



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/25/1963
1 Hilltop Cottages , The Mount, Ifield, West Sussex, RH11 0LF

DESCRIPTION:

Demolition of existing outbuilding. Erection of 1no. detached two storey self-build/custom-build dwelling with associated works.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/22/0347	Retrospective application for the change of use of barn to commercial storage (Use Class B8).	Application Refused on 12.08.2024
DC/25/1954	Removal of existing barn building and erection of 5no. detached single storey self-build/custom build dwellings with associated works.	Pending determination
DC/16/2372	Use of barn as two residential dwellings and associated works (Certificate of Lawful Development - Existing)	Refusal on 25.08.2017
DC/18/2530	Conversion of existing barn into two dwellings with associated car parking facilities	Refusal on 26.06.2019
DC/19/1962	Continued use of former agricultural building for residential purposes ancillary to the authorised use of the main dwelling (Certificate of Lawful Development - Existing)	Refusal on 05.02.2020
DC/22/0347	Retrospective application for the change of use of barn to commercial storage (Use Class B8).	Refusal on 12.08.2024

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The application site consists of part of the residential curtilage to 1 Hilltop Cottages, located to the east of the dwellinghouse and comprising a corner plot. The application site is not located within any defined built up area and is therefore considered to be located in the countryside in policy terms.

The site is located approximately 2.2km to the east of the closest built-up area boundary of Rusper. The site is also located approximately 2km away from the built-up area of Crawley Borough Council. There is a Grade II listed building known as The Mount Farm located to south west. To the east of the site is a kennel buildings and there is a barn to the south of the site.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The application seeks permission for the subdivision of a residential plot of a property known as 1 Hilltop Cottages, to erect a detached dwellinghouse with three bedrooms. The plans indicate a detached bike and bin store, two parking spaces within an existing area of hardstanding. The dwellinghouse would have a half hipped appearance with hanging tiles, black horizontal

weatherboarding and red brick plinth. The approximate dimensions of the dwellinghouse would be a width of 8 metres, a ridge height of 7 metres, an eaves height of 3.2 metres and depth of 10.75 metres.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):

Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development
Policy 2 - Strategic Policy: Strategic Development
Policy 3 - Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy
Policy 7 - Strategic Policy: Economic Growth
Policy 9 - Employment Development
Policy 10 - Rural Economic Development
Policy 15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision
Policy 16 - Strategic Policy: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection
Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles
Policy 34 - Cultural and Heritage Assets
Policy 35 - Strategic Policy: Climate Change
Policy 36 - Strategic Policy: Appropriate Energy Use
Policy 37 - Sustainable Construction
Policy 38 - Strategic Policy: Flooding
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 – Parking

Rusper Neighbourhood plan 2018-2031

Policy RUS1: Spatial Plan
Policy RUS3: Design
Policy RUS4: Local Heritage Assets
Policy RUS6: Walking, Cycling and Equestrian Routes

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

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

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

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

Strategic Policy 1: Sustainable Development
Strategic Policy 2: Development Hierarchy
Strategic Policy 3: Settlement Expansion
Strategic Policy 6: Climate Change

Strategic Policy 7: Appropriate Energy Use
Strategic Policy 8: Sustainable Design and Construction
Strategic Policy 9: Water Neutrality
Strategic Policy 11: Environmental Protection
Strategic Policy 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Strategic Policy 14: Countryside Protection
Strategic Policy 15: Settlement Coalescence
Strategic Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Strategic Policy 19: Development Quality
Strategic Policy 20: Development Principles
Strategic Policy 23: Infrastructure Provision
Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport
Policy 25: Parking
Strategic Policy 37: Housing Provision
Strategic Policy 38: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Policy 39: Affordable Housing
Policy 40: Improving Housing Standards in the District

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

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

Planning Advice Notes:

Facilitating Appropriate Development
Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS RESPONSES

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

Consultations:

Naturespace:

No objection subject to the application including conditions for the Naturespace certificate, with verbatim wording and informatives.

Environmental Health Officer: Objection

The noise report does not consider the impacts of the increased aircraft activity and aviation noise following the approval of the Development Consent Order for the Northern Runway Project at Gatwick Airport.

The development site is projected to fall within the outer noise insulation zone from 2032 and therefore further information is required on the insulation of the dwelling against aircraft noise and the mitigation of overheating risks.

