PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

DATE:	17th November 2026
DEVELOPMENT:	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 24no. dwellings including the creation of a new access from Sandygate Lane with associated works.
SITE:	Cedar Cottage, Sandygate Lane, Lower Beeding, West Sussex, RH13 6LR
WARD:	Nuthurst and Lower Beeding
APPLICATION:	DC/26/0640
APPLICANT:	**Applicant Name:** BlackOnyx Becketts Limited **Address:** C/O Agent, 91 Boundary Road, Hove, BN3 7GA **Agent Name:** Molly McLean MRTPI, Whaleback **Address:** 91 Boundary Road, Hove BN3 7GA

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.
- By request of Lower Beeding Parish Council
- By request of Councillor Livingstone

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 and social considerations. 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.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

1.2 The proposal seeks the demolition of the existing property on the site, Cedar Cottage, and the erection of 24 dwellings, and associated infrastructure. Access to the proposed development would be formed by way of a new priority T-junction, involving hedge trimming to achieve suitable visibility splays. The existing vehicular access to the western neighbour, Sandygate, will be maintained separately to serve that dwelling.

1.3 The proposed layout follows a sinuous ribbon pattern of development alongside the new estate road, ending in a cul-de-sac with turning head. The proposal would be a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings, with each property having at least 2 car parking spaces. The site includes the provision of 4 x dedicated visitor parking spaces.

1.4 A substation compound and parking space is indicted within the centre of the site, alongside the visitor parking bays.

1.5 Indicative materials shown in the accompanying Design and Access Statement (DAS) as red / brown facing brick, brown horizontal timber boarding, and / or tile-hanging with red / brown roof tiles, with a further reference to the possibility of grey roof tiles.

1.6 The proposal includes the following affordable housing split (35% = 8 units):

- 1 x 2-bed Affordable Ownership
- 4 x 2-bed Affordable Rented
- 3 x 3-bed Affordable Rented

Amendments:

1.7 Amendments to the site's layout were received on 24th July seeking to address consultee comments, particularly the landscape and tree comments. The layout now seeks to locate development clear of RPA's, with increased planting and landscape pockets throughout the site. Furthermore, plot 6 has been revised to a chalet bungalow.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

1.8 The 1.09ha site is located to the western side of Lower Beeding, adjoining the defined Built-Up Area Boundary of the village. Lower Beeding is located approximately 3.5miles southeast of Horsham and is designated in Policy 3 of the HDPF as a 'small village', noted to have limited services, facilities and social networks, but with good accessibility to larger settlements. The site is located on the peripheries of the High Weald National Landscape, but does not directly adjoin it.

1.9 The application site comprises a residential plot of Cedar Cottage, set on the southern side of Sandygate Lane, along with an area of land to the rear (paddocks), where the site widens and wraps around the rear of and adjacent property, Sandygate, and its extensive garden, which includes a tennis court sited alongside the application boundary.

1.10 The application property is a chalet bungalow, as is the neighbouring dwelling to the east (Gardeners Cottage). Sandygate to the west is a two-storey property set on a large plot, which shares a single vehicular access point with the application property off Sandygate Lane. An established and well-maintained hedgerow runs along the southern side of Sandygate Lane, forming a strong frontage of the southern plots.

1.11 There are trees covered by Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's) in adjacent plots:

- TPO/1422 (T1 and T2 – Oaks) - In the southern tip of Gardeners Cottage
- TPO/1613 (T1 - Oak) - in the south-eastern corner of Sandygate

1.12 Adjoining the eastern boundary of the site lies a residential development site, Trinity Fields, comprising some 31 dwellings. The properties which adjoin the application site from Trinity Fields appear to have benefitted from an outlook over the application site, with low separating boundary fences and hedges, along with established vegetation by way of shrubs and trees. The paddock part of the application site is defined largely by a rustic post and rail fence affording the site with a sense of connection to the wider area beyond the site boundary.

1.13 The aforementioned High Weald National Landscape lies some 50m to the east of the site, separated by the intervening Trinity Fields development. To the north of the site, there is a newly completed residential development for 22 properties, known as The Gallops, permitted in September 2023 under DC/22/0708. It is noted that this development (The Gallops) was allocated in the Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan (2025) for 20 properties (policy 8).

1.14 The site includes Previously Developed Land to an area of around 450sq.m, comprising the existing house and hardstanding. The site is not identified as being at any surface water, ground water or river flooding risk. The site does not include any land identified for Nature Recovery purposes.

2. INTRODUCTION

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

2.1 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES
The following Policies are considered to be relevant to the assessment of this application:

National Planning Policy Framework (2026):
S3: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
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
HO13: Build out of residential and strategic sites
M3: Assessing the benefits of mineral development
M6: Safeguarding mineral resources and infrastructure through decision-making
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
P2: Ground conditions
P3: Living conditions and pollution
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
N4: Protected Landscapes
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

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 15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision
Policy 16 - Strategic Policy: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection
Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles
Policy 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

Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan (2025):
Policy 1: Biodiversity
Policy 2: Landscape Character
Policy 3: Green Infrastructure
Policy 4: Sustainability
Policy 5: Energy Efficiency
Policy 11: Housing Mix
Policy 12: Design
Policy 13: Density
Policy 19: Water Neutrality

Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19):
Strategic Policy 1: Sustainable Development
Strategic Policy 2: Development Hierarchy
Strategic Policy 3: Expansion of Existing Settlements
Strategic Policy 6: Climate Change
Strategic Policy 7: Appropriate Energy Use
Strategic Policy 8: Sustainable Design and Construction
Strategic Policy 9: Water Efficiency
Strategic Policy 10: Flooding
Strategic Policy 11: Environmental Protection
Strategic Policy 12: Air Quality
Strategic Policy 13: Landscape and Settlement Character, Development Patterns and the Natural Environment
Strategic Policy 14: Countryside Protection
Strategic Policy 16: Protected Landscapes
Strategic Policy 17: Green and Blue Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 18: Local Green Space
Strategic Policy 19: Development Principles
Strategic Policy 21: Heritage Assets and Managing Change within the Historic Environment
Strategic Policy 23: Infrastructure Provision
Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport

Policy 25: Parking
Strategic Policy 37: Housing Provision
Strategic Policy 38: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Strategic Policy 39: Affordable Housing
Policy 40: Improving Housing Standards in the District
Strategic Policy HA11: Lower Beeding

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

Planning Advice Notes:
Shaping Development in Horsham District (2025)
Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure (2022)

PLANNING HISTORY AND RELEVANT APPLICATIONS

DC/05/0323	Demolition of Cedar Cottage and erection of replacement chalet style dwelling	Application Permitted 01.04.2005

3. OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

3.1 Where consultation responses and representations 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 horsham.gov.uk/planning/planning-applications/view-and-comment-on-planning-applications.

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

3.2 **HDC Arboricultural Officer:** Comment

[Summary 04.09.2026] The amended submission has addressed a number of the previous arboricultural points raised previously, which is positive, although some matters remain outstanding. Conditions advised

3.3 **HDC Environmental Health (Contamination):** No Objection
[Summary] Condition advised

3.4 **HDC Environmental Health (Air Quality):** Comment
[Summary 15.05.2026] An Air Quality Screening Assessment is needed

3.5 **HDC Environmental Health (Noise):** Comment
[Summary 15.05.2026] The dwellings fronting Sandygate Lane may be exposed to high levels of daytime noise so an Environmental Noise Assessment Survey is needed

3.6 **HDC Housing**: More information
[Summary 06.08.2026] The Housing Register in Lower Beeding currently has 135 households waiting for housing of which is broken down to:

- 39 households (29%) in need of a 1-bedroom unit,
- 20 households (15%) in need of a 2-bedroom unit,
- 53 households (39%) in need of a 3-bedroom unit
- 23 households (17%) in need of 4 or more bedrooms

Households with a 3- or 4-bedroom need are currently the longest waiting on our housing register waiting on average 3 times longer than households with a 1- or 2-bedroom need. Housing Officers would ask developers to deliver affordable housing provision in line with the above demand, and to provide information on engagement with an RP to demonstrate there is an interest in delivering the AH provision in this location. Without this, the proposal cannot be supported.

