

~}}]

By Electronic Submission

Our ref: DC/26/0253
Your ref: 6013156
Email: tamara.dale@horsham.gov.uk
Direct Line: 01403 215166
Date: 25th September 2026

Dear Sir/Madam,

Appeal 6014605 – West Chilmington House, Harbolets Road, Pulborough, RH20 2LG

Following the submission of the appeal against the refusal of full planning permission for the demolition of the existing residential dwelling and erection of 5no. terraced houses (2no. 2 bed dwellings and 3no 3 bed dwellings), the Local Planning Authority would like to further substantiate the reasons for refusal as follows.

Refusal Reason 1

“The development would be located beyond a defined built-up area on a site not allocated within the Development Plan and would not be essential to this countryside location. The development would therefore be contrary to the overarching spatial strategy and hierarchy approach of concentrating development within defined settlements and advocating a planned approach to settlement expansion, contrary to policies 1, 2, 3 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015). Notwithstanding the absence of a five-year land housing supply, and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) at paragraph 11(d), it is not considered that there are any material considerations which would outweigh harm arising from conflict with the above policies.”

Policy 2 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) sets out the main growth strategy, focusing development in the main settlements. The HDPF outlines that the proposed settlement hierarchy is the most sustainable approach to delivering housing; where new development is focused in the larger settlements of Horsham, Southwater and Billingshurst; and limited new development is directed elsewhere, and 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.

Policy 4 of the HDPF refers to the expansion of settlements outside the built-up area, and states that such development is only 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.

As the site is located outside of any defined built-up area boundary, Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF are of significant weight in the determination of the application. As stated within Policy 3 of the HDPF, development will be permitted within towns and villages that have defined built-up areas; with development in the countryside more strictly controlled through the provisions of Policy 4. This policy

states that development outside of built up areas will only be supported where the site is allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan and adjoins a settlement edge.

Policy H1 of the West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan states that development proposals will be supported where the following criteria as applicable are met:

- a) Located within a built-up area boundary
- b) Respond to the individual identities of The Common and The Old Villages as detailed in the Landscape Character Assessment
- c) Do not have a detrimental impact on the predominantly open and undeveloped landscape setting of the Parish as a whole
- d) All development within the Sussex North Water Resource Zone (WRZ) will need to demonstrate water neutrality through water efficient design and offsetting of any net additional water use of the development
- e) Land outside of either built up area boundary is considered to be countryside and development will only be allowed if it is the subject of a specific policy in this Neighbourhood Plan or can demonstrate a need to be located in the countryside, as set out in national and local policies.

Policy H2a and H2b allocations two sites for housing development. The application site does not form part of either of these allocations.

Policy S3 of the NPPF states that decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development, where outside settlements, policy S5 should be applied.

Policy S5 of the NPPF states that only certain forms of development should be approved outside settlements. These should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework. These forms of development include:

- a. Development for: agriculture, horticulture and forestry; outdoor sport and recreation; allotments; cemeteries and burial grounds; mineral extraction and processing; engineering operations and infrastructure (including for transport, energy, water and telecommunications); roadside facilities in accordance with policy TR5; national defence and security; or which is solely for nature conservation, restoration and/or enhancement;
- b. Development for rural businesses and services, including tourism, where a location outside settlement is shown to be necessary;
- c. The reuse, extension, alteration or replacement of an existing building, provided that the existing building is of permanent and substantial construction, is lawful in planning terms, and any extension or alteration will not result in a disproportionate increase in size compared to the existing building. In the case of proposals for a replacement building, it should be for the same use and not disproportionately larger than the one it replaces;
- d. The redevelopment or previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed-use including residential);
- e. Limited infilling within groups of houses;
- f. An exception site as provided for in policy HO10, or development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order;
- g. Development which would address an evidenced unmet need for gypsy, traveller or travelling showpeople accommodation, provided it meets the criteria in policy HO12;
- h. Residential and mixed-use development which would:
 - i. Be within reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station (applying the definitions in the glossary at Annex B);
 - ii. Be physically well-related to the station of the settlement within which the station is located;

- iii. Be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure; and
 - iv. Not prejudice any proposals for long-term comprehensive development in the same location.
- i. The development of land allocated for that purpose in the development plan (where this lies outside settlements) and
- j. Development which would address an evidenced unmet need (including, but not limited to, development proposals involving the provision of housing where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites or score below 75% in the most recent Housing Delivery Test) and where the development would:
 - i. Be physically well-related to an existing settlement (unless the nature of the development would make this inappropriate) and be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure; or
 - ii. Comprise major development for freight and logistics purposes which accords with policy E3.

