



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0103
1 Pathfield Cottages, Cross Lane, Barns Green, West Sussex, RH13 0QF

DESCRIPTION:

Erection of a two-storey dwelling.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/15/2501	Erection of a two-storey rear extension to a pair of semi-detached properties plus two storey side extension to No 1 Pathfield Cottages and a new front porch	Application Refused on 11.03.2016
DC/17/0562	Erection of two storey and single storey rear extension	Application Refused on 08.05.2017

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

Pathfield Cottages are located on the north side of Cross Lane which sits between Emms Lane to the west and Trout Lane to the east, some 650m southeast of Barns Green. The Cottages are within a small hamlet of some 13 properties set in a countryside location, outside of any designated built-up area boundary. The area is characterised by sporadic residential properties of varying form and design. The site is not located within a conservation area and there are no listed buildings in the vicinity of the site.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The application seeks to erect a two-storey dwellinghouse with three bedrooms. The existing plot has a large precast double garage to the side of 1 Pathfield Cottages, which is set back from the existing building line. The current garage would be removed to allow the proposed plot to be created to the side of the existing property. The existing house would be retained with a revised boundary and parking to the front. Two parking spaces would be provided for the proposed dwelling, as well as two parking spaces for the existing dwelling.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):

Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development
Policy 2 - Strategic Policy: Strategic Development
Policy 3 - Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy
Policy 4 - Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection
Policy 28 - Replacement Dwellings and House Extensions in the Countryside
Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles
Policy 35 - Strategic Policy: Climate Change
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking

Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan (2024-2031):

Policy 12: Design Parameters
Policy 13: Sustainable Design
Policy 15: Parking Provision

Paragraph 33 of the NPPF requires that all development plans complete their reviews no later than 5 years from their adoption. Horsham District Council is currently in the process of reviewing its development plan however at this stage the emerging policies carry only limited weight in decision making. As the HDPF is now over 5 years old, the most important policies for the determination of this application must be considered as to whether they are 'out of date' (NPPF paragraph 11d). This includes, for applications involving the provision of housing, whether the Council can demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites (NPPF footnote 8).

The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, with the supply currently calculated as being 1.7 years. The presumption in favour of development within Paragraph 11d) of the NPPF therefore applies in the consideration of all applications for housing development within the District (unless footnote 7 or Paragraph 14 applies to relevant applications), with Policies 2, 4, 15 and 26 now carrying only moderate weight in decision making.

All other policies within the HDPF as itemised above have been assessed against the NPPF and are considered to be consistent such that they continue to attract significant weight in decision making.

Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19):

Strategic Policy 1: Sustainable Development
Strategic Policy 2: Development Hierarchy
Strategic Policy 3: Settlement Expansion
Strategic Policy 4: Horsham Town
Strategic Policy 6: Climate Change
Strategic Policy 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Strategic Policy 14: Countryside Protection
Strategic Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Strategic Policy 19: Development Quality
Strategic Policy 20: Development Principles
Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport
Policy 25: Parking
Policy 32: Conversion of Agricultural and Rural Buildings to Commercial, Community and Residential Uses

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

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

Parish Design Statement

Planning Advice Notes:

Facilitating Appropriate Development
Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS RESPONSES

Where consultation responses have been summarised, it should be noted that Officers have had consideration of the full comments received, which are available to view on the public file at www.horsham.gov.uk

Consultations:

Southern Water: Comment

Insufficient information provided.

WSCC Highways: Comment

The proposed dwelling will make use of the existing vehicle access point, with the existing dwelling also being provided with access from Cross Lane. From inspection of local mapping, there are no apparent visibility concerns with the existing and proposed points of access on Cross Lane. The proposed access points should be formalised by means of a vehicle crossover – these works will be subject to a licence obtained from WSCC, and construction to a specification agreed with a WSCC Highway Area Engineer.

WSCC Car Parking Demand Calculator indicates that a three-bedroom dwelling in this location would require three car parking spaces, so any overspill parking would have to be accommodated on-street. The LHA does not anticipate that the shortfall in parking would give rise to a highway safety concern, but the LPA may wish to consider the potential impacts on on-street parking from an amenity point of view.

The site is situated approximately 750m southeast of Barns Green Village, which provides some local services and amenities within walking/cycle distance of the site.

The LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:

Representations:

11 letters of Objection have been received from 7 addresses, objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Unsustainable location not within the built-up area
- Out of keeping with the character of Cross Lane
- Overdevelopment
- Unbalanced appearance with existing cottages
- Loss of overall amenity
- Significant loss of privacy
- Dominance and enclosure
- Plot too small for dwelling
- Highway safety concerns
- Parking already restricted
- Ground stability and subsidence risk
- Limited public benefit
- Insufficient drainage details
- Conflict with Neighbourhood Plan

Parish Comments:

Itchingfield Parish Council: Objection

- Proposed dwelling has greater overall width compared to existing properties
- Overall mass out of keeping with the existing properties
- Current tenants of 1 Pathfield Cottages lose ability to park off road and could result in difficult access for those with mobility issues
- Overdevelopment
- Loss of light

- Design which is overbearing and out of keeping with the current street scene

Member Comments:

None received

HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUALITY:

The application has been considered having regard to Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act 1998, which sets out a person's rights to the peaceful enjoyment of property and Article 8 of the same Act, which sets out their rights in respect to private and family life and for the home. Officers consider that the proposal would not be contrary to the provisions of the above Articles.

The application has also been considered in accordance with Horsham District Council's public sector equality duty, which seeks to prevent unlawful discrimination, to promote equality of opportunity and to foster good relations between people in a diverse community, in accordance with Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. In this case, the proposal is not anticipated to have any potential impact from an equality perspective.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

Principle of Development:

The application is located outside of the designated built-up area boundary and is therefore within a countryside location.

Policy 2 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) sets out the main growth strategy, focusing development in the main settlements. The application site is situated outside of any of the defined settlements as categorised under Policy 3 of the HDPF and therefore is considered to be in a countryside location in policy terms.

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

In this countryside location, the proposal is also considered against Policy 26 which seeks to protect the countryside against inappropriate development unless it is considered essential and appropriate in scale; whilst also meeting one of four criteria. This criteria includes: supporting the needs of agriculture or forestry; enabling the extraction of minerals or the disposal of waste; providing for quiet informal recreational use; or enabling the sustainable development of rural areas. The proposed development does not meet any of this criteria, nor is it considered to be essential to the countryside location and does not therefore comply with Policy 26 of the HDPF.

Paragraph 83 of the NPPF states that *"to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby."* The addition of one dwelling would have a very minor benefit in enhancing the vitality of the settlement.

Paragraph 84 of the NPPF outlines that planning decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:

- a) there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;
- b) the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;
- c) the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;
- d) the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential building; or
- e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it:
 - i. is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and
 - ii. would significantly enhance its immediate setting and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

While the site is not considered to be within an isolated rural location for the purposes of paragraph 84 of the NPPF, due to the residential dwellings to the north and west, it is nonetheless a site that lies beyond any built-up area boundary. The nearest settlement is Barns Green, located approximately 0.7km away, which is classified as a 'medium village' within the HDPF, with a moderate level of services and facilities. WSCC Highways in their consultation response noted that the site is located near to Barns Green Village which provides some local services and amenity within walking/cycling distance of the site. However, while this is acknowledged, it is worth noting that in order to reach this settlement from the application site, however occupants would have to walk along Emms Lane which lacks formal footways and street lighting. There are no formal footways for 0.6km from the application site. Furthermore, while it is noted that there is a bus stop close to the entrance to Cross Lane on Emms Lane, this operates infrequently, only on Tuesdays/Thursdays. Therefore, there would likely be reliance upon the private car in this location.

It is acknowledged that the site would fall under the NPPF definition of previously developed land. However, while this is the case, the NPPF, alongside Policy 2 of the HDPF directs new development within existing settlements. Therefore, while it is recognised that the site is previously developed land, the proposal does not fully accord with the Council's spatial strategy as it falls outside of an established settlement.

An appeal decision for Lancasters Cottage (DC/24/0669) – for one dwelling outside the built-up area boundary – was refused due to the location not being considered sustainable by the Inspector. The Inspector highlighted that *there is no footpath, nor is there a separate cycleway. Even if traffic levels are low, it is still unlikely that this would be an attractive walking or cycling option for future occupiers, particularly in the dark or in poor weather. It is unlikely that future occupiers would use the bus services that would also require travelling this route. While there is a public right of way opposite the site, it is still some distance until the next village. Although there is a footpath from Littleworth to Partridge Green, this would not overcome the issues that exist between the site and Littleworth.... Even taking account of its rural location, the appeal site is not in a location which would allow for ready use of means of travel other than the private car.*