3.7 **HDC Landscape Architect:** More Information
[Summary 25.08.2026] No concerns are raised regarding the proposed development in principle, however modification is requested in order to protect and conserve existing landscape features. Following amendments a number of concerns remain [nb These are set out in more detail in the landscape section in the report below]

3.8 **HDC Waste & Recycling:** No Objection

3.9 **HDC BNG:** No Objection
[Summary 02.10.2026] Scenario 1 BNG triggered, HMMP condition would be required. The metric calculation tool currently demonstrates that the development will have a -20.25% net loss (-0.65 units) in area habitats and an increase in 0.68 units for hedgerows) in area habitats..
As there is no net gain on-site, this cannot be considered as significant on-site BNG and therefore a legal agreement to secure on-site proposals is not required. However, there are current concerns with the baseline assessment, and there is scope for further on-site delivery in accordance with the biodiversity gain hierarchy, which may alter the final BNG calculation figures.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

3.10 **Archaeology Consultant:** No Objection
[Summary] Condition advised

3.11 **Ecology Consultant:** No Objection
[Summary 15.10.2026] Following review of all reports and additional information submitted, previous concerns have been addressed. Conditions advised, including the provision that the fallen tree be retained within the site, and if necessary moted to a more suitable location

3.12 **NatureSpace:** No Objection
[Summary 16.09.2026] Following additional information being received (GCN eDNA Sampling statement) NatureSpace confirm that they are satisfied with the amended precautionary measures. Condition advised

3.13 **Southern Water:** Comment
[Summary 22.05.2026] There is currently adequate capacity in the local sewerage network to accommodate a foul flow of 4.01 l/s. There is currently adequate capacity in the local surface water network to accommodate a surface water flow of 4 l/s. Conditions advised

3.14 **WSCC Highways:** No Objection
Conditions advised

3.15 **WSCC Lead Local Flood Authority:** No Objection
[Summary 11.09.2026] Additional Information has been reviewed and satisfactorily addresses previously raised queries. Conditions advised.

3.16 **WSCC Rights of Way:** No Objection

3.17 **WSCC Fire and Rescue:** No Objection
[Summary 14.05.2026] Condition advised

3.18 **WSCC Minerals and Waste:** Comment
[Summary 14.05.2026] The development does not meet the thresholds for consulting WSCC Minerals and Waste, so the LPA will need to be satisfied that the proposals minimise waste generation, maximise opportunities for re-using and recycling waste, and where necessary include waste management facilities of an appropriate type and scale (Policy W23 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan, 2014).

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

3.19 Representations:

To date, representations have been received from 53 address points, all of which object on the following grounds:

Design / Appearance / Context / Amenity:

- Loss of privacy to neighbouring properties (Trinity Fields, Sandygate and Gardeners Cottage)
- Overbearing height and massing (Trinity Fields, Sandygate and Gardeners Cottage)
- Locally resisted development as part of NP process = will result in 20% increase over existing village size (in addition to the NP allocated developments
- Overdevelopment of small village
- Demolition of perfectly serviceable house (20 years old - DC/05/0323)
- Loss of outlook (from Trinity Fields)
- Too high density
- Increased traffic and pollution (light, noise and air) = implications on health
- Impact on residential amenity arising from internal estate / access road

Highways / Access / Parking:

- Persistent speeding issues = accident risk and turning conflicts
- Estimated peak trip rate appears low
- Accident blackspot (Sandygate Lane) = used as a cut-through from M23 to A281
- Proximity of 4 junctions within 150m (The Gallops, Church Farm, Trinity Fields and development) = impact of peak traffic
- Lack of safe route to local school
- Proposal to cut back hedges on neighbouring land will not be granted consent by land-owner
- Incorrect / inconsistent details in submitted documents, eg: neighbouring / highway / access boundaries = misleading findings, incapable of delivery (access, visibility splays and existing pavement widths at 1.24m-1.8m, not 2.4m) = access cannot be delivered with required visibility splays maintained on public /application land
- No public transport into Horsham
- Insufficient on-site parking
- Restricted access for emergency vehicles
- Narrow local pavements make walking (especially with dogs, buggies and children) dangerous

Infrastructure:

- Inadequate local infrastructure (no local shop, pharmacy or Drs, only a small local school)
- Locally expected new shop and roundabout as part of s106 for adjacent Trinity Fields development have not been delivered
- Unreliable electricity supply = implications on proposed on-site pump / holding tank

Policy:

- Overall harm outweighs need for housing
- Conflict with approved NP (Oct 2025)
- Lack of social / affordable housing
- Recent expansion in the same road (Trinity Fields and The Gallops)
- HDC previously resisted development of this site on account of it being a buffer between rural and urban aspects of Lower Beeding
- Presumption against the infilling of gardens
- Lack of local support

Ecology / Nature / Flooding:

- Field erosion / loss of green space = reduction in wildlife habitat / biodiversity
- Impact on TPO and adjoining trees
- Surface water flood risk = no robust SuDS strategy
- High localised water table = implications on foundations / construction / drainage
- Sewage pipe crossing the site requiring added protection
- Implications of both The Gallops and application site relying on pumping stations if both have power outage, or want to pump at the same time, or are subject to a storm deluge = ditch network connects south from Leech Pond and into Leonardslee Gardens
- Concern that site is old infilled Clay pit = risk of subsidence
- Implications of placing SuDS tanks in an area with a highwater table
- Potential saturation risk of land to the south, which sits at a lower level / gradient = soil creep and pollution / run-off risk during heavy rain in the build phase
- Increased demand in water / impact on area subject to water stress
- Concerns over ongoing pump maintenance given costs and potential should this not be maintained, or the building company goes into liquidation
- Confirmation if there is adequate emergency storage for SUDS – eg heavy rainfall and power outage situations
- Implications of drainage / SuDS costs on deliverability of AH housing

3.21 Parish Comments:

Lower Beeding Parish Council: Objection

- proximity of the application site to the built-up area boundary, the loss of green space, the impact on the local environment and the direct impact on neighbours.
- Site not allocated in Neighbourhood Plan – conflict with para 14 NPPF
- Lower Beeding Parish Council requests escalation of this application for determination at committee, on the grounds that this application raises a significant planning matter on the basis that it does not appear in the made Neighbourhood Plan.

3.22 Member Comments:

The application raises several significant planning matters, including:

1. **Access visibility and hedge ownership:** The high hedges adjacent to the proposed access are not within the control of the developer. Neighbouring residents have made clear their objection to any reduction in hedge height. As a result, the required visibility splays at the site entrance cannot be achieved, creating a potential safety risk for vehicles exiting the development.
2. **Affordable housing delivery:** No registered provider has yet been identified or agreed for the affordable housing element. This should be secured through confirmed contractual arrangements prior to any planning approval, rather than left to a condition. This is necessary to ensure that the affordable homes are genuinely deliverable.

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.

6. PLANNING ASSESSMENTS

Principle of Development:

Current Development Plan Policy and 5 year housing supply position

6.1. The development plan relevant to the proposed development comprises the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF, 2015) and the Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan (LBNP, 2025). In accordance with planning law, these documents are the starting point for the assessment of the development proposals.

6.2. The site lies outside of the defined built-up area boundary (BUAB) of Lower Beeding and therefore remains located within the countryside in policy terms. The wider characteristics of the application site follow a linear ribbon pattern of spacious residential properties set on generous plots fronting onto Sandygate Lane (B2115), outside of the settlement boundary. The site is not allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF), or the Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan (LBNP). As a result, residential development on this greenfield site would conflict with the requirements of Policies 2 and 4 (Settlement Expansion) of the HDPF. In addition, the development would conflict with the countryside protection policy of the HDPF (Policy 26) owing to its siting outside the BUAB and as the proposed residential development is not considered to be essential to this countryside location. Consequently, the proposed development of this site for housing conflicts with the adopted development plan for the district.

6.3. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the HDPF is now over 5 years old, and that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply, with the calculated housing land supply currently at 1.7 years supply, according to the latest AMR (published April 2025).

Shaping Development in Horsham District (Planning Advice Note)

6.4. The Council published the SDPAN in September 2025, recognising the lack of a current 5 year housing land supply. Whilst the advice contained in the SDPAN does not form policy, nor does it alter the statutory decision-making framework, it forms guidance in the decision-making process, particularly where residential developments are proposed in locations outside of the defined settlement edge.

6.5. The current application would meet all of the criteria set out within the SDPAN as the site adjoins the Lower Beeding built up area boundary, is of a scale appropriate to the scale and function of Lower Beeding in the settlement hierarchy, retains its important landscape features, is contained within a defensible boundary, and would not prejudice long term planned development. The SDPAN therefore offers positive support for the proposal, albeit this carries only limited weight given the status of the SDPAN as guidance only.

Emerging Development Plan Policy

6.6. The Horsham District Local Plan 2023-40 (the emerging Local Plan or 'eLP') has recently completed its examination in public and the examining inspector has stated in his Post-Hearing Note of 30th October 2026 that he considers the plan to be sound, subject to some further modifications. The Horsham District Local Plan 2023 - 2040 remains the emerging Local Plan (eLP) in the context of NPPF Policy DM4 and therefore constitutes a material

consideration. Nonetheless, given the plan is now at post-examination stage, the policies and background evidence base within the eLP are now considered to carry significant weight in decision-making.