Policy HO11 of the NPPF states that development proposals for isolated homes in the countryside should only be supported where one or more of the following circumstances apply:

- a. There is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;
- b. The development would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets in accordance with policy HE4;
- c. The development would reuse a redundant or disused building and enhance its immediate setting, including proposals which would secure the long-term reuse of a vacant or underused listed building (subject to taking into account any harm to its significance, as set out in policy HE6);
- d. The development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential building; or
- e. The design is of exceptional quality, in that it:
 - i. Is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise the standards of design more generally in rural areas; and
 - ii. Would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

The term “isolated” is not defined within the National Planning Policy Framework, but case law has confirmed that it should be given its ordinary objective meaning of remote and far away from other places, buildings and people, and separate or remote from a settlement, services, and facilities. It was concluded in the Braintree Judgement that a settlement would not necessarily exclude a cluster of dwellings. The application site is located within close proximity to a number of residential dwellings and other buildings, and given this spatial context is not considered to be “isolated” in its truest sense, and does not therefore engage the considerations of Policy HO11 of the NPPF.

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

The proposed development seeks to the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection a terrace of 5no. residential properties, which would result in the net increase of 4no. dwellings. The application site is located within the countryside in policy terms, where the development would not accord with the overarching spatial strategy and would be contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

It is recognised that the appeal site would represent previously developed land, where the development would replace the existing fire-damaged dwelling with 5no. residential dwellings. The proposed development would also contribute to an evidenced unmet housing need within the district. The development site would not however be considered to be “physically well-related to an existing settlement”. Specifically, the appeal site is located approximately 3.3km north of the built-up area boundary of West Chiltington. The site is located on an unlit road which does not benefit from a dedicated pavement for pedestrians. There are no direct Public Rights of Way leading to the nearest built-up area, with the nearby footpaths providing limited access to West Chiltington. While the speed limit is reduced along this section of Harbolets Road, due to its unlit nature and lack of dedicated pavement, it is unlikely that walking and cycling would offer a viable or attractive option. As such, occupiers of the development would be reliant on private vehicles to serve their day-to-day needs.

Policy CC2 of the NPPF states that development proposals should, where relevant to the proposal, accord with policies TR3 and TR4 so that sustainable patterns of movement are prioritised, opportunities are taken to improve walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport, and infrastructure is provided to support the transition to zero-emission vehicles. Development should support good access to facilities in order to limit the need to travel, whether through the development's location, through development densities which improve catchment populations for local services, or by incorporating community facilities and premises to support local employment opportunities.

Policy TR3 of the NPPF outlines that so development is located where it can support sustainable patterns of movement, enable good accessibility for different users, and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure, development proposals should reflect certain principles, taking into account the vision of the site, the type of development and its location. These principles include, among others, that development proposals which could generate a significant amount of movement, in the context of the area within which they would be situated, should be in locations that are sustainable (or which can be made so, taking into account planned improvements, including any provided for as part of the development itself). This means the location should limit the need to travel, particularly by private car, and offer a genuine choice of transport modes for residents and users, unless the nature of the development would make this impractical.

The proposed development would fail to prioritise sustainable patterns of movement, which due to the distance of the site from the built-up area boundary and the lack of infrastructure in the form of dedicated pavements, would not benefit from opportunities to improve walking, wheeling, cycling, and public transport. The appeal site is considered to be located in an inappropriate location where the proposed would not support good access to facilities in order to limit the need to travel. For these reasons, the proposed development would be contrary to policies CC2 and TR3 of the NPPF.

