Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 11 June 2026

Site visit made on 12 June 2026

by E Catcheside BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6005400
Land South of Bax Close, Storrington, Horsham

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Samuel MacDonald (A2Dominion Developments Ltd) against the decision of Horsham District Council.
- The application Ref is DC/24/1196.
- The development proposed is erection of 30 No. residential units with associated landscaping, public open space, earthworks, drainage, access and all other associated infrastructure.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of 30 No. residential units with associated landscaping, public open space, earthworks, drainage, access and all other associated infrastructure at Land South of Bax Close, Storrington, Horsham in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/24/1196, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the development reflects the wording agreed between the parties after the application was submitted.

3. The titles and numbers of some plans were amended after the hearing with the agreement of the Council. The changes were made to more precisely reflect the contents of the plans and did not alter the proposal shown on the plans. Therefore, no prejudice is caused in me referring to the revised plans in the conditions.

4. Some appeal documents were not made publicly available on the Council's website until after the original deadline for interested parties to comment on the appeal. To ensure that no procedural unfairness would occur, interested parties were provided with an additional period in which to make written comments following the event. I have taken account of all comments received, and I am satisfied that no party has been prejudiced through the late publication of the documents.

5. The appellant's evidence sought to address the Council's concerns in respect of a protected tree by providing further information about the construction of the site access. The construction method proposed would entail works within the highway on Bax Close, outside of the appeal site. There are circumstances where off-site highway works could be secured through a planning permission. However, there is no plan to show the extent of the works, and the Highway Authority has not commented on them. Moreover, interested parties would not have had the

opportunity to consider and comment on the Bax Close works during the application process. This, alongside the potential for effects that were not considered during the application stage, means there is uncertainty over the acceptability and the deliverability of the Bax Close works.

6. The Procedural Guide: Planning Appeals (England) makes it clear that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme, and it is important that the scheme considered at appeal is essentially the same as the scheme considered by the local planning authority and interested parties at the application stage. For the reasons I have outlined here, and in the interests of procedural fairness, I have not taken account of the highway works on Bax Close that were advanced during the appeal.

7. A draft S106 Agreement was discussed at the hearing, and an amended, counterpart signed document was provided after the event. A revised conditions schedule was also provided after the hearing. The amendments to the conditions and the S106 Agreement sought to address issues raised during the event, and I shall set out my approach to them later in this decision.

8. There have been two previous refused applications for housing on this site, which were subsequently dismissed at appeal[1]. This appeal scheme proposes fewer dwellings than the previous proposals on the site, and the circumstances are not identical including in respect of the housing land supply (HLS) position. Therefore, the proposals and the considerations are not directly comparable. I have, however, had regard to the previous appeal decisions in my assessment of this appeal.

9. On 31 October 2025, after the application was determined, Natural England (NE) withdrew its position that developments in the Sussex North Water Supply Zone (SNWSZ) must demonstrate water neutrality in order to safeguard the integrity of the Arun Valley Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC), and Ramsar Site (the 'Arun Valley Sites'). Consequently, the Council advised that it would not seek to defend the second reason for refusal relating to water neutrality and I have considered the appeal accordingly.

10. Nonetheless, the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the Habitats Regulations) require that, before deciding to give permission for a plan or project which is likely to have a significant effect on a European site, the competent authority must make an appropriate assessment (AA) of the implications of the plan or project on its conservation objectives. I have had regard to this duty and will return to this matter later in my decision.

11. The emerging Local Plan Review (LPR) is undergoing examination, and a consultation on the Schedule of Main Modifications (SMM) closes on 24 August 2026. The SMM includes draft Strategic Policy HA18, which allocates the appeal site for 30 homes and sets out several criteria for the site's development.

12. The LPR is at an advanced stage of preparation, and it is a relevant consideration in this appeal. However, the consultation on the SMM has not yet closed, and there will be further scrutiny of the LPR in future hearing sessions in Autumn 2026. In this context, there could be unresolved objections to the LPR, and it could be subject to change prior to its adoption. This uncertainty limits the weight that the LPR carries

[1] Appeal decision references: APP/Z3825/W/15/3128935 (Appeal A) and APP/Z3825/W/15/3141250 (Appeal B), dated 27 June 2016.

in my decision. Whilst I have had regard to the LPR, I have necessarily determined the appeal against the requirements of the statutory development plan.

Main Issues

13. The main issues are:

- the effect of the proposal on trees, with particular regard to protected tree T2; and
- the character and appearance of the area, and the setting of the South Downs National Park (the SDNP).

Reasons

Trees

14. The appeal site lies to the north of Amberley Road and adjacent to the existing built-up edge at this end of Storrington. Public Right of Way 2972 (the footpath) traverses the northern edge of the site, connecting the village with the fields to the northwest. The site has been used informally for recreation for many years; and there are well-trodden pedestrian routes evident across the site.

15. The site comprises two fields separated by a central copse, and it has deep, wooded borders. There is variety in the species, age, and condition of the trees across the site overall. However, the borders are distinctive in that they comprise a large proportion of mature oak trees, many of which are identified in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) as high quality (Category A) trees with a long remaining life expectancy. In this regard, the site is characteristic of the Parham and Storrington Wooded Farmlands and Heaths Landscape Character Area[2] which is noted for its small well-hedged fields with mature hedgerow oaks.

16. Two mature Oak trees, near to the site's boundary with Bax Close, are protected by virtue of the "Land West of New Town Road, Storrington" Tree Preservation Order (dated 2002) (the TPO). It is common ground that one of these protected trees is in a state of terminal decline. The second protected Oak tree (tree T2) is of moderate quality (Category B) and, therefore, it is of a lower quality than many other Oak trees on the site. However, I heard consensus that tree T2 is in good health and that its remaining lifespan could exceed 100 years. The TPO plan shows there was once a third protected Oak tree on the site, which died and has been removed.

17. Tree T2 is a visually striking tree in close views from Bax Close and from the footpath and the site due to its height, proximity, and wide crown spread; and it is well-valued by the local community. The tree also stands out because, unlike other Oak trees on the site, it is relatively isolated. Indeed, should the other on-site protected tree die, as I heard is reasonably likely, tree T2 would be the only Oak tree in this north-eastern corner of the site. Overall, whilst tree T2 blends visually with other trees in wider views, it has high amenity value at a localised level.