WSCC Highways: No Objection

The proposal would use the existing access point from The Mount, with no visibility issues identified, and a single new dwelling is not expected to significantly increase traffic on the local road network. Two parking spaces are proposed for the new dwelling, which is considered adequate, while sufficient parking will remain for the existing dwelling. On-site turning space would allow vehicles to leave in a forward gear.

The site is in a rural area with limited access to services and amenities, and the surrounding roads are unlit and without footways. As a result, residents are likely to rely mainly on private cars, although cycling may be suitable for confident cyclists, with secure cycle parking included in the proposal

Place Services Ecology: Objection

The Preliminary Ecological Assessment was reviewed and it is questioned why no further surveys are recommended to provide sufficient information in respect to the bat droppings found in building 1. Without this information, it is unknown if the work would impact on protected species.

This information is necessary because the presence of protected species is a material planning consideration, and the Local Planning Authority must be certain about ecological impacts before granting permission. The extra information will allow the authority to meet its legal and biodiversity duties under national policy and legislation.

Southern Water: Comment

Insufficient information provided for foul drainage. Southern water have guidance on tree planting where there should be a distance away from southern water mains.

HDC Landscape architect: No Objection subject to conditions

There would be a small incremental change that would erode the rural character of the area due to urbanising features and external lighting, however as the site is currently residential in nature, it would not be unexpected to have a house in this location.

Conservation officer: No Objection subject to conditions

The proposed dwelling will be placed within the setting of The Mount Farm, a Grade II listed farmhouse and associated historic agricultural buildings. This setting has changed over time and together with the conversion of the historic farm buildings has diluted but not erased the historic character of the setting. A pair of semi-detached properties built in the mid-twentieth century are placed between the listed former farmhouse and the development site. Satisfied there will be little, if any, intervisibility and the proposed dwelling will not appear as an unexpected dwelling in this location.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:

Representations:

Seven letters of Objection from six addresses on the following grounds:

- Highways safety concern
- Private lane and traffic, damage to soft verges
- Overdevelopment
- Contrary to neighbourhood plan
- No details of drainage
- No details of flooding
- Design concerns as the development does not reflect the locality
- Given that there is another development proposed for 5 dwellings to the immediate rear of the site, the cumulative impact would be a loss of character.
- Amenity concerns
- Extensive enforcement issues within the applicant's ownership
- Noise impact assessment is not reflective of the site situation
- Harm to wildlife
-

Parish Comments: Objection

The Council objects on the grounds that the development requires its own drainage and sewage provision, and the proposed two-storey design is not in keeping with the character of the area. The Council requests that careful consideration be given to the principle, scale, design, and impact on the local environment. Attention should also be paid to highway safety, neighbouring amenity, and drainage arrangements. If permission is granted, appropriate conditions should ensure separate drainage provision and address these concerns.

Member Comments:

None received

HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUALITY:

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

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

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

Background:

There is extensive enforcement history and planning history for the land to the rear of the application site, with the planning history of the site indicating that the land is within the same ownership and that some of the history relates to both 1 Hilltop Cottages and to the land to the south containing a barn and field. It is acknowledged that there is currently an application for consideration under DC/25/1954 for 5 dwellings.

Principle of Development:

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

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 outlines that the expansion of settlements outside the built-up area are supported where the site is allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan and adjoins an existing settlement edge; the level of expansion is appropriate to the scale and function of the settlement type; the development is demonstrated to meet the identified local housing needs; the impact of development individually or cumulatively does not prejudice comprehensive long term development; and the development is contained within an existing defensible boundary and the landscape and townscape character features are maintained and enhanced. The HDPF outlines that the proposed settlement hierarchy is the most sustainable approach to delivering housing; with new development focused in the larger settlements of Horsham, Southwater and Billingshurst; with limited new development elsewhere, only where it accords with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy 26 of the HDPF only permits development in the countryside where such a location is essential, and the proposal meets one of four criteria. These are that it either supports the needs of agriculture or forestry; enables the extraction of minerals or the disposal of waste; provides for quiet informal recreational use; or enables the sustainable development of rural areas.