While the proposed development would contribute to an identified housing need, the contribution of 5no. dwellings (a net increase of 4no. dwellings) to the housing supply would be modest. The benefits arising from the scheme would, when considered overall, be of moderate weight. In addition, it is likely that future occupiers would be reliant on private vehicles to access everyday services, amenities and facilities. The site is therefore considered to be located within an inappropriate and unsustainable location, contrary to the overarching spatial strategy contained within the HDPF and the policies within the NPPF when read as a whole.

Refusal Reason 2

“The development would be of a poor design and visual quality, where the proposal would appear as a prominent feature within the landscape. The limited visual relief and stark elevations would exaggerate the overall massing and bulk of the built form, and the proposal would fail to reflect the built character and architectural features of the wider locality. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would be contrary to Policies 25, 32, and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).”

Policy 25 of the HDPF states that the natural environment and landscape character of the District, including the landscape, landform and development pattern, together with protected landscapes and habitats will be protected against inappropriate development. The Council will support development proposals which: protects, conserves and enhances the landscape character, taking into account areas identified as being of landscape importance, the individual settlement characteristics, and maintains settlement separation. Policy 33 of the HDPF outlines that in order to conserve and enhance the natural and built environment development should presume in favour of the retention of existing important landscape and natural features, for example trees, hedges, banks, and watercourses. Development must relate sympathetically to the local landscape and justify and mitigate against any losses that may occur through the development.

Policy H2 of the West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan states that new development should incorporate innovative approaches to the construction of low carbon homes which demonstrate sustainable use of resources and high energy efficiency levels. High quality design should give a sense of place and sense of orientations, and landscape design and green infrastructure should contribute to a sustainable sense of orientation. All mature trees and hedgerows should be retained unless their removal is essential, and where possible, hedgerows should be enhanced. The density of new development should be appropriate to its located by virtue of size, height, siting and relationship to existing properties and good quality outdoor amenity space should be incorporated.

Policy H3 of the West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan states that proposals for new housing must be of a high quality, be energy efficient and designed to reflect the local character, and reinforce where possible, local distinctiveness.

Policy EH8 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that all development should maintain the local character of the landscape within the neighbourhood planning area and should not impact on significant views that currently provide open field aspects, views to the South Downs, or view from the village centres and other open spaces.

Policy N2 of the NPPF (2026) states that to contribute positively to the natural environment and support nature's recovery, development proposals should, among other things, conserve and enhance existing natural features of visual, historic or nature conservation (such as established trees and hedgerows) where possible; use appropriate landscaping to help create a well-designed place and integrate development into its surroundings; and ensure that green infrastructure and other features to support nature are located and designed to minimise risk of future failure, and that appropriate measures are in place for any necessary long-term management.

Policy N3 of the NPPF (2026) continues that in recognition of the benefits which trees can provide for biodiversity, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and the character and quality of the built environment, development proposals should:

- a. Make new streets tree-lined (unless there are strong reasons why this would be inappropriate in specific streets) and incorporate trees in other suitable locations, such as in parks and through the provision of community orchards;
- b. Ensure that the selection of species and their placement is compatible with highways and other infrastructure requirements and the needs of different users of public spaces; and will be effective

in helping to adapt to the effects of climate change and delivering other environmental benefits. Suitable arboricultural advice should be sought, and proposals discussed with highways and trees officers where necessary, so that the right trees are planted in the right place; and

- c. Make provision for the long-term maintenance of both existing and newly-planted trees which form part of the development.

Policy DP3 of the NPPF (2026) states that development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting) so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings. To create well-designed places, development proposals should also reflect relevant aspects of a number of principles, as appropriate to the nature of the development and its location. This includes incorporating and/or connecting to a network of high quality, accessible, multifunctional green infrastructure to provide opportunities for recreation and healthy living, strengthening habitats, improving climate change resilience and improving air and water quality. This should include maintaining and enhancing tree cover and incorporating sustainable drainage systems in accordance with policies N3 and F8.

The proposed development would comprise a terrace of 5no. dwellings, with the built form incorporating a half-hipped roof. Window and door openings would be provided to the north-east and south-west elevations.