18. Like the Inspector dealing with the previous appeals on the site, I saw that the central copse forms a key structural role that divides the site into two parts; and it is a prominent feature in close views from the footpath and from the informal recreation routes within the site. Overall, the boundary trees and the central copse

[2] As shown and described in the Horsham District Landscape Character Assessment Final Report (October 2003).

are defining features of the site's verdant character, and they contribute positively to the rural landscape setting at this edge of Storrington.

19. The trees also enclose the site such that it is well screened from Amberley Road and the adjacent fields, other than in glimpsed views through the vegetation.

20. The Council does not object to the tree losses insofar as they are shown on the Tree Retention and Removals Plan (TRRP). Nonetheless, I am mindful that the loss of all or part of the central copse was of concern to the Inspector who determined the previous appeals at this site. I do not have full details of the tree losses and the planting proposals for those appeal schemes. However, in this case, there would be extensive compensatory planting, including at the western end of the copse, which would ensure its structural role would be retained and reinforced.

21. The TRRP also shows that the development would necessitate works within the root protection areas (RPAs) of some trees adjacent to Amberley Road and the central tree group. The proportion of the RPAs that would be affected by these works would be minor and, thus, I am satisfied that these trees would be protected through appropriate arboricultural methods, which could be secured through a condition.

22. The protected trees near to Bax Close are shown on the TRRP as retained trees. However, the proposed access from Bax Close would be built over a large proportion of the RPA of tree T2, which could have implications for its health and longevity including through root damage and compaction. It is for this reason that the BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations (the British Standard) advises that structures should be located outside of RPAs and that technical solutions to prevent tree damage should only be considered where there is overriding justification for construction within the RPA.

23. There is a strongly held view amongst interested parties that harm to tree T2 could be avoided if access to the site was taken from an alternative place; and I was pointed to a former gated entrance to the site from Amberley Road. However, there are a range of issues that would require full consideration before it could be established whether an alternative access, of the size and engineering requirements necessary to serve the development, would be acceptable in planning terms. I do not have sufficient details before me to make such an assessment.

24. Moreover, whilst I have had regard to the potential for an alternative access to the site, I must necessarily consider the appeal scheme as it stands before me, which proposes access from Bax Close. There is no dispute that the delivery of the road here could not avoid permanent hard surfacing within the RPA of tree T2.

25. The hard surface would affect around 17.5% of the RPA of tree T2, which is a significant proportion but below the 20% upper threshold set out in the British Standard. Furthermore, the Root Survey shows that the roots that would be affected are low in density and have previously been disturbed, most likely by the Bax Close development and the gas main that lies beneath the site. Whilst I heard conflicting advice about the implications of the root density here, I am most convinced by the appellant's evidence that tree T2 relies less significantly on these low density, disturbed roots than it does on other parts of the root system.

26. It is, nonetheless, common ground that tree T2 would be unlikely to survive if a standard construction method was proposed for the road because it would

necessitate works at a depth that would severely cut roots. The appellant's own evidence at the hearing was that the root damage from a conventional method would be likely to de-stabilise the tree, thus necessitating its removal in the interests of public safety. It follows that, for the tree to have the best chance of survival, an alternative construction method would be required.

27. The appellant's proposed solution would be a reduced-dig method, comprising a cellular confinement system built predominantly above ground, which would protect the roots whilst also allowing for the transfer of water and nutrients. It is undisputed that, where site conditions allow for its implementation, a reduced-dig method could minimise the risk of harm to trees and, therefore, it would be the optimum solution in respect of tree T2. However, as I have already set out, there is no certainty that a reduced-dig method here would be acceptable in planning terms and deliverable.

28. I heard that there could be other arboricultural methods that would improve the chances of tree T2 withstanding the development, and, therefore, I find it would be reasonable and necessary for a condition to allow proper consideration of these options in the event the appeal is allowed. This would give tree T2 the best chance of survival in the longer term. However, there is significant uncertainty as to the likely success of these other measures. Having considered the evidence as it stands before me, it is highly likely that tree T2 would not endure the construction of the development, either due to its decline and subsequent premature death or its removal for safety reasons; and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

29. I am mindful that other trees on the site, including high quality Oak trees, would be retained; and there would be supplemental tree planting, including Oaks. These measures would ensure that the verdant character of the site and its structural vegetation features would be retained. However, the proposal could lead to the loss of a healthy, protected Oak tree that has high amenity value; and the application and appeal have not been advanced in a way that enables proper consideration of the potential for works that could secure its longevity.

30. Any harm to tree T2 would be deeply regrettable, and its loss would be a source of great sadness to residents and to regular users of the footpath and the informal paths on the site, from where the tree is best appreciated. The proposal would run counter to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which acknowledges the important contribution of trees to local character and requires existing trees to be retained wherever possible. Furthermore, the retention of tree T2 would be a requirement of Strategic Policy HA18 of the LPR if it were adopted in its current form. Therefore, its loss would lead to conflict with this emerging policy.

31. Overall, the proposal would conflict with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (excluding South Downs National Park) (November 2015) (HDPF), which presumes in favour of the retention of existing important landscape and natural features, including trees, and states that any losses that may occur through development must be justified and mitigated.

Character, appearance, and the setting of the SDNP

32. The erection of 30 dwellings and the associated infrastructure on this site would have an urbanising effect on the rural character of the local landscape and the LCA by elongating the built-up area of Storrington into the surrounding countryside. It would also lead to increased comings and goings on nearby roads and in the area.

This additional human activity would be experienced by residents on Bax Close as a harmful change to the very quiet character of the cul-de-sac.

33. However, whilst Bax Close would serve more properties than is currently the case, the proposal would not provide for through-traffic; and the effects associated with the comings and goings to it would be in-keeping with the residential character of the area. Moreover, whilst the development would be visible from Bax Close and Downlands as well as from the footpath, other potential views from the village, Amberley Road, and adjacent fields would be largely obscured by trees and existing buildings.

34. Concerns have been raised about the visual effects of the proposed pumping station. However, the pumping station would be sited amongst trees and there is nothing before me to suggest it would be unduly prominent by way of its scale or height. Details of the pumping station could be secured through a condition, which would enable the Council to ensure its presence on the site would be discrete.