In discussing a number of appeal decisions for and against dwellinghouses in the countryside, outside of the built-up area, the Planning Inspector for Clockhouse Cottage (ref: DC/25/0108) noted *there was an agreed failure to provide a five-year supply of housing land and therefore the presumption in favour of sustainable development applied. Even so, the theme linking these decisions is that to provide occupiers in rural areas with a realistic alternative to the car, local roads need to provide safe and suitable pedestrian and cycle routes to nearby services and/or bus stops. In situations where such provision is not available, new dwellings in the countryside would give rise to inappropriate patterns of transport, resulting in heavy reliance on the car.*

It is the case that even though the Council cannot provide a five-year housing supply, that the sustainability of the location is still of significant weight in decision-making for dwellings outside of the built-up area boundary. The proposed dwelling subject of this application would be remote from day-to-day services where the provision of one market dwelling in this location, not linked to a rural use, would be contrary to Policy 26 of the HDPF and would not be in accordance with the overarching spatial strategy for development as set out in Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF. It is therefore considered to be

contrary to the spatial strategy and principles of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Development Plan.

With the above in mind, the principle of the proposal is resisted. The appropriate degree of weight to be assigned to conflict with these policies is detailed further below.

Design and Appearance:

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

1 Pathfield Cottages sits on a sizeable plot, with a large precast double garage to the west side which is set back from the existing building line. The application proposes to remove the garage and create a residential dwelling to the side of the existing property. As the garage would be removed, the application also seeks to create a parking area to the front of 1 Pathfield Cottages for parking and in keeping with the other dwellings in Cross Lane. The existing property would have a revised boundary, as it would be subdivided, maintaining the same length rear garden but a reduced width to accommodate the new dwelling.

In terms of character and appearance, there are dwellings along the southern side of Cross Lane, extending the full length of the road from Emms Lane to Trout Lane, whereas the northern side has dwellings contained towards the centre. The replacement of the existing garage with a new dwelling would be in keeping with the established pattern of development along the road. The GIA of the proposed dwelling is a similar size to the existing property (1 Pathfield Cottages) which is approximately 104 sqm. The ridge height would sit in line with the existing house, matching the ridge height of the semi-detached Pathfield and Fairfield Cottages next door, which is 7.5m. The proposed dwelling would be 5.7m wide, a similar width to the existing dwellings on Cross Lane.

The proposed design was amended to remove the bay windows and add a chimney. The originally proposed bay windows protruded from the frontage and did not sit well within the street scene. The proposed chimney would also match those on the other dwellings along Cross Lane. It is considered that the amended design would appear as an attractive and well-designed addition within the context of the street scene.

The proposal is therefore considered to be of a design, form and scale which is appropriate to the existing character and appearance of the area. The dwelling is complimentary to the aesthetic of the houses adjacent and opposite to the site and would not harm the character and appearance of the wider area. It is therefore considered that the visual impact of the proposal is acceptable and would accord with the above policies.

Residential Amenity:

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

The concerns set out in the representation letters are acknowledged. It is considered that the neighbouring property most impacted by the proposed dwelling would be 1 Pathfield Cottages, as the proposal would sit within the current residential garden of this property. The proposed dwelling would sit at a separation of approximately 1.2m, a similar distance to between Pathfield Cottages and Fairfield Cottages, keeping in line with the current build pattern. The location of the dwelling and its separation and relationship with surrounding properties is such that it is not considered that there would be any

appreciable harm to these neighbouring properties by way of overlooking, loss of light, outlook or from an overbearing impact. The proposal would be in accordance with the above policies.

Highways Impacts:

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

The proposal would involve the removal of one garage as well as the existing driveway for 1 Pathfield Cottage, to accommodate the proposed dwelling. The existing vehicle access point will be retained, with WSCC Highways raising no apparent visibility concerns within the existing and proposed points of access on Cross Lane. The proposed access point would need to be formalised by a means of a vehicle crossover and subject of a licence obtained from WSCC; there is no indication to suggest this would not be granted. The block plan indicates the proposed parking arrangement, which proposes two off-street parking spaces for 1 Pathfield Cottages and two off-street parking spaces for the proposed dwelling. The existing shrubbery to the front of the dwelling would be removed and a front driveway would be created with block paving.

It is acknowledged that for a dwelling of this size, in this location, that a minimum of 2.2 parking spaces is required according to the WSCC parking calculator. WSCC Highways have therefore highlighted that a three-bedroom dwelling in this location would require three parking spaces, with any overspill needing to be accommodate on-street. This shortfall of parking provision is acknowledged. However, while less than ideal to park on-street, there are no parking restrictions preventing occupants from parking on-street on Cross Lane. It is considered that the provision of 2 off-street parking spaces would be sufficient to accommodate the proposed residential use, and the proposal would meet the above policies.

