



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0451

Helford Barn, Sincox Lane, Shipley, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 8PT

DESCRIPTION:

Outline Application for the erection of two dwellings following demolition of existing storage building with all matters reserved except access.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/20/0757	Change of use of existing buildings to a single residential dwelling with external alterations	Application Permitted on 16.06.2020
------------	--	-------------------------------------

DC/23/1194	Application to confirm the continuous use of building for (Class B8) storage purposes for a period in excess of ten years (Lawful Development Certificate - Existing)	Application permitted on 22/09/2023
------------	---	-------------------------------------

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The application site lies to the west of Sincox Lane, outside of any designated built-up area boundary. The site is therefore located within the countryside in policy terms.

The site comprises of a barn in B8 Storage use with a gravel hardstanding and post and rail gate. To the east of the application site is a residential dwelling converted from a light industrial, and to the west is an active commercial use. The barn itself is a mixture of materials consisting of horizontal cladding and metal sheeting.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The proposal seeks permission for two semi-detached two bedroom dwellings. Both dwellings would have 3 parking spaces each and a small amenity space to the rear. The existing access which serves the storage building would remain. Each of the dwellings would be approximately 80.5sqm. Given that the application is an Outline application with all matters reserved except the access, no landscape detail, elevation plans or sections have been included as part of the submission.

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 7 - Strategic Policy: Economic Growth

Policy 9 - Employment Development

Policy 10 - Rural Economic Development

Policy 15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision

Policy 16 - Strategic Policy: Meeting Local Housing Needs

Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection
Policy 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 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 – Parking

Shipley Parish Neighbourhood plan 2019-2031

HD1 – New Housing Development

HD2 - Housing Mix

HD3 - High quality design

Shipley Parish Design Statement

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 11(d) 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 6: Climate Change
Strategic Policy 7: Appropriate Energy Use
Strategic Policy 8: Sustainable Design and Construction
Strategic Policy 9: Water Neutrality
Strategic Policy 11: Environmental Protection
Strategic Policy 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Strategic Policy 14: Countryside Protection
Strategic Policy 15: Settlement Coalescence
Strategic Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Strategic Policy 19: Development Quality
Strategic Policy 20: Development Principles
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
Policy 39: Affordable Housing

Policy 40: Improving Housing Standards in the District

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD (2017)

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2017)

Planning Advice Notes:

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: General comments and advice for applicant to seek counsel with Southern water before commencing works.

Natural England: Standing advice

Drainage officer: Objection [Summary]

Insufficient information has been provided. HDC Drainage require more information to determine that the site drainage meets the requirements of the NPPF and PPG, National standards for sustainable drainage systems (June 2025), and the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) – Policy 35 and Policy 38.

WSCC Highways: Comment [Summary]

In summary, 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:

No letters of representation have been received at the time of drafting the report.

Parish Comments:

Parish Council: Neutral comments

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:

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 identified 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.

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

Paragraph 83 of the National Planning policy framework outlines 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.

Policy Ship HD1 states that applications for housing developments within Shipley and Coolham villages, and Dragons Green and Brooks Green hamlets, will be considered favourably where the proposals meet all of the following criteria: the proposed development is for an infill gap, or on previously developed land, within the continuity of existing buildings; the proposed development will not result in the outward extension of the villages or hamlets onto greenfield land; the proposed development delivers new affordable housing; the proposed development reflects the scale and density of existing development in the village or hamlet where it is located; and the proposed development responds positively to Shipley Parish Design Guidance. This policy does not allocate sites, nor establish a housing target for the Parish, but does provide general guidance as to the location, mix, and quality of any proposed new development.

Policy Ship HD2 continues that applications for new housing in Shipley Parish should respond to the most up-to-date local housing need wherever possible, including 2- and 3-bedroom homes as well as new affordable housing, contributing to a balanced mix of housing in the Plan area.