35. The site lies within the setting of the SDNP, which is a landscape designation of national importance that lies on the other side of Amberley Road. The SDNP has many special qualities, which are described in the Together Now for Nature, Climate and People: Partnership Management Plan 2026-31. These special qualities include its distinctive towns and villages, the opportunities for recreation and learning, its cultural heritage, its tranquil and unspoilt places, the rich variety of wildlife and habitats, farming and enterprise, and the inspirational landscapes and breathtaking views. The dark skies also contribute to these special qualities, which is reflected in the SDNP's designation as an International Dark Sky Reserve.

36. The scarp slope of the SDNP rises from the road towards the elevated viewpoints along the South Downs Way, including those at Kithurst Hill and Springhead Hill, and it is a prominent feature in wide-reaching views. Due to the absence of buildings within it, the site provides a visual and spatial buffer between the built-up area of Storrington and the SDNP, and it forms the foreground of views towards the escarpment from Bax Close and the footpath. However, due in part to the density and height of the boundary vegetation, upward views of the escarpment from the southern portion of the site are largely obscured.

37. Whilst the proposal would add built form into these existing views towards the SDNP, the removal of the fence at the end of Bax Close would reveal a vista along the proposed road towards the designated landscape, thus longer views would be retained. Furthermore, the wooded boundaries, open space, and new planting would soften the appearance of the built form, thus preserving some sense of a spatial and visual transition between the denser core of Storrington and the SDNP.

38. The panoramic views of the landscape that can be gained from Kithurst Hill and Springhead Hill incorporate the site. However, the site comprises a very small component of those expansive views and the built form would be observed in context with the comparatively large built-up area of Storrington which forms an integral part of the setting of the SDNP. Moreover, the views of the development, which has been reduced in scale from the previous proposals, would be well-filtered by the vegetation within the site and the wider landscape such that it would be barely perceptible. A condition to control external lighting would ensure there would be no discernible change to the dark skies in this area.

39. Having regard to the size of the site, its proximity to the village, and the large scale of the SDNP and its setting, the effects of the development on the scenic qualities of the designated landscape would be limited. Furthermore, having regard to my statutory duty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (as amended by the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023), I am satisfied that the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the SDNP would be conserved, as would opportunities for the public understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the designated landscape.

40. Overall, the development has been sensitively designed to minimise impacts to the setting of the SDNP and the landscape and scenic beauty of the SDNP would be conserved. Accordingly, it would meet the Framework's expectations regarding development within the setting of National Parks. The proposal would also accord with Policy 30 of the HDPF, which provides support for developments close to protected landscapes where there would be no adverse impacts to the natural beauty and public enjoyment of the landscape.

41. Whilst I find no harm in respect of the SDNP and its setting, there would be minor and localised harm to the rural landscape character at this edge of Storrington. This harm brings the proposal into conflict with Policies 25 and 26 of the HDPF, insofar as they expect developments to relate sympathetically to, conserve, and enhance the local landscape character.

Other Considerations and Matters

Spatial strategy

42. Taken together, Policies 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the HDPF and Policy 1 of the Storrington, Sullington & Washington Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031 (September 2019) (the NP) seek to direct development towards Horsham whilst also allowing for growth within other settlements commensurate with their size. There is a more restrictive approach to development outside of settlements where protection is given to the rural character of the countryside. Given that the site lies outside of the built-up area of Storrington and is not of a type that would be explicitly supported in the countryside, there would be conflict with these policies.

Access to services and facilities

43. Storrington is identified in the HDPF as a second-tier settlement and it would provide for many, albeit not all, of the services and facilities required to meet the needs of future residents.

44. Whilst the footpaths along Amberley Road and Pulborough Road are narrow in places, they would nonetheless enable the opportunity for future residents, particularly those who are able-bodied and physically fit, to access local services and facilities on foot. Indeed, I have read and heard that many existing residents from this end of the village regularly walk to and from the village core and I see no reason why this would not be the case for future occupants of the development.

45. Future occupants would also have the option to access Horsham and other settlements by bus, from where there would be options for onward travel by sustainable modes. Whilst the bus services nearest to the site are infrequent, they would nonetheless provide some connectivity by bus.

46. I have not been directed to any dedicated cycle routes in the area. Therefore, in all reasonable likelihood, cycling would be limited to the keenest and most confident of cyclists. However, the proposed bicycle parking facilities would go some way to facilitating travel by bike for those willing and able to do so.

47. Notwithstanding the above, it is inevitable that the development would result in additional journeys being undertaken by private car. However, car journeys to the village would be short, and the train stations nearby at Pulborough and Amberley would provide for onward rail connectivity to other service centres and central London. Whilst I have heard that there are car parking capacity issues at these stations, they would feasibly be accessible by other means including bus, taxi or car sharing arrangements. Thus, rail would provide a genuine option for travel.

48. Overall, there would be a good range of opportunities for future residents to meet their daily needs via sustainable travel modes. This points to the site being in a sustainable location in terms of its accessibility.

Traffic and highway safety

49. The addition of 30 dwellings to the area would inevitably lead to an increase in vehicle movements on local roads, including on Bax Close, New Town Road, and the wider network. The effect of these additional vehicles on traffic congestion and highway safety is a matter of great concern to interested parties.

50. I observed that visibility at the New Town Road/Amberley Road junction is impeded to the southwest by overhanging vegetation. Therefore, vehicles emerging from New Town Road are required to 'nose out' at a steep gradient onto the busy Amberley Road. There is evidence before me of serious incidents at this junction in the past, and I was informed that other, unreported, accidents have occurred.

51. The poor visibility makes the junction particularly hazardous when turning right from New Town Road onto Amberley Road. I heard that some existing residents choose to avoid this manoeuvre due to safety concerns, instead opting to turn left and drive into the village first before turning around to head out of Storrington. This, in turn, has knock-on implications for traffic congestion within the village during peak hours.

52. I heard that the overhanging vegetation would be cut back to deliver the new footpath along Amberley Road; and it is likely that average vehicle speeds would be reduced through the enhanced signage associated with the proposed gateway feature. Overall, therefore, there would be minor but beneficial effects to highway safety at this key junction. Moreover, even if this were not the case, there would be an alternative route to and from the site via Pulborough Road. Therefore, it would not be necessary for future occupiers to travel via the New Town Road/Amberley Road junction to access the village and the surrounding area.