6.7. Whilst it is recognised that the site is not allocated within the recently made Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan, the application site is allocated within the eLP under Policy HA11 - Lower Beeding Housing Allocations, site LWB4, for at least 28 homes. This site allocation also includes land within the adjacent property known as Sandygate, however this land is not included within the current application site red line boundary. Policy HA11 requires that he four site allocations within Lower Beeding protect and enhance the setting of the Grade II listed Holy Trinity Church, avoid negative impacts on the High Weald National Landscape, and retain and protect all areas of ancient woodland, veteran trees and tree subject to Tree Preservation Orders. Specifically in relation to the application site, Policy HA1 (LWB4) requires that:

a) It is demonstrated that development delivers comprehensive development across both land parcels across the site as a whole, including the timely provision of any necessary supporting infrastructure; and
b) Demonstrate that they do not prejudice the development of adjoining land and/or infrastructure within the allocation. This should include facilitating connections between the two land parcels and demonstrating how connections can be made to future adjacent developments.

6.8. Although the application site excludes the land within the curtilage of Sandygate, the plans nevertheless do not prejudice development at Sandygate coming forward, with the plans detailing an internal road link to allow the Sandygate parcel to be accessed from within the site. Based on the details submitted, there is no indication that the proposals do not accord with the above emerging policy requirements.

National Planning Policy Framework

6.9. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published August 2026 is a material consideration 'of critical importance' in decision making. Annex A of the NPPF sets out that development plan policies) which are materially inconsistent with national decision-making policies within the NPPF 2026 should be given very limited weight.

6.10. National decision-making Policy S3(1)(b) applies the presumption in favour of sustainable developments, which outside settlements, requires development proposals to accord with Policy S5. Policy S5 sets out a series of development types that '*should be approved, unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework'.*

6.11. Part i) of Policy S5(1) refers on one such type of as being '*The development of land allocated for that purpose in the development plan (where this lies outside settlements*)'. In this case, as the eLP is not yet the adopted development plan for the district, the site is not deemed to be allocated for the purposes of national Policy S5.

6.12. Accordingly, the application site falls to be considered under Policy S5(1)(j) instead, which supports development outside the defined BUAB 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;…

6.13. In this instance the application site is clearly physically well-related to the settlement of Lower Beeding and its modest scale of 28 homes (considered cumulatively with the neighbourhood

plan site allocations) is deemed appropriate to the infrastructure of Lower Beeding, which includes a public house, bus services, a nursery and primary school, sports facilities and some agricultural retail facilities.

6.14. The proposal is therefore considered to be supported by national policy S5(1) and as such is required to be supported '*unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects*'. In making this assessment Policy S5(2) clarifies that:

'In applying this policy, the circumstances in which the benefits of approving development proposals are likely to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects include, but are not restricted to, situations where the development proposal would fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances.'

6.15. Whether any such adverse effects are considered substantial is discussed in the planning balance at the end of this report.

6.16. Lower Beeding Parish Council have referred to the site not being allocated within their neighbourhood plan and have referenced the protections afforded by Paragraph 14 of the 2024 NPPF. This Paragraph has been replaced by Policy S6 of the new NPPF, which retains the same protections. The Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan is under 5 years old and contains allocations to meet its identified housing requirement. However, officers note that the Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan is silent on proposals for developments outside of the settlement edge should be managed, therefore it cannot be said that the proposals conflict with the Neighbourhood Plan. Consequently, national Policy S6 is not engaged in the consideration of this application.

Conclusion on principle

6.17. The proposed development presents a conflict with the current development plan insofar that the site lies outside of the defined BUAB, and has not been allocated for development in either the HDPF or the Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan, and is not essential to its countryside location. The principle of development is therefore contrary to Policies 2, 4, and 26 of the HDPF. The weight to be attributed to this conflict, having regard to the Council's five-year housing land supply position, the allocation of the site within the eLP, and the support to be found within the SDPAN and national Policy S5, is discussed in the overall planning balance at the end of this report.

Housing Mix and Affordable Housing:

6.18. Nationally, policy HO8 requires development proposals to meet or exceed up-to-date development plan requirements for the proportion and tenure of affordable housing, with a priority for on-site provision in the first instance.

6.19. Policy 16 of the HDPF requires that residential development should 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). Policy 16 also requires that on sites providing 15 or more dwellings, or on sites over 0.5 ha, the Council will require 35% of dwellings to be affordable with a tenure split of 70% affordable rented and 30% intermediate tenure. Policy 11 of the LBNP indicates a need for predominantly 2 and 3-bed homes in the parish.

6.20. The Council's Housing Team has commented that the Housing Register in Lower Beeding currently has 135 households waiting for housing, of which 39 households (29%) are in need of a 1-bedroom unit, 20 households (15%) in need of a 2-bedroom unit, 53 households (39%) in need of a 3-bedroom unit, and 23 households (17%) in need of 4 or more bedrooms. Furthermore, households in the housing register for 3-bed and 4-bed units face waiting times that are around 3 times longer than those waiting for 1-bed or 2-bed units.

6.21. In this instance, the proposed development of 24 units would provide for 8 affordable dwellings on-site against a policy requirement of 8.4 dwellings. The anticipated provision of affordable units on site, within the respective affordable rented and shared ownership splits, are set out below, alongside the current Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) expectations:

Affordable Rented	***SHMA 2019 expectation (5 units)***	**Proposal (7 units)**	**Over / under supply**
1-bed	*35% (1.75 dwellings)*	0 dwellings	-2
2-bed	*30% (1.5 dwellings)*	4 dwellings	+2
3-bed	*25% (1.25 dwellings)*	3 dwellings	+2
4+ bed	*10% (0.5 dwellings)*	0 dwellings	=

Shared Ownership	***SHMA 2019 expectation (3 units)***	**Proposal (1 units)**	**Over / under supply**
1-bed	*25% (0.75 dwellings)*	0 dwellings	-1
2-bed	*40% (1.2 dwellings)*	1 dwelling	=
3-bed	*25% (0.75 dwellings)*	0 dwellings	-1
4+ bed	*10% (0.3 dwellings)*	0 dwellings	=

6.22. This mix is considered appropriate with the additional three-bed affordable rent homes welcomed given the housing register need for this size of accommodation. Whilst the Council's Housing Team is concerned that no Registered Provided (RP) has been identified to confirm that the proposed tenure split and dwelling mix would be acceptable and deliverable in practice, the absence of an RP at application stage is not entirely uncommon. The planning agent considers that the lack of identified RP at this stage should not preclude the application from being determined positively, and states that some initial interest has been expressed in the location and number of units, although initial responses are non-committal on account of the underdetermined nature of the application at the current time. Furthermore, it is stated by the planning agent that the intentions are to build out the site as per the submitted details to avoid unnecessary delays by way of potential Deed of Variations to the s106 legal agreement.

6.23. The proposal would result in a technical shortfall of 0.4 units against local policy expectations, which can be addressed by a commuted sum secured in the associated legal agreement.

6.24. In terms of market housing, the proposal is for 16 market units with the following mx, set alongside the Council's current Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA, 2019), resulting in the over-provision of family-sized (3-bed) dwellings, which are locally found to be in demand:

Open Market	***SHMA 2019 (16 units)***	Proposal (16 units)	Over / under supply
1-bed	*5% (0.8 dwellings)*	0 dwellings	=
2-bed	*30% (4.8 dwellings)*	2 dwellings	*-3*
3-bed	*40% (6.4 dwellings)*	12 dwellings	*+6*
4+ bed	*25% (4 dwellings)*	2 dwellings	*-2*

6.25. The proposed housing mix is therefore considered appropriate in accordance with HDPF Policy 16 and Policy 11 of the LBNP and the Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD, subject to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement to secure the on-site affordable provision and payment in lieu of the 0.4 unit.

Landscape Impact:

6.26. Locally, Policy 25 of the HDPF seeks to preserve, conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character of the district, taking into account individual settlement characteristics, and maintaining settlement separation. Policy 26 states that, outside built-up area boundaries, the rural character and undeveloped nature of the countryside will be protected against inappropriate development. Policy 31 of the HDPF sets out support for development proposals that demonstrate that it maintains and enhances the existing network of green infrastructure, as well as requiring proposals to enhance existing biodiversity, and create and manage new habitats where appropriate. Policy 33 of the HDPF states that in order to conserve and enhance the natural and built environment, developments shall be required to ensure that the scale and massing of development relates sympathetically within the built surroundings, landscape, open spaces and routes within the adjoining site.

6.27. Nationally, Policy N2(1) of the NPPF seeks to ensure that developments respond positively to the natural environment, and support nature's recovery. The policy goes on to require the following relevant parts:

(a) consideration is given to the environmental qualities of development sites, including habitats, landscape character and the natural beauty and that those qualities are enhanced and conserved
(d) Conserve and enhance existing natural features or visual, historic or nature conservation value (such as hedgerows and trees), and use appropriate landscaping to help create a well-designed place and integrate the development into its surroundings
(e) Use green infrastructure as part of the scheme and nature-based solutions to secure multiple benefits
(g) Ensure that green infrastructure and other features which support nature are located and designed to minimised risk of failure, and that appropriate measures are in place for any necessary long-term management

6.28. Policy N2 sets out refusal for proposals where significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for.

6.29. Aligned with N2, is Policy DP3, which sets out an expectation that development proposals respond to their context (character and setting), to integrate with and enhance their surroundings, and under DP3(2)(c) to incorporate and / or connect to a network of quality and accessible, multi-functional green infrastructure to provide opportunities for recreation and healthy living, strengthen habitats, improve climate change resilience and improve air and water quality, including maintaining and enhancing tree cover (in accordance with policy N3, which expects suitable tree species, and new tree-lined streets).