Water Neutrality:

A 2021 Position Statement from Natural England identified that it could not be concluded with the required degree of certainty that new development in the Sussex North Water Supply Zone would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites. As a consequence, and to comply with the legal duties set out in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (known as the Habitat Regulations), all new development since has been required to demonstrate water neutrality.

On 31st October 2025 Natural England formally withdrew the 2021 Position Statement, citing a package of measures that they were satisfied would safeguard the Arun Valley sites. Principal amongst these measures is a reduction in the Southern Water abstraction licence 'by March 2026'. However, given the licence change has not yet taken place Horsham District Council, as competent authority under the Habitats Regulations, cannot yet be certain that new development will not result in adverse impacts on the Arun Valley sites.

To ensure development can come forward as water neutral in the meantime, the Council has agreed with Natural England to use the significant water savings made by Southern Water in 2024/25 through their programme of leakage reduction (amongst other measures). This has generated some 3,240,000 litres per day of water savings that can now be attributed to new development without increasing water abstraction in the Arun Valley beyond baseline. These savings were previously to be used to launch the Sussex North Water Certification Scheme (SNWCS), however following the withdrawal statement SNWCS will no longer be launching. Natural England standing advice dated 10 November 2025 raises no objection to using these savings to enable development to come forward. The standing advice clarifies that it functions as Natural England's formal response pursuant to Regulation 63(3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 to all relevant planning applications which seek to achieve water neutrality using the above Southern Water savings.

Officers have undertaken an Appropriate Assessment which demonstrates that the anticipated increase in mains water consumption from this development, alongside all other development granted since the 31st October 2025, will not exceed 3,240,000 litres per day.

Accordingly, Officers consider that the proposed development will not have an Adverse Effect on the Integrity of the Arun Valley Site, either alone or in combination with other plan and projects, thereby complying with Regulations 63 and 70 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, HDPF Policy 31, and paragraph 193 of the NPPF.

Other Matters:

Climate Change:

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

- Requirement to provide full fibre broadband site connectivity
- Dedicated refuse and recycling storage capacity
- Opportunities for biodiversity gain
- Cycle parking facilities
- Improved pedestrian and cycle links
- Electric vehicle charging points

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

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG):

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

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

The Applicant has submitted a Biodiversity Metric which demonstrates a 10.73% net gain in area habitat units and 16.56% net gain in hedgerow units, is achievable by way of onsite biodiversity gains. However, this is not so significant to warrant a legal agreement for monitoring. If the application were to be approved, an informative would be attached detailing that the proposed net gain shall be secured post-decision.

Conclusion and Planning Balance:

As the site is not allocated for development within the HDPF or a made neighbourhood plan, owing to the site's location outside the built-up area boundary, the principle of development is contrary to Policies 1, 2, 4, and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework.

Housing Land Supply

Chapter 3 of the Council's most recent Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) revealed that the Council currently benefits from a deliverable supply of housing sites of 1.7 years. On the basis of the Council's

lack of 5-year housing land supply, the presumption in favour of sustainable development at paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged in this instance.

NPPF paragraph 11(d)(ii) states that where there are no relevant development plan policies in place, the policies that are considered most important for the determination of applications (in this case, Policies 1, 2, 4 and 26 of the HDPF, owing to the lack of a five-year housing land supply) permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

Development Plan Policies

In circumstances where Paragraph 11(d) is engaged, NPPF Paragraph 225 (Annex 1) sets out that due weight can be given to the most important policies for determining an application according to their degree of consistency with policies in the Framework. However, the Framework does not prescribe the weight to be given to conflict with development plan policies. This is affected by the purpose of the policy and the circumstances of the case.

In this case the most important policies include those relating to the spatial development strategy as set out at HDPF Policies 1, 2, 3 and 4. Policy 1 reflects the Framework presumption in favour of sustainable development and is thus fully consistent with the NPPF. Policies 2, 3 and 4 set out how sustainable growth will be achieved, though as they seek to focus development within settlements and only allow expansion on allocated sites, they have a restrictive element. Nonetheless, they generally reflect the Framework preference for development to be well located in relation to services and facilities. Therefore, moderate weight is applied to these policies.

HDPF Policy 26 refers specifically to countryside protection outside built up area boundaries, requiring development to be essential to this location. Whilst again this reflects the Frameworks preference for development to be well located in relation to services and facilities, as the definition of built-up areas is based on out-of-date housing numbers, this policy is afforded moderate weight.