As outlined within the Delegated Report, the proposed development would incorporate limited visual relief or interest. The lack of detailing and features would further exacerbate the scale and massing of the proposed development, where the resulting built form would appear as a dominant feature within the wider surroundings. While the proposal would replace existing built form, where this is an established part of the landscape, the proposed development is considered to be of a poor design and visual quality, with the lack of detailing and visual relief considered to result in a stark and bulky building that would fail to reflect the built characteristics and architectural features within the locality.

The proposed area of hardstanding to the northern section of the site would include limited landscaping features, where this would appear as a prominent feature at a distance from the proposed dwellings. The absence of any landscaping to offset or reduce the visual presence and impact of this area would fail to protect, conserve or enhance the landscape character and visual amenity of the site and surroundings.

When considered in totality, the proposed development would be of a poor quality of design and visual quality, where the proposal would appear as a prominent feature within the landscape. The limited visual relief and stark elevations would exaggerate the overall massing and bulk of the built form, and the proposal would fail to reflect the built character and architectural features of the wider locality.

For these reasons, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies 25, 32, and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) as well as Policy H3 of the West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan and policies DP3 of the NPPF.

Conclusion

The proposed development seeks to the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection a terrace of 5no. residential properties, which would result in the net increase of 4no. dwellings. The application site is located within the countryside in policy terms, where the development would not accord with the overarching spatial strategy and would be contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

It is recognised that the appeal site would represent previously developed land, where the development would replace the existing fire-damaged dwelling with 5no. residential dwellings. The proposed development would also contribute to an evidenced unmet housing need within the district.

The development site would not however be considered to be “physically well-related to an existing settlement”. Specifically, the appeal site is located approximately 3.3km north of the built-up area boundary of West Chiltington. The site is located on an unlit road which does not benefit from a dedicated pavement for pedestrians. There are no direct Public Rights of Way leading to the nearest built-up area, with the nearby footpaths providing limited access to West Chiltington. While the speed limit is reduced along this section of Harbolets Road, due to its unlit nature and lack of dedicated pavement, it is unlikely that walking and cycling would offer a viable or attractive option. As such, occupiers of the development would be reliant on private vehicles to serve their day-to-day needs.

To this effect, the development would be in some conflict with policy S5 of the NPPF, and would not be located to promote sustainable patterns of development as directed by policies CC2 and TR3 of the NPPF. While the proposed development would contribute to an identified housing need, the contribution of 5no. dwellings (a net increase of 4no. dwellings) to the housing supply would be modest. The benefits arising from the scheme would, when considered overall, be of moderate weight. In addition, it is likely that future occupiers would be reliant on private vehicles to access everyday services, amenities and facilities. The site is therefore considered to be located within an inappropriate and unsustainable location, contrary to the overarching spatial strategy contained within the HDPF, Policy H1 of the West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan, and the policies within the NPPF when read as a whole.

Policy S6 of the NPPF (2026) relates to neighbourhood plans and the presumption, and states that for development proposals involving the provision of housing, the benefits of approving development are likely to be substantially outweighed by the adverse effects where a proposal would conflict with a neighbourhood plan. Providing 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 allocations to meet its identified housing requirements (see Policy HO2).

West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan was made on 24 June 2026 and is therefore less than five years old. The Plan allocates two sites for residential development in order to meet its identified housing requirements. It is therefore considered that both criteria a. and b. are met. The proposed development would conflict with Policy H1 of the West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan, where the conflict is given significant weight.

Furthermore, the proposed development would be of a poor design and visual quality, failing to respond to its context, including the character and features of the site and surroundings, and would not integrate with and enhance the surroundings. As such, the proposal is considered to conflict with paragraph 1 of Policy DP3 of the NPPF, where paragraph 3 directs that development should be refused if, without clear justification, it conflicts with the relevant paragraphs of the Policy. No clear justification has been provided, and it is therefore considered that the proposed development would conflict with Policy DP3.

Subparagraph 2 of Policy S4 of the NPPF (2026) states that in applying policy S4, circumstances in which the benefits of approving development are likely to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects include (but are not restricted to) situations where the development proposal would fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances. Paragraph 3 of Policy DP3 of the NPPF (2026) states that development proposals should be refused if, without clear justification, they conflict with paragraph 1 of this policy or relevant aspects of the principles in paragraph 2.

