 3, 4 and 5 on plan Open Space Transfer Plan (Ref: OSTP 1.0) have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include plans and measures addressing the following:

    (a) Details of all existing trees and planting to be removed and retained
    (b) Details of all proposed trees and planting, including schedules specifying species, planting size, densities and plant numbers and tree pit details
    (c) Details of all hard surfacing materials and finishes
    (d) Details of all boundary treatments
    (e) Details of all built features and street furniture and wayfinding features
    (f) Details of all external lighting

    The approved landscaping scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details within the first planting season following the first occupation of any part of the development. Unless otherwise agreed as part of the approved landscaping, no trees or hedges on the site (other than those within private gardens) shall be wilfully damaged or uprooted, felled/removed, topped or lopped without the previous written

consent of the Local Planning Authority until 30 years after completion of the development. Any proposed or retained planting outside of private gardens, which dies, is removed, or becomes seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development that is sympathetic to the landscape and townscape character and built form of the surroundings, and in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

27. **Pre-Occupation Condition:** Prior to any part of the permitted development being occupied, a verification report demonstrating the completion of works set out in the remediation strategy approved under condition 19 and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the LPA.

    The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.

    Reasons: To ensure that the site does not pose any further risk to the land and water environment by demonstrating that the requirements of the approved verification plan have been met and that remediation of the site is complete and to ensure that any pollution is dealt with in accordance with Policies 24 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

28. **Pre-Occupation Condition:** Prior to occupation a lighting design strategy for biodiversity in accordance with Guidance Note 08/23 (Institute of Lighting Professionals) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall:

    a) identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for bats and Hazel Dormouse and that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and
    b) show how and where external lighting will be installed so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places.

    All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the scheme and maintained thereafter in accordance with the scheme. Under no circumstances should any other external lighting be installed without prior consent from the local planning authority

    Reason: To allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (as amended) and Policy 31 of the Horsham Development Framework.

29. **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development shall be first occupied until such time as the vehicular access serving the development has been constructed in accordance with the details shown on the drawing titled Proposed Site Access Arrangement and numbered 2505500-ACE-XX-00-DR-C-0502B.

    Reason: In the interests of road safety.

30. **Regulatory Piling condition:** No piling shall be undertaken until details of the piling scheme have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning

Authority. The scheme shall be based on the information submitted as part of the application and, where necessary, supported by:

- Foundation Works Risk Assessment including risks of downward contamination mobilisation
- A conceptual site model
- Specification of the type, number and depth of proposed piles/ foundations/ dimensions of shaft/tunnel/ design of heating and cooling system
- A contingency action plan including the list of potential mitigation measures that will be implemented, should unexpected changes in groundwater quality be noted as a result of decommissioning piling works.

The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing/phasing arrangements contained in the scheme, or any details as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the LPA.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed piling, does not harm groundwater resources in line with the NPPF and Position Statement A3 of The Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection.

31. **Regulatory Condition:** All mitigation measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the Ecological Appraisal (Aspect Ecology Ltd., January 2026) and the Ecological Method Statement for Black Redstart (Aspect Ecology, November 2026) as already submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the local planning authority prior to determination. This includes the Precautionary Method Statement for mobile protected and Priority species in Sections 6.1.17 and 6.1.18 of the Ecological Appraisal (Aspect Ecology Ltd., January 2026)), which avoids impacts on protected species.

    This will include the appointment of an appropriately competent person e.g. an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) to provide on-site ecological expertise during construction. The appointed person shall undertake all activities, and works shall be carried out, in accordance with the approved details."

    Reason*:* To conserve protected and Priority species and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (as amended).

32. **Regulatory Condition**: If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA) shall be carried out until further investigation and a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the LPA. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

    Reasons: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site. This is in line with the NPPF.

33. **Regulatory Condition**: The dwelling(s) hereby permitted shall meet the optional requirement of building regulation G2 to limit the water usage of each dwelling to no more than 110 litres per person per day. The subsequently installed water limiting measures shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: To limit water use in order to improve the sustainability of the development in accordance with Policy 9 of the Horsham District Local Plan 2023 – 2040 Policy 37 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

34. **Regulatory Condition:** No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until the cycle parking facilities serving it have been provided within the garage or side or rear garden for that dwelling. The facilities shall thereafter be retained for use at all times. The cycle parking facilities shall thereafter be retained as such for their designated use.