53. Although the southern section of New Town Road does not have a continuous footpath, the road is lightly trafficked and there are plentiful grass verges which could be accessed with reasonable care to provide refuge from passing vehicles. Moreover, the additional vehicle movements on New Town Road would not be so significant in number that they would exacerbate pedestrian safety issues. That said, there would also be other pedestrian routes available, for new and existing residents, utilising the new footpath link along Amberley Road or via Pulborough Road. Whilst I recognise that the widths of local footpaths are inconsistent, they nonetheless provide important segregation between vehicles and pedestrians.

54. There is no substantive evidence to indicate that local roads, including Bax Close and New Town Road, would be too narrow for construction traffic, or that there would be a harmful deterioration of the condition of roads and verges. The swept path analysis in the evidence shows that refuse vehicles, and therefore other large vehicles, would be able to access and leave the site in forward gear.

55. The vehicle movements associated with the construction process could inevitably lead to some disturbance to existing residents. However, this would be for a temporary period, and it would be managed through appropriate construction management measures which could be secured through a condition.

56. Overall, whilst I have had regard to the concerns in respect of traffic and highway safety, I am mindful that no objection to the proposal has been raised by the Highway Authority, which has stated that the local roads would be capable of receiving the additional flows without severe harm to the highway network. Given the statutory role of the Highway Authority and its expertise on traffic and highway safety matters, its views carry significant weight in my assessment.

57. The Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios. Overall, the proposal would accord with the Framework's expectations in respect of highway safety and the road network, and no increased risks or harm would occur.

Grade II listed building

58. The site lies close to the Grade II listed building known as Cobb Court[3], which is a two-storey detached house with stucco façade, chimney stack, and a walled garden. According to the list entry, Cobb Court dates from around 1800. However, the Heritage and Archaeology Statement (HAS) notes that it has some features which suggest it has earlier origins, potentially from the 16th or 17th Century.

59. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their settings, and any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

60. The HAS finds that Cobb Court was originally built as an isolated edge-of-common farmhouse, some distance from the historic village core; and that its name was likely derived from a local family. There is mapping evidence to show that the building was orientated to face the former common land to the east; and, therefore, the HAS concludes that Cobb Court would have been associated with farming activity on the common rather than the land to the rear of the building, which includes the appeal site.

61. Based on the information that is before me, and insofar as it is relevant to this appeal, the special interest of Cobb Court is derived from its architectural features and materials, including its distinctive stucco frontage and boundary wall, which are indicative of construction methods from the time of the building's origins and throughout its evolution. The building is also historically significant due to its siting

[3] List entry number 1354071

and orientation, as these features reveal information about the past siting and extent of the common and how the area has changed over time.

62. The building also gains some significance from its setting, including insofar as the architectural features and the distinctive walled garden can be best appreciated from close views on New Town Road. However, the building's immediate setting is now largely characterised by the housing developments that have established around it, and which have eroded the perception of the house as one that was once relatively isolated from other buildings.

63. The roof and the chimney of Cobb Court are visible in glimpsed views from the appeal site. Thus, the site provides for some, albeit very limited, visual connectivity between the listed building and the surrounding rural landscape. Overall, the appeal site's contribution to the significance of Cobb Court, insofar as it lies within its setting, is limited.

64. The proposal would bring new built form into the setting of Cobb Court, adding to the encroachment of development that has already occurred. However, the scheme has evolved from previous proposals, and it would retain a generous amount of space to the rear of the listed building. This would ensure there would be no harmful change to the ability to experience and appreciate the building from within its setting. Overall, I am satisfied that the setting and significance of Cobb Court would be preserved.

Habitats and species

65. The Ecological Assessment (EA) was undertaken by professionals with relevant expertise, and I see no reason to doubt its robustness in assessing the effects of the proposal on habitats and species. The EA shows that the site contains a range of habitats that support a mix of species, including protected species.

66. The bat activity surveys show that the site is important for the foraging and commuting of bats, including rarer species such as Barbastelle. Impacts on bats would be managed through a range of measures including a sensitive approach to lighting during the construction and operational phases of the development; and there would be habitat creation and enhancements, including planting, drainage features, and compensatory bat boxes.

67. There is also a known population of slow worm on the site, which would be translocated to other land under the same ownership as the appeal site. Details of the translocation method and delivery would be secured through a legal agreement if planning permission is granted to ensure that no harm would be caused to protected reptiles. On-site reptile habitats would also be created and enhanced.

68. Precautionary measures would be employed for a range of other species that the site has potential to support, including badger and nesting birds. Overall, I am satisfied that the measures proposed would be sufficient to ensure that adverse effects on habitats and species would be adequately avoided or mitigated.

Housing supply and mix

69. Policy 16 of the HDPF requires proposals to provide a mix of housing sizes, types, and tenures to meet the needs of the community. Whilst the policy states that the need is evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), it also

recognises that the appropriate mix of housing types and sizes will depend upon the established character and density of the neighbourhood.

70. In this case, the size of the affordable homes proposed would reflect the need identified by the Council's housing waiting list, which is live data that post-dates the SHMA. The market housing proposed, which would predominantly comprise larger dwellings, would broadly reflect the neighbourhood character. Therefore, the development would accord with the requirements of Policy 16 of the HDPF.

Living conditions

71. Future occupants of some dwellings could be exposed to road noise above recommended levels. However, road noise in this location would be unlikely to have characteristics that would be harmfully intrusive, particularly during the night when residents would be likely to be sleeping. Alternative ventilation measures would ensure that future residents would not need to rely on open windows to achieve a comfortable living environment; and noise mitigation fencing would reduce noise levels in affected gardens as far as possible.

72. I see no basis for a finding that harm would arise through odour emissions from the adjacent agricultural land given that the pig farm, which had ceased to operate at the time of the hearing, generated only a few complaints during its lifetime.

73. There would be the potential for adverse noise, traffic, and air quality effects to arise during the construction process. However, these effects would be temporary, and they would be mitigated and managed through appropriate construction and traffic management measures, which could be secured through a condition.

74. The Air Quality Assessment does not identify any harm would arise through increased vehicle movements through the Storrington Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and I note that the conclusions of the AQA have been reviewed and accepted by the Council's Environmental Health department. Therefore, I see no reason to conclude that the proposal would lead to air quality harm.