6.30. As has already been established, the application site adjoins but lies outside of the defined settlement edge of Lower Beeding in policy terms. In physical terms, the site lies within a patchwork of residential gardens, paddocks and extensive garden grounds, and so is not readily perceived as a 'rural' setting insofar as an open agricultural setting. Visually, there are a number of trees around the site's perimeter, either within the application site or adjoining land, which act to provide a sense of enclosure to the site.

Landscape

6.31. Officers confirm that this site does not comprise a Protected Landscape as it does not fall within the nearby High Weald National Landscape (formerly AONB), or otherwise impact on its setting. The Council's Landscape Architect has assessed the proposal, first noting in June 2026 that the layout should avoid instances where established trees and vegetation is placed within private gardens, in order to secure its long-term retention and securing the associated benefits thereof. Furthermore, ensuring that Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of retained trees, including TPOs, remain outside of residential curtilages, provides additional protection for these trees from potentially damaging works such as hard landscaping and garden structures. Layout changes have been made to address these comments.

6.32. Additionally, the Landscape Officer requested that the access road be tree-lined on the approach to / from Sandygate Lane, to 'conserve and enhance tree cover around village fringes and on approach roads' as highlighted in the Planning and Land Management Guidelines for *N1 - Mannings Heath Farmlands Landscape Character Area* (of the 2003 Landscape Character Assessment), which has now been provided. Furthermore, it has been recommended that the central area under the central tree be expanded to function as a community seating area with feature planting to address OSSR requirements for open space (Open Space, Sports & Recreation Review 2021). Amendments introduced additional tree planting within the northern section of the site, alongside the estate road.

6.33. Following review of submitted amendments, a number of the previously raised landscape comments have been satisfactorily addressed, amending a number of encroachments into identified Root Protection Areas of trees within and adjacent to the site. However, there are a number of comments which remain, which have been addressed by the planning agent:

1) Garden of Plot 6 falls within the RPA of T42, which is subject to a TPO
The planning agent confirms that the dwelling footprint falls outside of the RPA (14th Sept 2026)

2) Removal of Plot 7 would facilitate the provision of a more meaningful open space around T19, which is subject to a TPO (in accordance with the OSSR, 2021)
The planning agent considers that the absence of additional open space (beyond what is already proposed) would not represent an adverse effect that would substantially outweigh the benefits, both in terms of the national policy position. As such, Plot 7 will not be removed (from the scheme), as this would be unnecessary and would reduce the amount of much-needed new homes in the district (14th Sept 2026)

3) Plot 13 and the associated access / turning spur lie within the RPA of T24 and T26, which present shading concerns and present a considerable risk of future lopping or felling pressure, which would impact on the site's landscape character and amenity value
The planning agent confirms that the dwelling footprint has been relocated 3m outside of the canopy of T24 and avoiding any incursion into the RPA (14th Sept 2026)

4) Provision of a knee-rail fence to the RPA of T19 should be replaced by a post-and-rail fence to provide more robust barrier against access
The planning agent confirms that suggested fencing can be secured by condition (14th Sept 2026)

5) No amenity space or seating / feature planting indicated in central area by T19 – the site meets the minimum threshold for multi-functional greenspace provision as identified in the OSSR, 2021. This should be provided to address the open space that could be provided on site and address landscape and visual amenity concerns
The planning agent notes that in relation to the OSSR requirements, the OSSR study does not specify a current or required provision of amenity greenspace for the village of Lower Beeding, but does identify an 'overprovision' of parks and gardens. It is therefore unclear which OSSR requirement is unmet, in any case, given the limited space and scale of the development and site constraints, no additional open space can be provided beyond the two identified areas on the plan (central green around the Oak Tree / T19, and the landscaped area in the south-west corner) (14th Sept 2026).

6) Whilst a number of planted buffers have now been included and shown on plans, it is noted that long-term retention of this planting cannot be guaranteed within private amenity space, and therefore these buffer planting areas must be provided with a maintenance access strip and excluded from private plot ownerships.

T*he planning agent confirms that the buffers will fall outside of plot ownerships and can be secured by way of a condition, as can more detailed fencing and planting. Exact access strip dimensions will be dependent on species within buffer (14th Sept 2026)*

6.34. Officers have reviewed the OSSR (2021), noting that Landscape officer's comments reflect an expectation that the application site provides some multi-functional greenspace (MFGS), which includes amenity greenspace natural greenspace, and parks and gardens. Whilst there is a marginal over-provision in Lower Beeding for 'parks and gardens', this is outweighed by the greater lack of natural, and semi-natural greenspace and amenity greenspace, with an overall deficit of 21.7sq.m / per resident.

6.35. Given the restricted site area, the Council's Landscape officer acknowledges that not all MFGS typologies could be delivered in site. Instead, it is suggested that the central open area around the retained tree (T19), could be widened to deliver amenity space that could be enjoyed by residents, by way of seating and feature planting. Given these expectations, officers consider that a reasonable approach would be to deliver some small meaningful contribution towards MFGS, by way of the and the inclusion within the site of the central open area under T19, affording residents a connection point to the natural environment, and an opportunity to promote social interaction.

6.36. Officers consider that appropriately worded planning conditions, required at the specified trigger points, can secure these benefits.

Trees:

6.37. The Council's Tree Officer notes a number of removals across the site of trees to facilitate the proposed development, amounting to 16 individual trees, three groups and one hedge, all of which have been classified as Class C (low arboricultural quality, limited landscape value, or short term retention potential). It is not considered that the removal of these trees would be readily visible from the wider public domain, with the exception of the hedge to the frontage. These losses are considered to be mitigated by way of an appropriate landscape scheme, which can be secured by condition.

6.38. Furthermore, whilst there is some pruning works identified as necessary to facilitate construction, these are assessed as relatively minor, and BS:3998 compliant.

6.39. The revised plans have largely addressed the concerns relating to incursions of plots into identified RPAs. However, insofar as the Council's Tree Officer's advice, the following matters remain unaddressed:

1) *The protection of the undeveloped RPA of T19 at post development stage by way of a post-and-rail fence, and being able to establish a clear barrier between the curtilage of Plot 7 and the same RPA of T19*
2) *Large percentage of the PRA of T34 still within the curtilage of T34, so the removal of PD rights is suggested (Plots 15, 16, 17)*
3) *Encroachment of road / hard-surfacing into RPA of T26*
4) *Potential for post-development pruning pressure to the southern tree belt on account of likely shading to gardens and dwelling*

6.40. Officers note that there remains a point of disagreement on the matter of potential shading to Plots 14-17 by way of the retained southern tree belt, with the Council's Tree Officer noting that some shading would be inevitable at certain times of the day, likely giving rise to pruning requests to increase light penetration into gardens during the summer months.

6.41. The applicant's Arboriculturist considers that prospective residents would welcome the presence of shade during the summer months, and that furthermore, some pruning could take place up to the property boundary line with no material impact on the smaller canopies within G8 with no impact on amenity, and with T24 growing at a slow rate thus not unduly impacting on the area of garden being 'uncovered'. Furthermore, it is submitted that these

gardens would retain areas which are not subject to shading, thus *'highlighting that the garden space is not in a poor relationship with the retained canopies'.*

6.42. Matters regarding the post-development protection of T19, T34 and T42 can be secured by way of a planning condition, and it is noted that the roadway in the RPA of T16 is stated to be 'above ground'.

Conclusion on Trees and Landscape

6.43. The proposed development would not lead to an appreciable degree of landscape harm, noting the limited visibility of the site from the wider public realm, and noting the sinuous layout of the site with proposed street-trees now shown. Whilst there are a number of matters which have not been entirely addressed by way of the current layout as revised, officers consider that these matters could be adequately addressed by way of appropriately worded planning conditions, which would ensure that the development is capable of incorporating the existing retained trees as well as being able to establish meaningful new landscaping and screening. Furthermore, matters of potential shading are acknowledged, but alongside this, properties likely to be most affected have gardens depths of some 10m and an overall area of around 100sq.m, which means these properties do benefit from reasonably large gardens which would receive some natural sunlight throughout the day.

6.44. Accordingly, Officers consider that, subject to the addition of appropriate conditions, the landscape harm does not weigh significantly against the proposal and therefore, no adverse conflict with HDPF policies 2, 25, 31, 32 and 33, policies DP3, N2 and N3 of the NPPF and the emerging site allocation policy HA11 would be identified.