As outlined above, the proposed development, when considered in totality, would be of a poor quality of design and visual quality, where the proposal would appear as a prominent feature within the landscape. The limited visual relief and stark elevations would exaggerate the overall massing and

bulk of the built form, and the proposal would fail to reflect the built character and architectural features of the wider locality. The development would therefore fail to comply with national decision making policy DP3 of the NPPF (2026), where it is stated that development should be refused where it conflicts with the relevant aspects of the principles contained in paragraph 2.

For these reasons, the proposed development is considered to result in adverse effects that would substantially outweigh the benefits of the proposed development when assessed against the Framework as a whole. The Council therefore remain of the view that the scheme as submitted would be contrary to the relevant policies of the Horsham District Planning Framework and NPPF. The Inspector is therefore respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal. However, should the Inspector be minded to approve the appeal, a List of Suggested Conditions is attached to this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Tamara Dale
Principal Planning Officer

List of Suggested Conditions

1 **Approved Pans**

- 2 **Standard Time Condition:** The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

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

- 3 **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until the following construction site set-up details have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

- i. the location for the loading and unloading of plant and materials, site offices, and storage of plant and materials (including any stripped topsoil)
- ii. the provision of wheel washing facilities (if necessary) and dust suppression facilities

The approved details shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.

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

- 4 **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development shall commence until a drainage strategy detailing the proposed means of foul and surface water disposal has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure that the development is properly drained and to comply with Policy 38 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 5 **Pre-Commencement Condition:** No development shall commence, including demolition pursuant to the permission granted, ground clearance, or bringing equipment, machinery or materials onto the site, until the following preliminaries have been completed in the sequence set out below:

- (a) All trees on the site shown for retention on approved drawing number 25-1966-TTP, as well as those off-site whose root protection areas ingress into the site, shall be fully protected throughout all construction works by tree protective fencing affixed to the ground in full accordance with section 6 of BS 5837 'Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations' (2012).
- (b) Once installed, the fencing shall be maintained during the course of the development works and until all machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site.
- (c) Areas so fenced off shall be treated as zones of prohibited access, and shall not be used for the storage of materials, equipment or machinery in any circumstances. No mixing of cement, concrete, or use of other materials or substances shall take place within any tree protective zone, or close enough to such a zone that seepage or displacement of those materials and substances could cause them to enter a zone.

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

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

- 6 **Pre-Commencement (Slab Level) Condition:** No development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy for Protected and Priority species has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The content of the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy shall include the following:

- (a) Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed enhancement measures;
- (b) Detailed designs to achieve stated objectives;
- (c) Locations of proposed enhancement measures by appropriate maps and plans;
- (d) Persons responsible for implementing the enhancement measures;
- (e) Details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant).

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

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

- 7 **Pre-Commencement (Slab Level) Condition:** No development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until a schedule of materials and finishes and colours to be used for external walls, windows and roofs of the approved building(s) has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing and all materials used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall conform to those approved.

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

- 8 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the parking, turning and access facilities necessary to serve that dwelling have been implemented in accordance with the approved details as shown on the approved Block Plan and shall be thereafter retained as such.

Reason: To ensure adequate parking, turning and access facilities are available to serve the development in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

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

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

- 10 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied or use hereby permitted commenced until the cycle parking facilities serving it have been provided within the

side or rear garden for that dwelling. The facilities shall thereafter be retained for use at all times. The cycle parking facilities shall thereafter be retained as such for their designated use.

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

- 11 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a fast charge electric vehicle charging point for that dwelling has been installed. As a minimum, the charge point specification shall be 7kW mode 3 with type 2 connector. The means for charging electric vehicles shall be thereafter retained as such.

Reason: To mitigate the impact of the development on air quality within the District and to sustain compliance with and contribute towards EU limit values or national objectives for pollutants in accordance with Policies 24 & 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 12 **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the necessary in-building physical infrastructure and external site-wide infrastructure to enable superfast broadband speeds of 30 megabytes per second through full fibre broadband connection has been provided to the premises.

Reason: To ensure a sustainable development that meets the needs of future occupiers in accordance with Policy 37 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

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

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