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. These criteria include: 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 nearest defined Built-Up Area Boundary (West Chiltington), which provides access to essential goods, services, and employment opportunities, lies approximately 3 miles from the site. Travel to this settlement on foot would take in the region of 1 hour and 5 minutes and would necessitate walking along unlit rural roads, largely without any pavement and limited public transport links such that the nature of the road is considered to discourage residents from walking and cycling. Consequently, the site would be reliant on the use of the private car for meeting day-to-day needs, which is contrary to the

principles of sustainable development. The application site does not constitute a sustainable location for new residential development.

It is considered that the scheme would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchical approach of concentrating development within the main settlements as set out in the HDPF. The proposal for 2no new dwellings on the site is not considered to be essential to its countryside location and consequently represents an inappropriate, unsustainable and unacceptable form of development in this location. Additionally, the site has not been allocated for housing within a 'made' Neighbourhood Plan and has therefore, at present not been deemed to be appropriate for housing at a local level.

Further to the above, the site is currently in an active B8 storage use where consideration must be given to Policy 9 of the HDPF which relates to Employment Development. This policy states that 'Redevelopment of employment sites and premises outside Key Employment Areas, must demonstrate that the site/premises is no longer needed and/or viable for employment use'.

It is acknowledged that the residential property to the north of the application site, approved under DC/20/0757 was granted permission for a conversion from the light industrial use to a residential use. Given that the application was for a conversion, the HDPF an 'Issues and Options' paper was considered relevant and given limited weight in favour of the application. The current application however is for the demolition of the existing storage building and does not represent a conversion. Weight in favour of the development therefore does not apply in this instance. The DC/20/0757 application was unique in that there were planning restrictions which would make alternative commercial use unlikely and undesirable such that a conversion would ensure that the application site did not fall into redundancy through lack of use. There was in that particular instance a compelling case for conversion that does not apply to the current application site.

In addition, the applicant also cites the development at the former Arun Feedmills site which is in close proximity to the application site (ref: DC/23/2278). The applicant contends that this permission is a direct comparator to the development proposed by this current application and should justify an approval of planning permission. The former Arun Feedmills site benefits from an extant permission for a two-storey commercial development (ref: SP/48/98) granted permission in 1999. The weight given to this fallback position and the benefit derived from 8 dwellings was a matter for the decision maker to determine. The 'Conclusion and Planning Balance' section of the Arun Feedmills Committee Report acknowledged this fallback and noted that the residential development would not be expected to create additional trips beyond that which would result from the extant commercial development.

The Arun Feedmills report went on to state that, '*considering the application as a whole in the context of the Paragraph 11d 'tilted balance', and given the particular circumstances specific to this site, it is not considered that the harm afforded by the conflict with Policies 2, 4, 26 of the HDPF and Policy Ship HD1 and HD2 (which must be afforded reduced weight applying Paragraph 11d of the NPPF) significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefit of a new dwellings in this location*'. It is clear that the Arun Feedmills decision took into account site specific considerations and made a series of judgements as to the weighting of such considerations, with the final decision one the LPA were entitled to make. By comparison, the present development presents no such alternative as a fallback to the proposal.

The site is therefore considered to be inappropriate, where the development would not be essential to its countryside location. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policies 1, 3, 4 and 26 of the HDPF. In addition, the site is considered to provide valuable B8 storage use in a rural area. Given the lack of justification provided in this regard, the application is therefore considered to also be contrary to Policy 9 of the of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Whether there are any material considerations that would outweigh the conflict as identified above will be addressed in the Conclusions and Planning Balance section 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. Proposal 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.

Policy Ship HD3 of the Shipley Neighbourhood Plan states that all proposals for new development in Shipley Parish are expected to respond positively to local design characteristics and features as set out in the Shipley Parish Design Guidance. New development should be of a size and scale which respects, and where possible, enhances the character of the area or locality, using materials typical of the area.

The application is submitted in Outline, where all matters are reserved for later consideration apart from access arrangements. The Applicant has however provided an Indicative Site Plan suggesting the scale and arrangement of the development. This suggests that the development would comprise of 2 semi-detached dwellings. Each dwelling would benefit from an area of private amenity space, with parking provided for each dwelling. It is not known how many bedrooms each of the dwellings would have.