As per the preceding sections of this report, the granting of this permission would conflict with Policies 1, 2, 4 and 26 of the HDPF. Whilst the proposed would not support the spatial strategy for the District, these policies are not fully framework compliant. Furthermore, the issues associated with the Council's current five-year housing land supply situation result in moderate weight being applied to these policies in the overall planning balance.

Tilted Balance

This report has acknowledged that the Council is unable to demonstrate a full 5-year housing land supply, and it is recognised that this forms a material consideration in decision making which triggers the application of the 'tilted balance' at Paragraph 11d of the NPPF. In accordance with Paragraph 11d, the Council is required to grant permission unless either (or both) of the following limbs apply:

- '(i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or*
- (ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination'*

NPPF Paragraph 14 outlines the continued relevance of Neighbourhood Plans in situations where the presumption of favour or 'tilted balance' applies. Paragraph 14 states:

'in situations where the presumption (at paragraph 11d) applies to applications involving the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, provided the following apply:

- a) *the neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan five years or less before the date on which the decision is made; and*
- b) *the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement (see paragraphs 69-70).'*

In this instance the Barns Green & Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan (BINP) was formally made on 8th October 2025 and is therefore less than five years old. In addition, the BINP allocates two sites for a total of 52 dwellings to meet the identified local needs up to 2031 as identified in their Housing Needs Assessment undertaken in November 2017. It is therefore considered that both criteria (a) and (b) of NPPF Paragraph 14 have been met.

The proposal is in conflict with the Neighbourhood Plan, and as per Paragraph 14 of the NPPF, the adverse impacts of this conflict is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits for the purpose of 11(d) of the NPPF.

Planning Balance

The proposal would provide for one market dwelling. As above the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing supply, the provision of an additional dwelling towards this supply is afforded *significant* weight. However, the Council considers that this benefit would be *limited* given the negligible overall contribution to the supply.

The proposal's ability to demonstrate no adverse amenity impacts, safe access and suitable parking are not considered benefits to the scheme but would rather be necessary to demonstrate compliance with local planning policies. No other discernible benefits have been identified that would weigh in favour of granting permission.

The Council published the Shaping Development in Horsham District Document in September 2025. The document recognises that the Council is likely to receive applications outside the defined BUABs and on unallocated sites (such as this proposal) as it is unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. Given this position and the principles behind HDPF Policy 4, it will consider positively applications that meet all of the criteria:

- The site adjoins the existing settlement edge as defined by the BUAB;
- The level of expansion is appropriate to the scale and function of the settlement the proposal relates to;
- The proposal demonstrates that it meets local housing needs or will assist the retention and enhancement of community facilities and services;
- The impact of the development individually or cumulatively does not prejudice comprehensive long-term development; and
- The development is contained within an existing defensible boundary, and the landscape character features are maintained and enhanced.

While the current housing shortfall is a material consideration of significant weight, and the contribution of one market dwelling would bestow socio-economic benefits in the form of housing delivery, the site is not adjacent to nor adjoining an existing settlement edge. Therefore, the proposal would not benefit from the provisions of the Shaping Development in Horsham District document as above.

The cumulative benefits (the provision of one market dwelling (moderate weight) and the socio-economic (moderate weight) would be outweighed by the identified adverse impacts of the development. Namely the conflict with the development plan (moderate weight), the site's unsustainable location (significant weight) and the conflict with the Neighbourhood Plan (significant weight). On balance, this would demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Therefore, the proposal is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason for Refusal:

- 1 The development is within a countryside location outside of the built-up area boundary of any settlement on a site which has not been allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework. Consequently, this scheme would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchical approach on concentrating development within the main settlements. It has not been demonstrated that there are any material considerations of significant weight to justify a departure from this overarching spatial strategy. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policies 2, 3, 4, and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), the Barns Green & Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan 2024-2031 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

POSITIVE AND PROACTIVE STATEMENT

Statement pursuant to Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received, in order to be able to, where possible, grant permission.

Plans list for: DC/26/0103

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

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location & Site plan	Site Location & Block Plan	SPR001/01 REV P2	10.03.2026
Block plan	Site Plan	SPR001/02 REV P3	10.03.2026
Elevation plan	Existing Cottage Block Plan & Elevations	SPR001/03 REV P1	22.01.2026
Floor plan	Proposed Floor Plans	SPR001/04 REV P3	01.05.2026
Elevation plan	Proposed Elevations	SPR001/05 REV P3	01.05.2026
Section plan	Proposed Schematical Sections	SPR001/06 REV P2	10.03.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Bethan Tinning Date: 03.07.2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial Tamara Dale Date: 08.07.2026