Design and Appearance:

6.45. Policy 25 of the HDPF also seeks to ensure that developments respond appropriately to the settlement character and established development patterns of the District, whilst policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF require development to be of a high standard of design and layout. Development proposals must be locally distinctive in character and respect the character of their surroundings. Where relevant, the scale, massing and appearance of development will be required to relate sympathetically with its built-surroundings, landscape, open spaces and to consider any impact on the skyline and important views.

6.46. Nationally, these ambitions are embedded within policy DP1 as a whole, calling for refusals of developments which fail to conflict with DP3(1), or the paragraphs of DP3(2) without clear justification. The design quality of any proposal needs to be assessed against local plan policies, including Neighbourhood Plans (NP), and Parish Design Statements if these have been incorporated into the NP.

6.47. Lower Beeding has a modest rural character that is dominated by brick-built properties and cottages with red / brown clay tiled roofs. Areas of tile hanging and white or pale render are noted within the village, with slate roofs noted on the historic pub and church, as well as dotted within the newer developments. LBNP Policy 12 expects accordance with local vernacular traditions and materials.

6.48. The proposals set out detailed elevations of the development from which it is possible to conclude that the design features and architectural detailing would be suited to the application site, subject to details of elements such as boundaries and materials being secured by way of suitable planning conditions.

6.49. The layout of the proposal is also considered acceptable, with development set alongside a sinuous cul-de-sac roadway, and an open central area around a retained Oak Tree (subject to a TPO/1613). The building lines of the properties fronting onto Sandygate Lane would respect the set-back of Gardener's Cottage and Sandygate, and afford an appropriate entry

into the new development. Within the development, the proposed dwellings are appropriately spaced and respond to the site layout and constraints.

6.50. The resulting appearance, layout and design, including the indicative materials proposed meet the national, local and neighbourhood policy objections, including DP3 of the revised NPPF, subject to a condition to secure details of external materials. Whilst officers recognise that the proposed layout would achieve a particularly low density (9dph), on account of the required separations to the retained trees, rising water main crossing the site and the parking, this never-the-less yields an appropriate layout for the village location of the site and the site context and constraints.

Conclusion on Design and Appearance

6.51. In summary, it is considered that the development on this site is capable of incorporating a layout that incorporates the required open space, children's play space and landscaped buffers as set out in the Council's Open Space, Sport and Recreation Review (June 2021). Furthermore, officers are satisfied that the detailed site layout demonstrates a suitable and appropriate development for this site, ensuring sufficient space is maintained to the retained trees, and incorporating the principles established locally under HDPF policies 32 and 33, and nationally under policies DP3, CC3, N2, and N3.

Residential Amenity:

6.52. Policy 33 of the HDPF requires that 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. Under NPPF Policy P3, development proposals should take into account of living conditions, both within new sites and in relation to existing residential properties. Specifically, policy requirement P3(b) states that new development should not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, and that adverse impacts should be avoided where possible, or mitigates to an acceptable degree.

6.53. The site layout plan demonstrates the development could be accommodated within the developable area whilst providing for a good standard of amenity for all future occupants of the proposed development, including reference to natural light as per paras 6.37-6.42 A landscape buffer has been provided alongside the site boundaries to the eastern and southern side, secured by a post-and-rail fence, with a view of ensuring the boundary vegetation is not diminished within residential curtilages.

6.54. The latest plan includes dimensions which demonstrate that back-to-back distances to existing residential properties (notably Trinity Fields to the east) would be no less than 21m at first-floor between habitable windows. The impacts arising from the location and orientations of the proposed buildings onto neighbours raise no appreciable concerns.

6.55. The Council's Environmental Health officer notes that new dwellings fronting Sandygate Lane (B2115) may be exposed to high levels of noise from daytime traffic, and considers that a noise impact assessment should be provided, quantifying and assessing the impact of noise on residential amenity. This would provide the Council with confidence that noise levels, both internally and in proposed amenity spaces, are capable of being mitigated through conditions.

6.56. Officers note that these dwellings offer a comparable relationship to the B2115 as the adjacent properties and the host dwelling that currently occupies the site, with a separating distance of around 19m between the front building line and the B2115. Furthermore, the dwellings located within the opposite development The Gallops, are marginally closer to the B2115 (at 14m), and were not subject to a noise-related condition as part of DC/22/0708, whilst No's 31-35 Trinity Fields present an even closer relationship to the B2115.

6.57. In this instance, whilst officers acknowledge the concerns raised by the Council's Environmental Health team in relation to the potential noise environment of Plots 1 and 2, the situation presented is typical of villages and a 30mph speed limit, where traffic speeds would therefore be lower. Officers therefore do not consider it reasonable or necessary to require a noise impact assessment in this particular instance.

6.58. Construction operations associated with the proposed development would not be considered to result in permanent excessive or unexpected disturbance that would lead to unacceptable harm to the existing amenities of nearby occupiers/users of land, such as to amount to conflict with HDPF policy 33 in amenity terms.

6.59. In light of the progress to the eLP, reference is made to Policy 40 (Improving Housing Standards in the District), which looks to secure all new dwellings meeting the Nationally Described Space Standards alongside meeting the M4(2) optional standards for accessible and Adaptable dwellings under the Building Regs.

6.60. The submitted Design and Access Statement sets out that all dwellings within the site would meet the criteria of M4(2), and furthermore, the schedule of accommodation demonstrates that all dwellings would accord with, or exceed the Nationally Described Space Standards.

6.61. It is, therefore, considered that future occupiers would benefit from a sufficient standard of amenity so as to satisfy the provisions of NPPF policy P3 and HDPF policy 32 and 33,

Highways Impacts:

6.62. Nationally, the revised NPPF promotes a vision-led approach to creating well-designed, sustainable, inclusive and popular places in allocating and assessing development sites. Policy TR3(1) of the NPPF states that development should be located where it can support sustainable pattens of movement, enable good accessibility for different users and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure. Furthermore, development proposals should be in a location that can effectively limit the need to travel, particularly by car, and which can offer genuine alternative travel options for residents and users.

6.63. 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 Policies 40 and 41 promote development that provides safe and adequate access, suitable for all users.

Vehicular Access

6.64. Detailed approval is sought under this application for the means of access to the site, which would be by way of a new priority T-junction onto Sandygate Lane (B2115) alongside a 2m wide pavement along the estate road. Sandygate Lane is a reasonably busy, but straight B-road. Pre-application advice was sought from the WSCC Local Highways Authority (LHA) in 2025 for a potential development of 28 homes prior to the application having been submitted.

6.65. The proposed new access arrangements to the site from Sandygate Lane have been assessed by the WSCC LHA, noting that swept path tracking for refuse and emergency vehicles have been provided with turning heads within the site. It is also noted that the existing access to the adjacent property, Sandygate, which is currently shared with Cedar Cottage (the application site), would be replaced with a vehicle crossover, continuing to serve Sandygate. As a result of the proposal, no intensification to the access remaining for Sandygate would be anticipated.

6.66. The proposed new access to serve the development would be re-aligned to the edge of the highway, thus gaining increased visibility over Sandygate Lane in both directions, noting the

posted speed limits of 30mph to the east, and 40mph to the west result in the need to accommodate visibility splays of 120m and 50m respectively. LHA officers are satisfied with the arrangement, visibility and geometry of the proposed new access, and also in relation to its proximity with the access to The Gallops to the north, and the retained access to Sandygate to the immediate west.

6.67. The submitted Transport Statement acknowledges that the boundary hedge currently overhangs the public highway (pavement) and may therefore require cutting back to obtain the required visibility splays, both east and west-wards, whilst the submitted drawings indicate that the visibility splay itself, necessary to provide the required 120m west-ward splay, falls within the maintainable highway boundary. Officers understand that concerns have been expressed by a neighbouring landholder regarding the ownership of the hedge and whether consent has been obtained for any future cutting back, removal, reduction or maintenance. However, the submitted access drawing indicates that the required visibility splay can be provided within highway land, with the Local Highways Authority has confirmed that the submitted details demonstrate that safe and suitable access can be achieved to serve the proposed development. Accordingly, no objection has been raised on highway safety grounds.

6.68. Whilst some trimming of vegetation back to the highway boundary may be necessary from time to time, to ensure that visibility splays remain unobstructed, such matters fall outside of the scope of the current planning assessment and may, where necessary, be addressed through the highway authorities' statutory powers.

6.69. Therefore, Officers conclude that there is a reasonable prospect of that the safe visibility can be achieved and maintained, as the necessary splays fall within the highways demise, as concluded by the LHA response to the proposal.

Trip Rate Generation / A4 junction capacity

6.70. The quantum of development is anticipated to generate some 109 two-way trips across a day, of which 11/12 would be AM/PM peak movements, using the standard TRICS methodology which the Local Highways Authority has assessed as being an acceptable methodology. This would result in an extrapolated average of one additional vehicular movement every 3-5 minutes within the local highway network during peak hours, with the trip distribution forecasting an even split of movements to the right and left along the B2115.