While matters of scale and layout have been reserved for later consideration, the Indicative Site Plan suggests that the proposed development would comprise 2 dwellings. The indicative plots would differ in size to other similar development to the west of Sincox Lane where the indicative layout would fail to reflect the build pattern of the surrounding development. The applicant has outlined that they would seek to utilise the existing access to retain the planting at the front of the site, While this would offer some screening of the proposed development, this could not be relied upon to make the development acceptable, where there are concerns that the proposed development would have an unknown number of storeys and have potential to be prominent when viewed from the streetscene.

It is acknowledged that there is a cluster of surrounding development, however this would largely not be residential.

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 application is submitted in Outline, where all matters are reserved for later consideration apart from access. An Indicative Site Plan has been submitted which suggests the layout of the development. The proposal would comprise 2no dwellings in an area where the surrounding development consists largely of commercial buildings to the south, a residential dwelling located directly to the north of the site, and a commercial stables lies to the rear of the application site.

Whilst no information has been submitted with regards to ground contamination within the application site, a close relationship between stables and residential development is not uncommon in the countryside. Furthermore, the application seeks an outline permission such that this information could be reasonably provided at reserved matters stage to ensure that the proposal would have sufficient mitigation measures if required to not result in unacceptable potential health issues for future occupants of the development.

The proposed dwelling would be considered to provide sufficient internal and external amenity space to suit the needs of future occupants and in compliance with nationally described minimum space standards.

It is considered that the proposed development could be accommodated within the site while providing only a low level of mutual overlooking between future occupiers that would not be uncommon for semi-detached dwellings. There would be a modest but sufficient amenity space for each of the plots.

If the application were otherwise acceptable, further details would be required at reserved matters stage to ensure adequate boundary site treatments and contamination mitigations if required.

Highways Impacts:

Policies 40 and 41 of the HDPF states that development should provide safe and adequate access and parking, suitable for all users.

This outline application with all matters reserved except access seeks the erection of two dwellings following demolition of existing storage.

The existing access off Sincox Lane (a C-classified road subject to national speed limit) is shared with the immediate neighbouring dwelling.

Whilst all matters are reserved except the access, the application form indicates a total of 6 parking spaces. This would be in accordance with WSCC Parking Standards for a development of this size and location, and full details of proposed car and cycle parking provision would be expected at reserved matters stage

WSCC have commented that there are no apparent visibility concerns with the existing point of access which would remain as part of the proposed development. Given the small scale of development the proposals would not be anticipated to give rise to a significant material intensification of use of this existing access point.

There are no objections to the proposal in light of policies 40 and 41 of the HDPF.

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.

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.

In the event that the application were otherwise acceptable, the following would be sought via condition:

- Water consumption limited to 110litres per person per day
- Requirement to provide full fibre broadband site connectivity
- Dedicated refuse and recycling storage capacity
- Cycle parking facilities
- 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 applicant has outlined that the application would be a 'de minimus' exemption from mandatory Biodiversity net gain requirements. However, the indicative site plans illustrate an area proposed for development (from grassland) well in excess of the 25m² exemption. As such, the Local Planning Authority are of the view that the application would need to demonstrate BNG. In the event that the proposal were to be considered favourably, the LPA would have sought further information to secure this necessary detail.

Conclusion and Planning Balance:

Outline planning permission is sought for the demolition of an existing B8 building and the erection of 2no dwellings. As the site is not allocated for development within the HDPF or a made neighbourhood plan, owing to the site's location outside of the built-up area boundary, the principle of the development is resisted under Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF), Policy HD1 of the Shipley Neighbourhood Plan, and paragraphs 2, 11, 12 and 47 of the NPPF. Furthermore, in the absence of justification to support the loss of the existing commercial use, the proposal would also conflict with Policy 9 of the HDPF and paragraph 85 of the NPPF.

The Council published its Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) in December 2025. Chapter 3 of the AMR revealed that the Council currently benefits from a deliverable supply of housing sites of 1.7-years. Therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development at paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged in this instance, meaning the 'tilted balance' applies to the assessment.