Mineral safeguarding

75. The site lies within the mineral safeguarding area for soft sand. Given the small size of the site, its irregular shape, and the constraints afforded by the retained vegetation, there would be practical difficulties involved with mineral extraction which would be unlikely to be resolvable. Moreover, due to the proximity of the site to dwellings, mineral extraction here would be likely to cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of nearby residents. Therefore, there would be no conflict with Policy M9 of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan July 2018 (Partial Review March 2021) in respect of mineral safeguarding.

Infrastructure

76. The proposal would increase demand for local services and facilities, including health services, schools, and foul water treatment. There is no substantive evidence to show that there is insufficient capacity in these services and facilities to cater for the development. Moreover, the development would contribute towards infrastructure provision through the Community Infrastructure Levy regime.

77. There is no suggestion in the evidence that the gas pipeline beneath the site would be disturbed. Therefore, there would be no resultant interruption of the gas supply.

Recreation

78. The development would lead to the loss of the informal paths on the site, which are well-used by existing residents. However, whilst smaller in size, the proposed open space would contribute to local recreational needs in the longer term. Moreover, due to the site's proximity to the Rights of Way network and the SDNP, the area is rich in recreational resources and places to walk. Whilst the loss of the informal routes would be felt acutely by those who visit the site regularly, it would not lead to a harmful loss of recreational facilities overall.

Flooding and water quality

79. The FRA does not identify an increased risk of flooding would arise; and there would be measures, including a basin, that would provide for the storage and drainage of water from the site. The Lead Local Flood Authority, which has technical expertise in flooding matters, did not object to the proposal. Therefore, I am satisfied there would be no increased flood risk.

80. The evidence shows that the site is unlikely to be contaminated and a condition could secure appropriate works in the event of unexpected contaminants. Therefore, the proposal would not pose a harmful risk to water quality.

Climate change

81. The proposed buildings would be constructed to modern building regulation standards, and solar panels would be installed to enable the buildings to generate their own electricity. Thus, overall, the development would help to mitigate climate change in a manner that is proportionate to the scale of the proposal.

Other issues

82. Interested parties have expressed concerns that the development would set a precedent for further proposals to come forward in the area. However, this appeal decision does not and cannot predetermine the outcome of any such applications which would be considered by the Council on their own merits.

83. I also note concerns raised about the conduct of the appellant. However, this matter falls beyond the scope of the appeal.

Benefits of the proposal

84. The Council is only able to demonstrate 1.7 years of HLS, which is a substantial shortfall against the requirements of the Framework. The extent of the shortfall is evidence of a persistent and urgent need for additional housing in the area. Whilst I recognise that the LPR is progressing through the examination process, its adoption is not guaranteed and there is no certainty that the HLS would improve.

85. In this context, the delivery of 30 dwellings would make an important contribution to the immediate and pressing need for housing, and it would support the Framework's objective to significantly boost the supply of homes. Given the serious shortfall in the HLS, the delivery of housing carries significant positive weight.

86. The proposed affordable homes would contribute towards the affordable housing needs of the district, including the specific demands identified through the Council's housing waiting list, and it would help to meet the needs of different groups in the

community as the Framework requires. The affordable housing proposed carries significant positive weight in its own right.

87. The highway works, including the new footpath links, crossing points and the gateway feature, would enhance accessibility and safety for existing road and footpath users as well as serving new residents. The improvements to visibility at the New Town Road/Amberley Road junction would also be a benefit of the scheme. Together, these works carry moderate positive weight.

88. The development would deliver biodiversity net gain (BNG) of at least the statutory minimum requirement. However, because the proportional uplift in habitats would not be significant in real terms, the positive weight ascribed is moderate.

89. There would be economic benefits associated with construction employment; and future residents would increase spending on local services thus they would support the vitality of the rural community. These benefits would be commensurate with the small scale of the proposal, and they carry moderate positive weight.

90. I have already found that the proposed open space would compensate for the loss of the longstanding informal recreational routes. However, it would not lead to an enhancement of the recreation provision overall, and so would not be a benefit. Moreover, whilst the new homes would be constructed to mitigate the climate effects of the development, there is no evidence to suggest they would lead to climate enhancements overall. Similarly, financial contributions towards infrastructure provision would be to mitigate the effects of the development but would not secure enhancements. These factors are each neutral in my decision, and they do not carry positive weight.

Appropriate Assessment

91. The site lies within the SNWSZ, where water abstraction has the potential to adversely affect the Arun Valley sites, which include European sites that are protected under the Habitats Regulations. In its statement on 31 October 2025, NE confirmed that it has agreed a package of measures with its partners that will address the risk of further decline of the Arun Valley sites due to water abstraction. Therefore, NE advised that there is certainty that new developments within the SNWSZ would not have likely significant effects on the Arun Valley sites. NE was consulted on the appeal and has confirmed this position in respect of the appeal proposal. On this basis, I find that there would be no likely significant effects on the Arun Valley sites and an AA in respect of those sites is not necessary.

92. The site also lies close to the Duncton to Bignor Escarpment SAC (DBESAC), which supports Asperulo-Fagetum beech forests which is its qualifying feature. The evidence states that the DBESAC could be harmed through changes in recreational pressure and air quality. However, it is common ground that the proposal would be unlikely to cause significant effects on the DBESAC due to its small scale; and Natural England did not identify any likely significant effects or concerns in respect of the DBESAC in its consultation response on the appeal. Consequently, it is not necessary for me to carry out an AA for the DBESAC.

93. The site lies within 10km of the Mens SAC, which comprises a large area of Atlantic acidophilous beech forest with Ilex and Taxus in the shrub layer. The Mens SAC also supports Barbastelle bats, which are a qualifying feature. The conservation objectives of the Mens SAC are to maintain or restore the integrity of the site, and

to ensure it contributes to achieving the favourable conservation status of its qualifying features. The flight paths and feeding areas of Barbastelle bats extend for a wide area around the SAC and include the habitats within the appeal site. There is, therefore, a functional link between the site and the Mens SAC.

94. The bat survey work and the Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment, show that Barbastelle bats use the site in small numbers, most likely for commuting but also foraging purposes. Without mitigation in place, the development would be likely to impact or sever flightlines through habitat removals and additional lighting. Thus, it would undermine the conservation objectives and integrity of the Mens SAC.

95. There are a range of mitigation, compensation, and enhancement measures proposed in respect of Barbastelle bats. These include limitations on lighting during construction and in the long term, as well as replacement planting to compensate for lost habitats, including woodland, species-rich grassland, scrub, wet habitats, and native nectar rich flora species to attract invertebrates. NE has confirmed that these measures, which could be secured through conditions, would be sufficient to avoid an adverse impact on the integrity of the Mens SAC.

