

Planning Inspectorate
c/o Neil Devereux
Appeals Case Officer
Team East 2
Planning Inspectorate

Our ref: DC/25/2126
Your ref: 6009032

Date 28th August 2026

Dear Mr. N Devereux,

Ref: NPPF 2026 comments

Your ref: 6009032

Our ref: DC/25/2126,

Address: 5 Kingsfold Close, Billingshurst, West Sussex, RH14 9HG,

Proposal: Erection of a single storey detached granny annexe together with a detached single storey multipurpose workshop and gym.

The LPA acknowledges safe receipt of the agent's comments regarding the new NPPF 2026. In respect to the above proposal, LPA highlights the key policies within the new NPPF 2026 that are relevant to the proposed development.

Design and Appearance:

The revised NPPF does have relevance to the above case file. The key policies which are material consideration to the proposed development are as follows, Policy DP3(1) of the NPPF 2026. This policy seeks to ensure 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; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets.

Furthermore, Policy DP3(2) sets out the criteria of assessment on the key principles for well-designed places where subsection (e) states that built Form: use the pattern of buildings to define the arrangement of streets, squares and other spaces, promote compact forms of development to optimise the site's potential, distinguish between public and private areas, create focal points and, where appropriate, enhance views into and out of the scheme;

Additionally, DP3(3) reinforces the fact 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, or with any explicit design standards set out in the development plan (including those in locally specific policies, guides, codes or masterplans). Substantial weight should be given to compliance with relevant development plan policies when assessing the design quality of proposals.

The above requirements are discussed within paragraph 3.5 of the LPA appeal statement which explains that 'good design involves taking account of the pattern and scale of the surrounding context and built form. This does not appear to be the case in this instance, with limited detail or justification on the rationale for the scale, form and design of the annexe outbuilding and how this has evolved. The proposed footprint and form would create a visible and incongruous contrast with both the host building and the pattern of surrounding development. This contrast would create a jarring relationship which would be harmful to the prevailing character and appearance of the site and wider surrounding area.'

The revised NPPF 2026 reinforces the concerns raised with respect to the proposed annexe outbuilding which is considered 'by reason of its scale, form and design, would represent an unsympathetic form of development which would be harmfully out of keeping with the character and appearance of the application site and wider locality, in contrary to policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Policy Bill 2 of the Billingshurst Parish Neighbourhood Plan' and moreover Policy DP3 of the revised NPPF 2026.

Tree impact:

In respect to landscape impact, Policy N2.(1)(d) aims to maintain that development proposals should conserve and enhance existing natural features of visual, historic or nature conservation value (such as established trees and hedgerows) where possible; and use appropriate landscaping to help create a well-designed place and integrate the development into its surroundings. Moreover, Policy N3(1)(c) states that development proposal should make provision for the long-term maintenance of both existing and newly-planted trees which form part of the development.

Paragraph 3.13 of the LPA appeal statement explains that 'the access and working space requirements for both builds will foreseeably spread across the rear garden areas. A tree protection condition would be recommended to require the denoted root protection areas that overlap into the garden area be fenced off from the development process.' As such, this requirement would be in compliance with the above policies of the revised NPPF 2026.

Water Neutrality:

Regarding water neutrality, paragraph 3.21 of the LPA Appeal statement and paragraph 5.1, in particular the suggested condition 4 makes reference to paragraph 193 of the NPPF 2024. This is now superseded by policy N6 of the revised NPPF 2026, which aims to ensure that development proposal support the conservation of important habitats, species and sites of geodiversity value.

I hope the above information is of assistance to you.

Yours sincerely

Halima Chowdhury
Horsham District Council, Planning Officer
Telephone: 01403 215059
Email: Halima.Chowdhury@horsham.gov.uk