Emerging Strategic Policy 2 of the draft Horsham District Local Plan (HDLP) promotes a similar development hierarchy within the defined BUAB as in Policy 3 of the HDPF. Therefore, as the proposal is located outside the defined BUAB this proposal does not accord with Emerging Strategic Policy 2. Emerging Strategic Policy 3 of the HDLP supports the expansion of existing settlements to meet identified local housing needs where all the criteria detailed within the policy is met. This includes the

site being either allocated in the Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan and adjoining the existing settlement edge.

Policy RUS1: Spatial plan in the Rusper Parish neighbourhood plan defines the built up area boundary of Rusper, which supports policy 4 of the HDPF.

In this countryside location, the proposal is also considered against Policy 26 which seeks to protect the countryside against inappropriate development unless it is considered essential and appropriate in scale; whilst also meeting one of four criteria. These criteria include: supporting the needs of agriculture or forestry; enabling the extraction of minerals or the disposal of waste; providing for quiet informal recreational use; or enabling the sustainable development of rural areas. The proposal would not meet any of the exceptions set out in policy 26 of the HDPF.

The proposed development would not accord with the spatial strategy as expressed through Policies 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the HDPF. The proposal would also not meet any of the criteria contained within Policy 26 of the HDPF. The development would therefore be unacceptable in principle. Whether there are any material considerations or benefits arising from the development that would weigh in favour of the proposal will be considered in the Planning Balance and Conclusions section below.

Design and Appearance:

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

Policy 34 of the HDPF seeks to sustain and enhance the historic environment through the positive management of development affecting heritage assets. Development will be required to preserve and enhance the special character of heritage assets through appropriate siting, scale, form, design, materials and techniques. Development proposals must be designed to preserve a clear appreciation, and the legibility, of distinctive vernaculars, features and fabrics, whilst appropriate assessment should be undertaken to inform an understanding of the significance of the heritage asset.

Policy RU3 of the Rusper Neighbourhood Plan states that proposals for new development must be of the highest design standards and will be required to reflect the character and scale of surrounding buildings. Proposals should satisfactorily take into account, among other things, the significance of any heritage assets and their settings and how the proposal will sustain and enhance that significance, and the retention of key views out to the countryside.

Strategic Policy 19: Development Quality of the emerging local plan holds limited weight. The policy aims to achieve High-quality and inclusive design for all development in the District will be required based on a clear understanding of the local, physical, social, economic, environmental and policy context.

The character of the area is rural and verdant, with limited buildings to the rear of the residential development along the street – with much of the buildings in the locality consisting of agricultural buildings, equestrian use, and small rural enterprise which would not be unexpected in this location. The site's wider setting is predominantly rural and agricultural in character on account of the surrounding, undeveloped fields and agricultural features, including the presence of farm buildings, which are reflective of the locality and contribute to its rural qualities. There is a predominance of undeveloped, agricultural fields of irregular pattern, defined by hedgerow and shaws, as well as areas of woodland some of it Ancient Woodland (AW) predominantly to the north.

The HDC Landscape Architect has been consulted as part of the application and has raised some concern that the development would erode the character of the area, but nevertheless note that the character of the area has already been partly eroded and the landscape impacts of the proposal would

not be harmful. It is considered that this consultation response is tantamount to a no objection comment subject to conditions being required in respect of hard and soft landscaping details being submitted.

The small residential outbuildings within the application site are incidental to the host dwellinghouse and are small scale compared to what is proposed. The design of the proposed dwelling would be in excess of the outbuildings in this location. It is therefore considered that the proposal would contribute to a small incremental change that would further erode the rural character of the area as result of the additional urbanising features and external lighting. However, given the domestic nature of the site, and the relationship of the proposal with the existing pair of semi-detached dwellings and associated building, it is not considered that this impact would be significantly harmful. Whilst there would be some erosion of rural character due to increased residential built form, the development would not be at odds with the character of the area, where the proposal would reflect the residential development in the locality which consists of individually designed detached and semi-detached dwellings in various rural styles.

The HDC Conservation Officer has been consulted as part of the application. The proposed dwelling will be placed within the setting of The Mount Farm, a Grade II listed farmhouse and associated historic agricultural buildings. The character of the setting has been eroded over time and there would be little intervisibility between the proposed dwelling and the Grade II listed property. It is not therefore considered that the proposal would result in harm to the significance and setting of the designated heritage asset.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would not be out of character with the surrounding locality, in accordance with Policies 32, 33 and 34 of the HDPF.