96. Taking account of NE's advice, and the measures proposed in respect of the Mens SAC, the proposal would not cause significant adverse effects on European sites.

Planning Obligations

97. I have considered the obligations within the S106 Agreement against the tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and the Framework, noting that it is common ground that the obligations comply with the tests. The tests require that the obligations are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, are directly related to the development, and are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

98. The S106 Agreement provides for the provision of affordable housing, which is necessary to ensure the proposal complies with Policy 16 of the HDPF. Obligations relating to the provision and management of open space would be necessary to meet the needs of future occupiers and to accord with Policy 32 of the HDPF.

99. An obligation provides for the implementation and monitoring of BNG, which is necessary to ensure the habitats endure in the long term. A further obligation would secure the implementation of a reptile mitigation strategy, including translocation to an off-site location, which is necessary to ensure that the scheme would not harm protected species and to comply with Policy 31 of the HDPF.

100. A financial contribution towards measures to encourage the use of sustainable travel modes is necessary to encourage modal shift and to reduce the emissions from private vehicles, as required by Policy 24 of the HDPF.

Planning Balance

101. The proposal would accord with the development plan in respect of its effects on the setting of the SDNP. However, there would be conflict with Policies 25, 26, and 33 of the HDPF in respect of the harm to tree T2 and the localised harm to the rural character at the edge of Storrington. There would also be conflict with the spatial strategy set out in the development plan through Policies 2, 3, 4, and 26 of the HDPF and Policy 1 of the NP. The conflict with these policies brings the proposal

into conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. However, because of the HLS position, paragraph 11 d) of the Framework is engaged.

102. Given my conclusions in respect of the SDNP, the Grade II listed Cobb Court, and Habitats sites, there is not a strong reason to refuse the development under the provisions of paragraph 11 d) i. of the Framework. Therefore, the proposal falls to be considered against the test set out in paragraph 11 d) ii.

103. The Framework is clear that trees should be retained wherever possible. However, whilst regrettable, the harm that could be caused through the loss of tree T2 would be localised and there would be some compensation through the replacement planting of Oak trees, albeit that those trees would take a long time to reach full maturity. In this context, I ascribe moderate negative weight to any loss of tree T2.

104. The harm to the setting of Storrington village would be minor in nature and localised in extent; and I am satisfied that the proposal would be landscape-led such that the site would be rich in natural features. Consequently, the harm to the local character carries limited negative weight in my decision.

105. The Framework does not preclude development outside of defined settlement boundaries, and the site would be well located to provide good accessibility to services and facilities by sustainable travel modes. The proposal would, therefore, accord with the Framework's aim to direct development to sustainable locations.

106. The Council's own document 'Shaping Development in Horsham District Planning Advice Note 2025' (the SDPAN) acknowledges that developments will come forward in locations not supported by the development plan, given that the housing target in the HDPF can no longer be used to calculate the HLS. Whilst the SDPAN does not reduce the statutory weight of the development plan, it is a relevant consideration that sets out how the Council intends to support development that would meet housing needs and, consequently, it is pertinent to my decision.

107. The SPDAN includes criteria for housing proposals on unallocated land outside of settlements where development would normally be restricted through Policy 26 of the HDPF, which includes the appeal site. The site adjoins the edge of Storrington, and the development would be appropriate in size to the scale and function of the adjacent village. The development would contribute towards housing needs, and it would not lead to the loss of community facilities or services, nor would it prejudice comprehensive long-term development. Therefore, the proposal would accord with the first four criteria listed in paragraph 5.12 of the SPDAN.

108. The fifth and last criterion requires development to be contained within an existing defensible boundary and that landscape character features are maintained and enhanced. It is the Council's view that the proposal would not accord with this criterion. However, the site is well-bound by woodland planting, which would be largely retained and supplemented with additional trees. Thus, the defensible boundary and landscape character features would be maintained and enhanced. Overall, the proposal would meet the objectives of the SPDAN.

109. Taking account of the degree of consistency with the Framework and having considered the Council's advice in the SPDAN, the harm that would arise through the conflict with the spatial strategy carries limited weight.

110. Set against the harms would be the benefits of the scheme, including the provision of market and affordable housing, which carry significant positive weight; and the BNG, highway improvements, and economic benefits which carry moderate weight.

111. Overall, the adverse impacts of granting planning permission in this case would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole and having particular regard to the key policies referred to in Paragraph 11 d) ii. of the Framework. The proposal benefits from the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the Framework and, therefore, planning permission should be granted.

Conditions

112. I have considered the suggested conditions agreed between the parties against the tests for conditions set out in the Framework. Where necessary, I have amended the wording of the conditions to ensure compliance with the tests or in the interests of brevity and consistency. The appellant has confirmed agreement to the conditions that are pre-commencement conditions.

113. I have included a condition specifying the relevant plans (1) to provide certainty over the development permitted; as well as the standard time limit condition (2) which is necessary to secure the timely delivery of the scheme. Condition 3 is necessary to protect the road network, habitats, species and the living conditions of nearby residents during the construction process. Condition 4 is necessary to ensure there would be adequate provision for foul and surface water drainage and to avoid the risk of flooding.

114. Conditions 5 and 6 are necessary to ensure that existing trees are protected from harm during the development, and condition 5 would allow for the full consideration of any potential measures that could be taken to protect tree T2 to ensure it would not die, or be felled, unnecessarily. Condition 7 is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area. Condition 8 is necessary to ensure adequate provision of fire hydrants to safeguard future occupants from fire risk. It is also necessary to include a condition requiring details of the pumping station (9) to protect the character and appearance of the area.

115. Condition 10 is necessary to ensure that the bird and bat boxes proposed provide suitable compensatory habitats; and it is necessary to include a condition (11) securing details of the acoustic and ventilation measures for some dwellings to protect future occupants from unacceptable noise effects.

116. Conditions 12 and 13 are necessary to protect local character and, in the case of condition 13, to ensure that the development mitigates and adapts to climate change. Condition 14 is necessary to ensure that parking spaces, internal roads, and footways would be appropriate to serve the development. Condition 15 is necessary to ensure external lighting does not cause harm to protected species and habitats, and to the dark skies of the SDNP. Conditions 16 and 17 are necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area and, in the case of condition 17, to ensure habitats are replaced and enhanced.