6.71. The recent development in close proximity to the north, The Gallops (DC/22/0708), has been acknowledged in the highway assessment and is not considered to generate a cumulative number of trips which would lead to any capacity or safety issues on the public highway.

6.72. Accordingly, the Local Highways Authority does not consider this to lead to a 'severe' impact on the existing nearby highway capacity.

Active Travel / Inclusive Mobility (pedestrian and cycle links)

6.73. The principles of Active Travel have been embedded within local and the revised national planning policies, under policy TR4, which seeks to ensure developments give priority first to walking, wheeling and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas. LTN 1/20 'Cycle Infrastructure Design', sets out the expectations for development to incorporate inclusive and accessible design for cycle infrastructure with a view that this is no longer seen as merely a leisure activity, but a viable means of transport in itself. Further advice set out in the document 'Inclusive Mobility' (Dec 2021) on the advised widths of footpaths.

6.74. The site is served by a continuous pedestrian footpath along the southern side of Sandygate Lane which leads east into the village and west along to Brighton Road, where there is a bus stop with a service into Horsham (route 17).

6.75. The proposal includes the provision of an informal dropped kerb to the eastern side of the application site to link into the development on the opposite site of the road (The Gallops), as shown on drawing 8240636/6101 Rev E within the transport statement.

Parking

6.76. Policy 41 of the HDPF states that adequate parking and facilities must be provided within developments to meet the needs of anticipated users, with HDPF policy requiring safe, convenient and visually attractive areas for parking vehicles and cycles without dominating a development, which is echoed by NPPF Policy TR4(1)(e).

6.77. Each dwelling would be provided with 2 dedicated parking spaces and additionally, there are 4 visitor spaces within the site. Each property would also be provided a cycle store within the rear garden, and EV charging provision.

6.78. The LHA has commented that the provision would accord with the expectations of the development in terms of location and demand, although the layout would lead to parking dominance, particularly around Plot 24 / visitor spaces, with a recommendation that these spaces be re-distributed throughout the site. Taken in the balance with other landscape and layout considerations, Officers consider that the proposed parking layout at this point is capable of being screened by effective landscape details, and would provide for a central open area around the retained oak tree (T19) opposite to be retained, thus reducing the likely visual impact of the group of visitor parking spaces.

Conclusion of Access, Parking and Active Travel

6.79. Officers acknowledge that the geometry of the proposed access (from Sandygate Lane) has been found to be acceptable to the Local Highways Authority, and that the site is capable of incorporating a suitable parking quantum to serve the development.

6.80. The proposal would lie within a walkable distance to the limited facilities available in Lower Beeding, noting the proximity to the Plough Inn (116m), Bus stops (200m to the west, 300m to the east), Primary School (400m), Day Nursery (600m), thus being suitably located in relation to an existing settlement and its limited facilities. The provision of three (albeit limited) bus routes also passing along Sandygate Lane, and a further bus route stopping around 650m to the west of the site (Brighton Road), also provides some sustainable access links to other larger settlements, in accordance with promoting active travel principles and in line with policies TR3 and TR4 of the NPPF, thus ensuring that the site is capable of providing viable alternative non-car modes of transport by which prospective residents can access what are noted to be limited local services, and nearby local public transport (Bus stops).

6.81. Policy TR6(4) of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be a severe adverse impact on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Based on the information submitted and subject to conditions, and a suitable legal agreement (to secure Travel Monitoring), WSCC Highways are satisfied that the development would not result in any unacceptable safety or otherwise severe impacts, and would provide for appropriate sustainable transport choices in compliance with policies TR3, TR4, TR6 and CC2 of the revised NPPF.

Biodiversity / Ecology:

6.82. HDPF policy 31 sets out the principles of maintaining and enhancing existing networks of green infrastructure, biodiversity, and woodland, along with introducing compensatory ecological mitigation measures where appropriate.

6.83. Policy N2(1)(e) and (f) of the NPPF indicates that when determining planning applications local planning authorities should ensure that development proposals minimise adverse impacts on biodiversity and include features which support priority or threatened species, and take suitable opportunities to connect and strengthen ecological networks which extend beyond the site (such as Local Nature Recovery Strategies). Developments resulting in the loss of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient, or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons (such as infrastructure projects where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of habitat) and a suitable compensation strategy exists (policy N6(2)).

6.84. In this instance, the main house, which is to be demolished, has been identified as possessing day roosts and transition/ occasional roosts for several bat species. Furthermore, potential roost features (PFMs) were identified within one tree along the western boundary. Therefore, the Council's Ecological Consultant requested additional surveys and reports to provide more details over these matters.

6.85. Subsequent to the additional information having been submitted and duly assessed, the Council's Ecological Consultant is satisfied that the works will be subject to a EPS licence, issued by Natural England (or other evidence as rquired), and that suitable mitigations can be secured by conditions.

6.86. The consultation response received from NatureSpace advises that no likely impact would arise to GCN or their habitat as a result of the proposed development.

6.87. Accordingly, the proposal meets the criteria set out under HDPF policy 31 and Policy N1 of the NPPF, and would contribute towards the enhancement of existing biodiversity, and would retain and / or enhance significant features of nature conservation

Drainage and Flood Risk:

6.88. The updated Environment Agency flood maps show that the application site is located within Flood Zone 1, indicating that it is at a very low risk from river flooding. In terms of surface water flood risk, the EA mapping data shows a low risk of surface water flooding, with climate change predictions modelling no changes at the site.

6.89. The application site has a fall of around 5m from the north to the southern-most corner of the site, so the drainage strategy uses this natural fall to direct the surface water flow towards the lowest point of the site and then into the Southern Water surface water main, where capacity has been confirmed by Southern Water as part of pre-application discussions with the utility provider. Given the site's topography, lack of nearby drainage ditches and high groundwater levels, this is the only possible option available, accompanied by a pumping station to ensure that any flows into the network are controlled at a managed flow-rate.

6.90. Furthermore, the foul flows can be accommodated into the existing foul sewer system, with the northern part of the site relying on gravity fed sewers, whilst the southern part of the site would rely on a pumped connection, as this lies below the level of the rising foul sewer. Southern Water have confirmed the capacity and that a 3m easement each side of the rising water main would be required for access and maintenance (north of plots 7 and 24).

6.91. The Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA) has reviewed the additional information submitted which sought to address the comments raised previously by the LLFA, and finds the details are now satisfactory to demonstrate how the surface water can be adequately managed on site and that the development will be safe for its lifetime and will not increase flood risk elsewhere, in accordance with NPPF policy F4 and F7.

6.92. Appropriate conditions are therefore recommended to ensure that the measures to ensure the foul and surface water drainage measures, including SuDS, are fully implemented.

Subject to these conditions the proposal accords with policy 31 of the HDPF and Chapter 18 of the revised NPPF.

Other Matters:

Heritage Impacts:

6.93. Section 66 of the Town and Country (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides a statutory requirement for decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting. National policies HE4, HE5 and HE6 refer to proposals affecting heritage assets, including their settings, requiring a clear and convincing justification in the event of harm to, or loss of, a designated heritage asset, and its setting.

6.94. The application does not impact on a designated heritage asset, insofar as listed or locally listed buildings are concerned, noting the siting of the Grade II listed Plough Inn and Holy Trinity Church, some 160m and 183m respectively to the east of the application site. The submitted Heritage Desk-Based Assessment does consider the wider impact on a number of listed buildings within the wider area, with Pollards Hill Farm, some 460m to the east, and Brick Kiln Farm, some 540m south, being closest to the site. The Council's Heritage Officer is satisfied with the conclusions and that no harm would be derived to the identified listed buildings or their settings from the proposed development.

6.95. With regards to archaeology, the Council's Archaeological consultant has reviewed the submitted archaeological desk-based assessment and is in agreement with the conclusions which state that there is low potential for significant archaeological remains. The archaeologist advises that whilst the potential for significant remains is low, there has only been one previous investigation in the vicinity of the site and so the potential remains uncertain. Therefore, in order to clarify the nature, extent and significance of any archaeological deposits that may be present, further investigations are required and so an archaeological field evaluation of the site would be appropriate which will enable suitable mitigation measures to be developed should significant archaeology be discovered

6.96. As such, a condition is recommended for the submission and approval of a programme of archaeological work (in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation). This condition is considered to be reasonable and would be attached to any consent granted.

6.97. In summary, it is not considered that the proposal will result in harm to the settings of Grade 2 listed Holy Trinity Church and The Plough Inn, and the layout and design of the scheme is considered to respond appropriately to the wider historic character of the village, in accordance with the general heritage requirements of HDPF Policy 34 and policy HE5 of the revised NPPF.