NPPF paragraph 11(d)(ii) states that where the policies most important for determining the application are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless 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.

NPPF paragraph 14 also states that *'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...'*

As the Shipley Neighbourhood Plan is now over 5 years old, and the plan does not allocate sites for development, the plan is not afforded the 'protection' bestowed under paragraph 14 of the NPPF. Therefore, a diminished level of weight can only be attributed to the policies contained within the plan when assessing planning applications. However, the Neighbourhood Plan remains a component of the statutory Framework and part of the adopted Development Plan under Section 38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. While its housing supply policies are out-of-date, its conflict with the overarching settlement strategy and its purpose to protect the rural character of the parish still carry measurable weight in the planning balance

The Shaping Development in Horsham District Planning Advice Note (SDPAN) was endorsed at Cabinet on 17 September 2025. The SDPAN recognises at 5.12 that the Council is likely to receive applications outside of 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.

The site is located in a countryside location, though not isolated in the truest sense, it is a relatively remote location that does not adjoin the settlement edge. Therefore, the proposal fails on the first criterion and therefore the development does not benefit from the provisions of the SDPAN.

In the context of the Council's current five-year housing land supply position, the provision of housing as a general principle is a matter of significant weight. However, because this proposal would provide for only two market dwellings, it makes no meaningful contribution toward recovering this shortfall. As such, the weight attributable to this specific scheme's housing delivery is tempered to *moderate weight*.

It is acknowledged that any development would bestow socio-economic benefits, such as the creation of temporary jobs during the construction phase in the short-term, and local expenditure and contribution to the local economy in the medium to long-term arising from increase occupancy. However, this is not a particularly unique benefit that would result from this development. Nonetheless, this benefit is afforded *limited weight* in the overall planning balance.

The proposal's ability to demonstrate an absence of adverse amenity harm, acceptable highways impact, and suitable ecological impact etc. are neutral considerations that demonstrate general policy compliance rather than positive benefits weighing in favour of the scheme. No other discernible benefits would arise from the granting of this permission.

As per the preceding sections of this report, the granting of this permission would conflict with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the HDPF. This conflict with the development plan is afforded *significant weight*, as it would undermine the strategic process of allocating housing sites for development in appropriate locations, and the democratic process of selecting sites within Neighbourhood Plans. Furthermore, the

applicant's complete failure to submit robust marketing evidence or financial viability data to demonstrate that the building is no longer viable for commercial uses directly contradicts the provisions of Policy 9 of the HDPF, in addition to the rural economic objectives of the NPPF

While the Council's housing land supply shortfall (1.7 years) triggers the presumption in favour of sustainable development under NPPF Paragraph 11(d), the tilted balance is not a green light for unsustainable development. In this case, the complete absence of marketing evidence to justify the loss of a rural commercial asset (contrary to HDPF Policy 9), combined with the site's failure to meet the location criteria of the SDPAN, results in clear harm to the rural economy and settlement strategy. These combined adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of delivering two market dwellings when assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole. As such, the presumption is displaced, and the proposal is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason for Refusal:

1. The development would be located in a countryside location outside of the built-up area boundary of any settlement, on a site which has not been allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework or a Made Neighbourhood Plan. The development would therefore be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchical approach of concentrating development within the main settlements which would not be essential to its countryside location, and would result in the unjustified loss of a potentially viable employment asset, undermining the sustainable growth and vitality of the local rural economy. There are no material considerations which outweigh this harm, and the proposal therefore represents unsustainable development contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3, 9, and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Policy HD1 of the Shipley Neighbourhood Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

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/26/0451

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

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location plan		PL-01 A	12.03.2026
Block plan	EXISTING AND PROPOSED	PL-02 C	12.03.2026
Design & Access Statement		NONE	12.03.2026
Floor plan	EXISTING	PL-02 A	12.03.2026
Elevation plan	EXISTING	PL-03 A	12.03.2026
Supporting Statement	PLANNING	NONE	12.03.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Hannah Darley Date: 06th May 2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial RHERMITAGE Date: 02 July 2026