    Reason: To ensure that there is adequate provision for the parking of cycles in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

35. **Regulatory Condition:** No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until the car parking spaces (including garages where applicable) necessary to serve it have been constructed and made available for use in accordance with approved Parking Plan Ref: P24-2268_DE_010_B_006]. The car parking spaces permitted shall thereafter be retained as such for their designated use.

    Reason: To provide car-parking space for the use in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

36. **Regulatory Condition:** No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until provision for the storage of refuse and recycling has been made for that dwelling in accordance with Refuse Strategy Plan Ref P24-2268_DE_010_B_009. These facilities shall thereafter be retained for use at all times.

    Reason: To ensure the adequate provision of recycling facilities in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Conditions relating exclusively to land marked as area 1 on plan Open Space Transfer Plan (Ref: OSTP 1.0):

37. **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development within the areas marked as area 1 on plan Open Space Transfer Plan (Ref: OSTP 1.0) shall commence until full details of all hard and soft landscaping works to cover this area have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include plans and measures addressing the following:

    (a) Details of all hard surfacing materials and finishes including connecting paths
    (b) Details of all boundary treatments
    (c) Details of all play space, play equipment and sports provision
    (d) Details of all built features and street furniture and wayfinding features
    (e) Details of all external lighting
    (f) Details of any other landscaping works

    The approved landscaping scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.

    Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development that is sympathetic to the landscape and townscape character and built form of the surroundings, and in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Biodiversity Net Gain Condition

Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states that planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the "biodiversity gain condition" which means development granted by this notice must not begin unless:

(a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
(b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission is Horsham District Council.

This permission will require the submission and approval of a Biodiversity Gain Plan before development is begun.

For guidance on the contents of the Biodiversity Gain Plan that must be submitted and agreed by the Council prior to the commencement of the consented development please see the link: Submit a biodiversity gain plan - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements
There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. These can be found at Paragraph: 003 Reference ID: 74-003-20240214 of the Planning Practice Guidance, which can be found at https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-net-gain.

Irreplaceable habitat
If the onsite habitat includes irreplaceable habitat (within the meaning of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024) there are additional requirements for the content and approval of Biodiversity Gain Plans.

Informative - Works within the Highway – Implementation Team
The applicant is required to obtain all appropriate consents from West Sussex County Council, as Highway Authority, to cover the off-site highway works. The applicant is requested to contact The Implementation Team Leader (01243 642105) to commence this process. The applicant is advised that it is an offence to undertake any works within the highway prior to the agreement being in place.

Informative - Temporary Developer Signage
The applicant is advised that the erection of temporary directional signage should be agreed with the Local Traffic Engineer prior to any signage being installed. The applicant should be aware that a charge will be applied for this service.

Informative - Landscape Details
The applicant is advised that full details of the hard and soft landscape works include the provision of, but shall not be necessarily limited to:

- Details of existing and proposed levels for all external earthworks associated with the landscape proposals (including SuDS, play areas, etc). Such details to include cross sections where necessary
- Planting and seeding plans and schedules specifying species, planting size, densities and plant numbers
- Tree pit and staking/underground guying details
- A written hard and soft landscape specification (National Building Specification compliant), including ground preparation, cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment
- Hard surfacing materials - layout, colour, size, texture, coursing, levels
- Walls, steps, fencing, gates, railings or other supporting structures - location, type, heights and materials
- Minor artefacts and structures

- location and type of street furniture, play equipment, refuse and other storage units, lighting columns and lanterns

Informative - Fire Hydrants
The applicant is advised to contact the WSCC Fire and Rescue Service to agree the need for, and location of, any fire hydrants that may be required to service the site under the Building Regulations.

Informative - Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan
A Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan is a site-specific strategy that demonstrates how the site will be managed and maintained in order to fulfil the original intentions of the applicant and guarantees that the scheme and the retained landscape and ecology structures are maintained and improved for the lifetime of the development. A guidance note to content and layout can be found using the following link https://www.horsham.gov.uk/planning/development-management.

Informative - Note to Applicant
The applicant is advised that this decision does not officially endorse the wider site masterplan document submitted with the application given the wider masterplan includes development that would be subject to separate planning consent. It has however been taken into consideration in the determination of this application insofar that the Council is satisfied that the proposed uses within the masterplan would likely not prejudice the operation of the current proposals, and vice versa.

8. USE OF AI

8.1 This report has not been prepared with the support of artificial intelligence tools.