Contaminated Land:

6.98. The Council's Environmental Health team has reviewed the submitted Preliminary Land Quality Risk Assessment (Rev V1) and consider that the risks from contamination to future users has now been adequately assessed. However, it is advised that further chemical testing of soils is carried out to confirm the full range of ground conditions across the site. Officers are satisfied that these testing details can be requested as an appropriate pre-commencement condition, which would satisfy the requirements of NPPF Policies P2 and P3, and HDPF policy 24.

Climate Change:

6.99. Policies 35, 36 and 37 require that development mitigates to the impacts of climate change through measures including improved energy efficiency, reducing flood risk, reducing water consumption, improving biodiversity and promoting sustainable transport modes. These policies reflect the requirements of policy CC2 of the NPPF that decisions should seek to reduce the impact of development on climate change. The proposed development includes

the following embedded measures to build resilience to climate change and reduce carbon emissions:

- Installation of Air Source heat Pumps to all properties
- Water Efficiency measures to reduce water consumption to less than 110 l/p/d

6.100. Under Part S of the Building Regulations, each new dwelling is expected to be provided with an active EV charge point and passive ducting to all other spaces.

6.101. It has therefore been sufficiently demonstrated that local plan policies requirements related to energy use and sustainable construction (HPDF Polices 36 and 37) have been complied with, and appropriate measures could be secured by planning conditions.

Air Quality:

6.102. 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, an Air Quality Assessment (AQA) has been requested. However, given the scale of the proposal and in light that the site is not located within an area identified as being in or near an AQMA, and particularly as the submitted Air Quality Assessment does not identify any harm to the air quality, the planning agent does not consider it a reasonable or necessary request. Further applications are cited by the applicant that have not been required to provide the additional level information (such as the application for The Gallops). However, the applicant is willing to agree to a pre-commencement condition to secure this additional information.

6.103. Officers note the applicant's stance on providing the requested information at application stage, and note that matters relating to air quality have recently been updated since the determination of the application on the opposite parcel of land at the Gallops. Notwithstanding this, Officers consider that an appropriate planning condition can be secured to specify the total damage cost and to secure appropriate mitigation measures. Furthermore, the damage cost calculation should be revised as part of the details sought to reflect the price-base of the year of the appraisal. A suggested condition is therefore considered appropriate as an acceptable mechanism to mitigate air quality impacts arising from the proposed development, as required under HDPF policy 24 and policy P3(2)(c) of the NPPF.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and S106 Heads of terms

S106 Heads of Terms:

6.104. In the event that planning permission is approved, 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.

6.105. 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 (8 units) and the respective tenure split and dwelling size
- Commuted sum in lieu of the remaining 0.4 affordable unit = £28,952
- Travel Plan Monitoring fee £1,765
- Retention of access spur from the site into adjacent property 'Sandygate' to facilitate potential adjacent development within the wider emerging site allocation.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL):

6.106. 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. In the case of outline applications, the CIL charge will be calculated at the relevant Reserved Matters stage. This would comply with expectations of HDPF Policy 39.

6.107. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds raised by the new development shall be used to support the delivery of projects identified in the District Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (July 2024). The IDP is identified as a key document forming part of the evidence base in Local Plan preparation that assesses the quality and capacity of infrastructure within a local planning authority area and sets out the infrastructure likely to be required to support new development across Horsham District. This includes emergency services such as the Sussex Police Service (current provision/ planned provision/ key issues and future considerations). No evidence has been submitted to indicate a requirement for the mitigation of impacts on other forms of local infrastructure, such as education or healthcare facilities.

6.108. The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan and CIL Charging Schedule sets out that emergency service funding is covered by CIL in Horsham district, rather than individual contributions from individual development sites. 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. Furthermore, there is no direct evidence 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 policy DM6 NPPF and at Reg 122 of the CIL Regulations.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

6.109. Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021). This requires that development must achieve at least 10% BNG on all habitats within the development site.

6.110. The Applicant has submitted a Biodiversity Metric as part of this application, which has been revised to address the Council BNG Ecologist's comments. Overall, it is noted that the metric calculation tool currently demonstrates that the development will have a 20.25% net loss (-0.65 units) in area habitats, and an increase in 0.68 units for hedgerows in area habitats, which therefore demonstrates that there would be no on-site net gain delivered. Accordingly, the required BNG would be achieved by way of purchasing registered off-site units within an approved scheme. The applicant is advised that the LNRS has been published, which will impact on the calculations of the final Biodiversity Gain Plan required to discharge the relevant condition.

6.111. In the event the application is approved, it is a condition of the planning permission that a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This would show how the development will achieve BNG and must demonstrate how the habitats will be managed and maintained for 30 years, starting from the date the development is completed. The details concerning the purchasing of off-site habitat units would need to be demonstrated within the submission of details to satisfy the Habitat Management and Maintenance Plan planning condition.

Conclusions and Planning Balance

6.112. In accordance with section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the starting point for the assessment of this proposal is to consider whether or not it accords with the provisions of the adopted development plan, which in this case comprises the HDPF and the Made Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan. The application site is not allocated for housing development in the HDPF, or the Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore

in the first instance it must be concluded that the development of the site for housing is contrary to Policies 2, 4, and 26 of the HDPF.

6.113. However, it is recognised that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites. In these circumstances, the presumption in favour of sustainable development that is directed under Policy S3(1)(b) of the NPPF becomes a significant material consideration, requiring the application of Policy S5 (of the NPPF). Policy S5(1)(j) supports development outside the defined BUAB where the development would address an evidenced unmet need, such as where the LPA cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable sites, and where the development would be '*physically well-related to an existing settlement, and be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure'.*

6.114. Officers consider that the requirements of NPPF Policy S5(1)(j) would be met, and therefore turn to the questions as to whether the benefits arising from approving the proposed development would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects when assessed against the decision-making policies in the NPPF, per Policy S5(2).

6.115. In terms of benefits and weight of material considerations in favour of development, significant weight is to be attached to the site's allocation for housing within the emerging Local Plan (eLP), which has now been subject to a concluded Examination process and to which the inspector has found to be sound. Whilst this policy does not yet form part of the statutory development plan, it represents a significant material consideration weighing in favour of the proposal. Furthermore, key matters including impact on highway safety and capacity, ecology, heritage, flood risk and drainage, and sustainably/climate change are judged to be acceptable and carry some positive weight. Some economic benefit would be provided from construction jobs and activity, whilst the proposal includes significant off-site BNG improvements to meet and exceed that statutory requirement for a 10% net gain. Officers note that the proposed development can achieve suitable vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access, and furthermore would deliver cycle and pedestrian links to Sandygate Lane, with the site being considered to be sustainably located in this regard.

6.116. In assessing the wider aspects of the application, officers note that landscape matters have mostly been resolved by way of amendments to the layout, with residual matters suitably addressed by way of planning conditions being advised. Therefore, the proposal would be in accordance with HDPF policies 25, 31, 32 and 33. The harms would therefore be limited to the loss of undeveloped countryside land of limited value.

6.117. Officers therefore consider that, applying policy S5(2) of the NPPF, there are no adverse effects that would substantially outweigh the benefits of the development, having particular regard to the Council's significant housing land supply shortfall, the location of the development being 'well-related to an existing settlement', and the allocation of the site for housing within the eLP. Therefore, the proposal is recommended for approval subject to the completion of a S106 agreement and appropriate conditions.

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	2,717.4	238	2,479.4
		Total Gain	2,479.4

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 the conditions listed below 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.

Conditions:

1. Plans list

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.

3 Pre-Commencement Condition: The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (the HMMP), prepared in accordance with the Biodiversity Gain Plan and including:

(a) a non-technical summary;
(b) the planned habitat creation and enhancement works to create or improve habitat to achieve the biodiversity net gain in accordance with the Biodiversity Gain Plan, together with a timetable for its provision;
(c) the management measures to maintain habitat in accordance with the Biodiversity Gain Plan from the completion of development; and
(d) management responsibilities of the people or organisation(s) delivering the HMMP

has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

The created and/or enhanced habitat specified in the approved HMMP shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved HMMP. Any proposed or retained planting, which within a period of 5 years after the completion of development, 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 the development delivers a biodiversity net gain on site in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

4 Pre-Commencement Condition: Prior to commencement of the development, a proportionate surface water drainage scheme construction method statement shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. 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, in accordance with Policies 35 and 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy CC3 of the NPPF (2026).

5 **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved Plan shall be implemented and adhered to throughout the entire construction period. The Plan shall provide details as appropriate but not necessarily be restricted to the following matters,

- the anticipated number, frequency and types of vehicles used during construction,
- the method of access and routing of vehicles during construction,
- the parking of vehicles by site operatives and visitors,
- the loading and unloading of plant, materials and waste,
- the storage of plant and materials used in construction of the development,
- the erection and maintenance of security hoarding,
- the provision of wheel washing facilities and other works required to mitigate the impact of construction upon the public highway (including the provision of temporary Traffic Regulation Orders),
- details regarding dust and noise mitigation measures to be deployed in accordance with BS5228:2009 and the IAQM Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction.
- details of public engagement both prior to and during construction works, including named person for residents to contact;

The construction shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the details and measures approved in the CEMP for the related phase, unless the written consent of the Local Planning Authority is received for any variation.