Residential Amenity:

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

The dwellinghouse would have an internal footprint of approximately 116sqm and would be in accordance with Nationally described space standards for a dwellinghouse of this size, with a suitable provision of storage space within the dwellinghouse. There is sufficient space between the proposed and existing dwelling to prevent poor access to daylight or loss of privacy, although it is considered there would be a certain amount of mutual overlooking between the amenity spaces of the proposed dwelling and the existing dwellinghouse.

It is acknowledged that the future occupiers would be in close proximity to commercial premises and venues which would be at risk of causing potential noise disturbance. Environmental Health have been consulted as part of the application and have made an objection. The Environmental Health team consider that the noise report does not consider the impacts of the increased aircraft activity and aviation noise following the approval of the Development Consent Order for the Northern Runway Project at Gatwick Airport. This would warrant further information being submitted to support the application, with the site falling into the outer noise insulation zone from 2032. Further information is required on the insulation of the dwelling against aircraft noise and the mitigation of overheating risks.

It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the occupiers of the proposed development would not be adversely affected by aircraft noise. Due to the siting of the proposed development there is therefore the potential to result in a poor quality living environment, contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Highways Impacts:

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

Policy RUS6: Walking, Cycling and Equestrian Routes states that “Development proposals will be supported, provided that, where appropriate to their location they maintain the functionality of bridleways and footpaths, the layout and access arrangements of a scheme allow for an avoidance or minimisation of the loss of mature trees and hedgerows and access to the parish can be achieved by walking, cycling and riding.

The applicant has demonstrated two parking spaces to the rear of the proposed dwellinghouse which is sufficient for a dwelling of this size. The Local Highways Authority have been consulted as part of the proposal and have raised no objection to the application subject to the inclusion of relevant conditions.

Additionally, it is noted that the application would not give rise to a material intensification of the access and on site turning appears achievable. There are no objections to the proposal in light of policies 40 and 41 of the HDPF.

Ecology:

Policy 31 of the HDPF states that development will be supported where it demonstrates that it maintains or enhances the existing network of green infrastructure. Development proposals will be required to contribute to the enhancement of existing biodiversity, and should create and manage new habitats where appropriate.

Naturespace have been consulted during the course of the application, with the applicant having received their license prior to determination. Naturespace have commented that subject to the inclusion of conditions relating to the NatureSpace license, there would be no objections to the proposal.

The Council's Ecology Consultant has objected to the application on the basis of the information submitted being insufficient to conclude with certainty that the development would not give rise to harm to protected species. The Ecology Consultant objects on the basis that the Preliminary Ecological impact Assessment indicates that Building 1 contained evidence of bat droppings within the roof space. The Ecology Consultant considers that further surveys are necessary to demonstrate that there would be no adverse harm to protected species.

The applicant has clarified that Building 1 is the existing dwellinghouse known as 1 Hilltop Cottages, which would not in itself be subject to alteration as part of the proposal. Furthermore, the nature of the findings themselves suggested that the loft space was not being used as a roost at the time of the survey. As such, whilst the officer notes the concerns of Place services, it is considered that the EPSL license recommended to be sought through condition would be sufficient to conclude that there would be no harm to protected species.

Water Neutrality:

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

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

To ensure development can come forward as water neutral in the meantime, the Council has agreed with Natural England to use the significant water savings made by Southern Water in 2024/25 through their programme of leakage reduction (amongst other measures). This has generated some 3,240,000 litres per day of water savings that can now be attributed to new development without increasing water

abstraction in the Arun Valley beyond baseline. These savings were previously to be used to launch the Sussex North Water Certification Scheme (SNWCS), however following the withdrawal statement SNWCS will no longer be launching. Natural England standing advice dated 10 November 2025 raises no objection to using these savings to enable development to come forward. The standing advice clarifies that it functions as Natural England's formal response pursuant to Regulation 63(3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 to all relevant planning applications which seek to achieve water neutrality using the above Southern Water savings.

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

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

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG):

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

The Applicant has not submitted a biodiversity net gain matrix given that the application would form an exemption to the requirements as a self-build residential dwelling.