117. Condition 18 is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area; Condition 19 is necessary to facilitate modal shift away from the private car. Condition 20, which secures off-site highway works, is necessary to ensure the site would be accessible and to secure highway safety improvements. The works would

be undertaken on land outside of the appellant's control. However, there is a good prospect that the works would be delivered, because the land is in the control of the Highway Authority who supports the works.

118. Condition 21, relating to water consumption, is necessary to comply with Policy 37 of the HDPF. Condition 22 is necessary to protect the local landscape character and habitats. However, I have adjusted the wording to permit the removal of tree T2 in addition to the tree works detailed in the AIA because I have found it is likely that tree T2 would not survive. Condition 23 is necessary to ensure future occupiers are not exposed to harmful noise; and condition 24 is necessary to protect the environment and human health.

119. I have not included a condition requiring site access details and related measures to protect tree T2, because it would be unreasonable to secure off-site works that I have not considered and which could be unacceptable or undeliverable.

120. The appellant is advised that, due to the provisions of Schedule 7 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and as none of the statutory exemptions apply, the development may not be begun unless a biodiversity gain plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Conclusion

121. The proposal conflicts with the development plan. However, the material considerations in this case, including the provisions of the Framework, indicate that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

E Catcheside
INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawing nos:

Location Plan	LP.01 Rev A
Proposed Coloured Site Layout	CSL02 Rev C
Detailed Soft Landscape Proposals	P22-3065_EN_0001 _G_0001
Detailed Soft Landscape Proposals	P22-3065_EN_0001_G_0002
Detailed Soft Landscape Proposal Composite Plan	P22-3065_EN_0001_G_0003
Reptile Mitigation Area and Proposed Offsite BNG	6815/BNG2b
Pre-development Habitat Measurements	6815/BNG1a

Habitat Features Plan	13394/P14
Refuse Layout	RL.01 Rev C
Dwelling Boundary Materials Layout	DBML.01 Rev E
House Type 4BH1 – Option 2 Elevations	HT.4BH1-2.e Rev A
Plots 10 – 11 Elevations	P10-P11.e Rev A
Plots 12 – 13 Elevations	P12-P13.e Rev B
Plots 14 – 15 Elevations	P14-P15.e Rev B
Plots 16 – 17 Elevations	P16-P17.e Rev B
Plots 19 – 20 Elevations	P19-P20.e Rev B
Plots 21 – 22 Elevations	P21-P22.e Rev B
Plots 23 – 24 Elevations	P23-P24.e Rev C
Plots 26 – 27 Elevations	P26-P27.e Rev B
Plots 28 – 29 Elevations	P28-P29.e Rev B
House Type 4BH4 Elevations	HT.4BH1.e Rev A
House Type 4BH1 – Option 1 Elevations	HT.4BH1-1.e Rev A
House Type 4BH1 Floor Plans	HT.4BH1.p Rev A
Plots 10 – 11 Floor Plans	P10-P11.p Rev A
Plots 12 – 13 Floor Plans	P12-P13.p Rev A
Plots 14 – 15 Floor Plans	P14-P15.p Rev A
Plots 16 – 17 Floor Plans	P16-P17.p Rev A
Plots 19 – 20 Floor Plans	P19-P20.p Rev A
Plots 21 – 22 Floor Plans	P21-P22.p Rev A
Plots 23 – 24 Floor Plans	P23-P24.p Rev A
Plots 26 – 27 Floor Plans	P27-P27.p Rev A
Plots 28 – 29 Floor Plans	P28-P29.p Rev A
House Type 4BH4 Floor Plans	HT.4BH4.p Rev A
House Type 3BH12 – Detached – Variation A Floor Plans and Elevations	HT.3BH12-DET-A.pe Rev A
House Type 2BH1 – End Terrace – Option 2 Floor Plans and Elevations	HT.2BH1-END-2.pe Rev A
House Type 3BH12 – Detached Floor Plans and Elevations	HT.3BH12-DET.pe Rev A
Tree Constraints Plan	13394_P03 Rev A

2) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

3) No development shall commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), which demonstrates accordance with the ecological mitigation and avoidance measures set out in Section 4: Potential Impacts, Mitigation, and Enhancements of the Ecological Assessment (Tyler Grange, ref: 13394_R03a_NJ_CW, Rev A dated 17th June 2024), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include the following details:
   (i) Site management contact details and responsibilities;
   (ii) Proposed working hours;
   (iii) A plan detailing the site logistics arrangements, including:
      - Location of site compound,
      - Location of the loading, unloading, and storage of plant and materials (including any stripped topsoil),
      - Site offices (including location, height, size and appearance),
      - Location of site access points for construction vehicles,
      - Location of on-site parking,
      - Locations and details for the provision of wheel washing facilities and dust suppression facilities (with particular regard to the recommendations included at section 6 of the Air Quality Assessment (Air Quality Consultants J10/13076A/1/F2 dated 09.05.2024),
      - The arrangements for public consultation and liaison prior to and during the construction works (e.g. newsletters/fliers), to include site management contact details for residents,
      - Details of lighting, including location, height, type and direction of light sources, hours of operation, and intensity of illumination.
   (iv) Identification of biodiversity protection zones and associated protection fencing, exclusion zones, and/or barriers;
   (v) Practical measures (both physical and working practices) to avoid and minimise ecological impacts during construction;
   (vi) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features and protected species;
   (vii) The role and responsibilities of an ecological clerk of works or similarly competent person, including details of the occasions when an ecologist would be present on site to oversee works; and
   (viii) Measures for the control, containment and removal of any invasive non-native species.

   The development shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved CEMP.

4) No development shall commence until a detailed foul and surface water drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage scheme shall take account of the recommendations of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (Herrington Consulting, Revision 2, dated 03.05.2024) and shall include technical specifications, calculations and drawings of the drainage network

supporting the development, demonstrating the management of surface water within the site. The approved drainage scheme shall be implemented in full prior to the first occupation of any dwelling.

5) No development shall commence, no ground shall be cleared, and no equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought onto the site, until an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS), showing the measures to be taken to protect all retained trees and hedgerows, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved AMS.