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) and TR6 of the NPPF (2026).

6 **Pre-Commencement Condition:** Notwithstanding previously submitted information, no development shall commence, including demolition pursuant to the permission granted, ground clearance, or bringing equipment, machinery, or materials onto the site, until the tree protection fencing has been erected in the position as indicated in Tree Protection Plan Drawing No: SJA TPP 25319-041b dated July 2026. Once in place, the person(s) responsible for supervising the works must meet the Arboricultural Officer of the Local Planning Authority, on-site, so the Arboricultural Officer can supervise that the condition attached to planning permission is fully complied with.

Reason**:** As this matter is fundamental to ensure the successful and satisfactory protection of important trees on the site in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy N2 of the NPPF (2026)

7 **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development 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 be coordinated with the landscaping

proposals and Arboricultural Method Statement. 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).

8 Pre-Commencement Condition:

i. No development shall take place until a programme of archaeological work has been secured in accordance with a Written Scheme of Archaeological 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 condition 8[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**:** As 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).

9 Pre-Commencement Condition: No development shall commence until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following.

a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
b) Identification of “biodiversity protection zones”.
c) 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).
d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
h) 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*:* 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), Policy N2 of the NPPF (2026) 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).

10 Pre-Commencement Condition: No development shall commence until a Biodiversity Measures Strategy for protected, Priority and threatened species, prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

a) The content of the Biodiversity Measures Strategy shall include the following:
b) Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed measures or features;
c) detailed designs or product descriptions to achieve stated objectives;
d) locations of proposed measures or features by appropriate maps and plans (where relevant);

e) persons responsible for implementing the measures or features; and
f) 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 support protected, Priority and threatened species and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under National Policy N2 of the NPPF (2026), and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (as amended).

11 **Pre-Commencement Condition**: No development (including any demolition, earthworks, or site clearance) which will impact the breeding / resting place of bats, shall take place in any circumstances until 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 or Earned Recognition 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*:* 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), Policy N2 of the NPPF (2026), 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), the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

12 **Pre-Commencement Condition** No development shall commence until precise details (to include details shown on a plan) of the existing and proposed finished floor levels and external ground levels of the development in relation to nearby datum points adjoining the application site have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason**:** As this matter is fundamental to control the development in detail in the interests of amenity and visual impact and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

13 **Pre-Commencement (Slab Level) Condition:** No development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until a schedule of materials and finishes and colours to be used for external walls, windows and roofs of the approved building(s) has been 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).

14 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the vehicular access serving the development has been constructed in accordance with the details shown on the ‘Site Access and Visibility Splays’ plan (8240636/6101 Rev F, as shown in the Transport Statement) and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason**:** In the interest of road safety, and to ensure adequate access facilities are available to serve the development in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy TR4 of the NPPF (2026).

15 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied 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 in accordance with Policies 35 and 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policies C3, PD3 and F8 of the NPPF (2026).

16 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied 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 details as per drainage strategy drawing 8240636-1201 Revision P4. 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 County 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 in accordance with Policies 35 and 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policies C3, PD3 and F8 of the NPPF (2026).

17 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be first occupied until full details of all hard and soft landscaping works shall have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include plans and measures addressing the following:

- Details of all existing trees and planting to be retained and removed
- Planting and seeding plans, including a schedule specifying plant numbers, sizes, densities and species in Latin names - Particular focus shall be made to enhance planting along the western boundary of the site to enable an appropriate transition from built development to rural countryside.
- Hard and soft written specifications (NBS compliant) including ground preparation, cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment
- Details of knee-rail fencing to T19, along with feature planting and / or seating within the open space
- Tree pit and staking/underground guying details, including details for sloping ground and position of root barriers and root cells where required
- Details of all hard surfacing materials and finishes, including layout, colour, size, texture, coursing and levels
- Details of all boundary treatments - such as walls, fencing and railings - including location, type, heights and materials

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) and Policy DP3 of the NPPF (2026).

18 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan (LMMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details should apply to all communal hard and soft landscape areas and shall include:

- Long term design objectives
- Management responsibilities
- A description of landscape components
- Management prescriptions
- Maintenance schedules
- A plan identifying all areas of management responsibility, including all landscape maintenance strips, which shall be retained within the communally managed areas and shall not form part of, or be conveyed to, any individual residential plot

The landscape areas shall thereafter be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development and in the interests of visual amenity and nature conservation in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy DP3 of the NPPF (2026).

19 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No development shall commence until a lighting design scheme for biodiversity has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall:

a) identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for bats 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 (through provision of lighting layout plans, isolux contour plans, luminaire specifications, mounting heights, aiming angles, shielding measures, and lighting control strategies) 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: 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), Policy N2 of the NPPF (2026), 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).

20 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until provision for the storage of refuse and recycling, and bicycles, has been provided within the side or rear garden or garage for that dwelling. The facilities shall thereafter be retained for use at all times

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

21 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the access, car parking spaces and cycle parking facilities necessary to serve it have been constructed and made available for use in accordance with approved 'Proposed Site Layout' drawing (25109 P101 Rev K). The access, car parking spaces and cycle parking facilities permitted shall thereafter be retained as such for their designated use.

Reason**:** To provide car-parking and cycle parking space for the use in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy TR4 of the NPPF (2026).

22 **Regulatory Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until following first-floor flank windows have been fitted with obscure-glazing:
Plot 1 – east-facing
Plot 3 – north-facing
Plot 9 – south-facing

No part of those windows that are less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which they are installed shall be capable of being opened. Once installed the obscured glazing and non-openable parts of those windows shall be retained permanently thereafter.

Reason**:** To protect the privacy of adjacent occupiers in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy P3 of the NPPF (2026).

23 **Regulatory Condition** The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the precautionary mitigation, avoidance, compensation and working methods for Great Crested newts set out within the re-submitted GCN eDNA Sampling statement, by Arbtech, received 09.09.2026, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented and maintained for the duration of the construction works and shall include, where applicable, toolbox talks, precautionary vegetation clearance, and procedures to be followed in the event that Great Crested Newts are encountered during works.

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), Policy N2 of the NPPF (2026), 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).

24 **Regulatory Condition** All works shall be executed in full accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Implications Report/Outline Arboricultural Method Statement - Arboricultural Implications Report Proposed re-development at Cedar Cottage Sandygate Lane Lower Beeding West Sussex July 2026 Ref. SJA Ref. SJA air 25319

Reason**:** To ensure the successful and satisfactory protection of important trees, shrubs and hedges on the site in accordance with Policies 30 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy N2 of the NPPF (2026).

25 **Regulatory Condition**: The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the ecological mitigation and enhancement measures set out in the

submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Roost Assessment (Arbtech, April 2025), Preliminary Roost Assessment (Arbtech, June 2025), Bat Emergence and Re-Entry Surveys (BERS) (Arbtech, April 2026) and the Bat Emergence and Re-Entry Survey (Arbtech, August 2026). This may 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: 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), and Policy N2 of the NPPF (2026).

26 **Regulatory Condition:** Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (and/or any Order revoking and/or reenacting that Order) no development within the curtilage(s) of dwellings / plots 6, 16 & 17 of the development hereby permitted falling within Classes E and F of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Order shall be erected, constructed or placed within the root protection areas to trees T34 and T42 as identified on Tree Protection Plan Drawing No: SJA TPP 25319-041b (Appendix 4 of the Arboricultural Implications Report (July 2026) received 24/07/2026), without express planning consent from the Local Planning Authority first being obtained.

Reason**:** To ensure the successful and satisfactory protection of important off-site trees and their rooting environment in the interests of visual amenity, in accordance with Policies 31 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy N2 of the NPPF (2026).

27 **Regulatory Condition:** All works of demolition, construction and ancillary activities, including deliveries and dispatch, shall be restricted to 08:00-18:00 hours on Monday to Friday, from 08:00 to 13:00 hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason**:** To safeguard the amenities of adjacent occupiers in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy P3 of the NPPF (2026).

28 **Regulatory Condition:** The dwellings 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 37 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
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 Highway Agreements 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
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 local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

INFORMATIVE:
The Lighting design shall be based on guidance from SDNP Dark Skies Technical Advice Note Version 2 and The Bat Conservation Trust guidance note 08/23, and include:

- 3000Kelvin or warmer
- 500 Lumens or below
- Where appropriate, use of motion/proximity sensors and set to as short a possible a timer as a risk assessment will allow. For most purposes, a 1 or 2 minute timer is appropriate.
- Horizontally mounted luminaires with no light output above 90° and/or no upward tilt
- Shielding such as cowls, baffles or back shields to limit visibility, where relevant.

INFORMATIVE
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.

8. USE OF AI

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