Conclusions:

Planning permission is sought for the erection of one detached three bedroom dwelling within the curtilage of an existing dwelling known as 1 Hilltop Cottages. As the site is not allocated for development with the HDPF or a made neighbourhood plan, owing to the site's location outside of the built-up area boundary, the principle of the development is resisted under Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework, and paragraphs 2, 11, 12 and 47 of the NPPF.

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

However, it is acknowledged that the Council does not currently benefit from a 5-year housing land supply. Therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development at paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged in this instance.

NPPF paragraph 11(d)(i) states that where there are no relevant development plan policies in place, the policies that are considered most important for the determination of applications (in this case, Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the HDPF, owing to the lack of a five-year housing land supply) permission should be granted unless there is a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Policies 2, 4 and 26 are considered out of date and as determined by recent appeal inspectors now carry only moderate weight in decision-making. In order to support decision-making within this context, the Council have published a Planning Advice Note titled "Shaping Development in Horsham District"

which recognises that given the 5-year housing land position and the principles behind Policy 4 of the HDPF, applications that meet all of the following criteria will be supported:

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

The application would not meet the above criteria, and the proposed development would not be in full accordance with the requirements of the guidance within the Shaping Development in Horsham District. While the proposed dwelling would contribute to the identified housing land supply, the benefits of the single dwelling would be modest. The application site remains remote from day to day services, located at a distance from the nearest amenities and facilities, where the site has limited accessibility other than by private vehicle. It is therefore considered that the application site is an inappropriate location for housing when considering the spatial strategy, and would be in conflict with the above policies.

The site does not form previously developed land, and while the proposal would provide a self-build dwelling, it is not considered that this would result in such benefit to outweigh the harm as identified.

The proposed development has also not demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the occupiers of the proposed development would not be adversely affected by aircraft noise. Due to the siting of the proposed development there is therefore the potential to result in a poor quality living environment, contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

The benefits afforded to the provision of one market dwellinghouse in the context of a shortfall are acknowledged, however this would not be outweighed by the adverse impacts arising from the development, including the conflict with the development plan in regards to location and principle of development, and the harm arising to future occupiers. The harm arising from the development is not considered to be outweighed by the modest benefits of the single residential dwelling, and the application is therefore recommended for refusal.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

Horsham District Council has adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule which took effect on 1st October 2017.

It is considered that this development constitutes CIL liable development.

Use Description	Proposed	Existing	Net Gain
District wide Zone 1			116.29sqm
	Total Gain		116.29 sqm
	Total Demolition		

Please note that the above figures will be reviewed by the CIL Team prior to issuing a CIL Liability Notice and may therefore change.

Exemptions and/or reliefs may be applied for up until the commencement of a chargeable development.

In the event that planning permission is granted, a CIL Liability Notice will be issued thereafter. CIL payments are payable on commencement of development.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

- 1 The proposed development would be sited within an unsustainable location in the countryside, outside of a defined built-up area boundary, and on a site not allocated for housing development within the Horsham District Planning Framework, or a made Neighbourhood Plan. Furthermore, the proposed development is not essential to its countryside location, nor necessary for the function and needs of the business. 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 in this instance which would outweigh harm arising from conflict with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 20 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
- 2 It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the occupiers of the proposed development would not be adversely affected by aircraft noise. Due to the siting of the proposed development there is therefore the potential to result in a poor quality living environment, contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

POSITIVE AND PROACTIVE STATEMENT

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

Plans list for: DC/25/1963

(The approved plans will form Condition 1 on the Decision Notice of all Permitted applications)

Schedule of plans/documents not approved:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Supporting Statement	Planning statement	NONE	18.12.2025
Supporting Statement	Noise Impact Assessment	NONE	28.11.2025
Supporting Statement	Great crested newt survey	NONE	28.11.2025
Supporting Statement	Preliminary ecological appraisal and roost appraisal	NONE	28.11.2025
Location plan		000	28.11.2025
Block plan	Existing and tree survey	001	28.11.2025
Block plan	Proposed	100	28.11.2025
Elevation & Floor plan	Ground and first floor and bike shed floor and elevations	200	28.11.2025
Elevation plan	West, south, east, north	201	28.11.2025

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Hannah Darley Date: 12th February 2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial Tamara Dale Date: 12.02.2026