Any retained trees or hedges on the site that die or become damaged during the construction process shall be replaced with trees or hedging plants of a size, type, and siting that accords with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

6) No development shall commence until details of underground services, including locations, dimensions, and depths of all service facilities and required ground excavations, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

7) No development shall commence until detailed plans, showing the existing and final ground and floor levels, in relation to nearby datum points adjoining the application site, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

8) No development shall commence until details of the locations of fire hydrants have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The fire hydrants shall thereafter be provided in accordance with the approved details before the first occupation of the development.

9) Prior to the commencement of the construction of the pumping station, which shall be sited an accordance with the location indicated on drawing CSL02 Rev C, full details of the design, scale, and appearance of the pumping station, and any associated enclosure and hardstanding shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The pumping station, and any associated enclosure and hardstanding, shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details in advance of the first occupation of any dwelling.

10) No development shall take place above slab level until the precise locations and specification details for bird and bat boxes have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The bird and bat boxes shall thereafter be installed in accordance with the approved details.

11) No development shall take place above slab level in respect of the dwellings in Zone A (as denoted at Figure 7 of the Environmental Noise Assessment Report, Sol Acoustics ref. P2347-XX-XX-RP-Y-001 P03, dated 15.07.2024) until acoustic specifications for the proposed glazing and a ventilation strategy for the dwellings in Zone A has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details submitted shall demonstrate regard has been had to the recommendations in sections 7.3 and 8 of the Environmental Noise Assessment Report. The glazing and

ventilation strategy shall thereafter be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupancy of each dwelling in Zone A.

12) No development shall take place above slab level until a schedule of materials, finishes, and colours to be used in the external walls, windows, and roofs of the buildings hereby approved has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

13) No development shall take place above slab level, until details of the design, scale, and appearance of the solar photovoltaic (PV) equipment to be installed, which shall accord with the commitments within the Energy and Sustainability Statement (AES Sustainability Consultants, dated May 2024), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. PV equipment shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of each dwelling.

14) No development shall take place above slab level until the following details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

(i) The car parking spaces to be provided for each dwelling (including garages if applicable);

(ii) Visitor car parking spaces;

(iii) Surfacing materials and construction details of internal roads, footways, and parking areas; and

(iv) Drainage features for the car parking spaces, internal roads, and footways.

The internal roads, footways, and car parking spaces shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

No dwelling shall be occupied until the car parking spaces for that dwelling have been constructed and made available for use in accordance with the approved details. The approved car parking spaces shall thereafter be retained for car parking.

15) No dwelling shall be first occupied until an external lighting scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include specifications of the types, height, and locations of lighting so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent bats utilising their territory, and it shall accord with the recommendations of the Ecological Assessment at paragraphs 4.13 and 4.14 (Tyler Grange, ref: 13394_R03a_NJ_CW, Rev A, dated 17th June 2024). Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), no external lighting, including street lighting, shall be installed other than in accordance with the details approved pursuant to this condition.

16) No part of the development shall be first occupied until details of all hard landscaping, including hard surfacing materials and finishes, street furniture, waste bins, seating, and play equipment, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The hard landscaping

scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any part of the development.

17) No dwelling shall be first occupied until a programme for the delivery of the proposed planting, shown on the approved detailed soft landscape proposals drawings has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The planting shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved programme for delivery. Any trees or plants that die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased within five years of its planting shall be replaced in the next planting season with a similar tree or plant.

18) No dwelling shall be occupied until provision for the storage of refuse and recycling for that dwelling has been provided within the garage or the side or rear garden of the dwelling. The refuse and recycling storage facilities shall thereafter be retained.

19) No dwelling shall be occupied until bicycle parking facilities for that dwelling have been provided within the garage or the side or the rear garden of the dwelling. The bicycle parking facilities shall thereafter be retained.

20) No dwelling shall be occupied until the off-site highway works shown on drawing SK04, included within the Transport Statement (Transport Planning Associates, ref: 02, dated July 2024), have been completed.

21) Each dwelling hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the Building Regulations optional requirement of a water consumption rate of no more than 110 litres per person per day has been complied with.

22) Except in relation to the tree identified as T2 in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Tyler Grange, ref: 13394_R05_JP) (the AIA) and the tree works detailed in the AIA, no trees shown to be retained in the AIA shall be felled and/or subject to reduction unless in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

23) The boundary wall along the southern edge of the rear gardens of Plots 22 and 23, as shown on drawing DBML.01 Rev E, shall be constructed to a height of 2.4 metres and in accordance with the recommendations at Section 7.5 of the Environmental Noise Assessment Report, ref. P2346-XX-XX-RP-Y-001 P03, dated 15.07.2024 prior to the first occupation of Plots 22 and 23.

24) Any contamination that is found during the construction of the development shall be reported immediately to the local planning authority. Development on the part of the site affected shall be suspended until a risk assessment has been carried out and submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Where unacceptable risks are found, the construction of the development shall not resume or continue until remediation and verification schemes have been carried out in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

End of Schedule

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:
Tim Burrow (A2Dominion Developments Ltd)
Heather Sargeant (Landmark Chambers)
Andrew Watson (Savills)
Phillipa Robinson (Savills)
Robert Hughes (Incola)
Jamie Pratt (Tyler Grange)
Nathan Hanks (Transport Planning Associates)

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:
Kate Turner (Senior Planning Officer)
Andy Bush (Arboricultural Officer (Planning))
Dan Holmes (Senior Planning Officer)

INTERESTED PARTIES:
Claudia Fisher, Local Councillor & Storrington Traffic Group
William Aitkenhead, Storrington and Sullington Parish Council
Murray Chisholm, local resident
Mark Appleton, local resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE HEARING:

1. Completed S106 Agreement, dated 3 July 2026
2. Revised schedule of conditions
3. Drawing Nos. P12-P13.e Rev B, P14-P15.e Rev B, P16-P17.e Rev B, P19-P20.e Rev B, P21-P22.e Rev B, P23-P24.e Rev C, P26-P27.e Rev B, P28-P29.e Rev B
4. Covering Letter
5. Email dated 01 July 2026 from the appellant entitled ‘Update on Emerging Horsham Local Plan’ and attached documents comprising Appendix 6 Policies Maps Pack 4 and Strategic Policy HA18.
6. Email correspondence with the main parties regarding the above documents.
7. Representation letters received in response to the post-hearing public consultation.
8. Letter from the appellant dated 13 July 2026 responding the post-hearing representation letters received.