



TO: Planning Committee (North)
BY: Head of Development
DATE: 07 January 2020
DEVELOPMENT: Replacement of existing buildings with a two storey dwelling.
SITE: Millfield Barn Horsham Road Rowhook Horsham West Sussex RH12 3PZ
WARD: Rudgwick
APPLICATION: DC/19/1623
APPLICANT: **Name:** Jan Abbey and Kim Parsons Abbey & Parsons **Address:** Bines Farm Barn Bines Road Partridge Green RH13 8EO

REASON FOR INCLUSION ON THE AGENDA: More than 8 persons in different households have made written representation raising material planning considerations that are inconsistent with the recommendation of the Head of Development.

At the request of the Local Ward Member.

RECOMMENDATION: To refuse planning permission.

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

1.1 To consider the planning application.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

- 1.2 Full planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing building on site and the erection of a two-storey dwellinghouse. The proposed dwellinghouse would be served by an existing access point from Horsham Road to the east and would be designed in an 'L' shaped configuration over a part two-storey part single storey design. The proposed dwelling would include a sitting room, dining room, kitchen, utility room, bathroom, study, workshop and a double garage at ground floor level and 3no bedrooms and 2no bathrooms at first floor level.
- 1.3 The proposed dwellinghouse would have an overall length of approximately 24.5m when measured from north to south and an overall width of approximately 20.1m. The proposed would have an overall maximum height to the ridge of approximately 8.69m. The proposed dwelling would be of a barn conversion style design with large glazed areas to the eastern and western elevations.

- 1.4 As part of the proposals, hard and soft landscaping would be incorporated into the development of the site. The proposed GIA to be created would measure approximately 327sqm. The existing building to be demolished has a GIA of approximately 429sqm.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

- 1.5 The application site comprises a fairly modest plot, formerly part of the Millfield estate and comprises a fairly modern building that was originally constructed for agricultural purposes. The structure is set in a scattered group of buildings that lie in open countryside to the north-west of the village of Rowhook. Access is via a narrow track that runs westwards from the main road that passes through the village
- 1.6 The building is some distance from the nearest neighbouring residential property and is partly screened by trees and bushes. Notwithstanding that, the narrow access track passes close to a dwelling known as Little Millfields. A Public Right of Way (PROW) runs approximately north - south immediately east of the site.
- 1.7 It is noted that the site/building has a historic planning permission for use under uses class B8 storage and B1 office/light industrial, granted under planning reference DC/13/0468 in 2017. From a case officer site visit in September 2019, it was evident that this permission had not been implemented and the site was not in use.

2. INTRODUCTION

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

- 2.2 The following Policies are considered to be relevant to the assessment of this application:

2.3 **National Planning Policy Framework**

2.4 **Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF 2015)**

Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development.

Policy 2 - Strategic Policy: Strategic Development.

Policy 3 - Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy.

Policy 4 - Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion.

Policy 15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision.

Policy 16 - Strategic Policy: Meeting Local Housing Needs.

Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character.

Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection.

Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development.

Policy 33 - Development Principles.

Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport.

Policy 41 - Parking.

RELEVANT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

- 2.5 Status – Rudgwick Parish has been designated as a Neighbourhood Development Area as of June 2016.

- 2.7 Parish Design Statement:

Rudgwick Parish Design Statement

2.8 PLANNING HISTORY AND RELEVANT APPLICATIONS

RW/27/72	Extension to provide hay and storage, implement shed and covered grain tipping pit Comment: Br only barn to the n-e of millfield house (From old Planning History)	Application Permitted on 01.05.1972
RW/91/87	Change of use from agricultural to storage of furniture and household effects (barn to the n-e of millfield house) Comment: Enf.550 allowed on appeal 25/11/88 (1197-3467) (From old Planning History)	Application Refused on 22.01.1988
RW/9/02	Conversion of building into 3 storage/warehouse units Site: Millfield Barn Rowhook	Application Permitted on 24.05.2002
DC/13/0468	Extension of use from a restricted B8 (Storage or distribution use) to an unrestricted B8 use and B1 (Business) use	Application Permitted on 29.11.2017

3. OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1 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

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

- 3.2 **WSCC Highways:** No objection. The LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 109), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.
- 3.3 **Southern Water:** Comment. The applicant has not stated details of means of disposal of foul drainage from the site. There is no public foul sewer in the vicinity of the site. The applicant is advised to examine alternative means of foul sewage disposal. The Environment Agency should be consulted directly regarding the use of a private wastewater treatment works or septic tank drainage which disposes of effluent to sub-soil irrigation. The owner of the premises will need to empty and maintain the works or septic tank to ensure its long term effectiveness
- 3.4 **Ecology:** No objection. We have reviewed the Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) (Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology, 2018). Information regarding designated sites, protected and Priority habitats and species is considered sufficient for determination. This provides certainty of likely impacts on Protected species and, with appropriate mitigation measures secured, the development can be made acceptable. We support the reasonable biodiversity enhancements that should also be secured by a condition on any consent to deliver measurable net gain. This is needed to enable the LPA to demonstrate its compliance with its statutory duties including its biodiversity duty under s40 NERC Act 2006. Impacts will be minimised such that the proposal is acceptable subject to the conditions below based on BS42020:2013. In terms of biodiversity net gain, the enhancements proposed will contribute to this aim. Conditions recommended.

3.5 **WSSC Rights of Way: Comment.** The applicant is advised that a public access right has precedence over a private access right. Where a PROW runs along a route also used for private access purposes, usually for private vehicle access, this shared use has the potential for accident or injury – the applicant must consider how access is managed so the public is not endangered or inconvenienced. The development proposes shared use of a PROW with vehicles and a vehicular crossing point of a PROW, which increases the risk of accident or injury to a PROW user. The applicant is encouraged to introduce signage to advise vehicle drivers of the hazard and to act responsibly.

3.6 **Archaeology: Recommended Approval subject to conditions.** The proposed development is located directly on the projected line of the Roman road from Rowhook to Winterford Heath, Surrey. It is within the Archaeological Notification Area DWS8525 Mesolithic and Neolithic Flint Working Site and a section of the Winterford Heath Roman Road, Rudgewick. The area contains a concentration of Mesolithic and Neolithic flint scatters, comprising microliths, micro-burins, cores and axes was found in a field NW of Rowhook. The Roman road from Rowhook to Winterford Heath (Surrey) crosses the ANA, it was built on a single alignment. The Farr Millford area has been identified as a Medieval farmstead by the HLC assessment.

Archaeological deposits are both fragile and finite and the following condition is therefore placed on the application in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

- I) No development shall take place until a programme of archaeological work has been secured in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- II) The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until the archaeological site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition [i] and that provision for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing.

Reason: This matter is fundamental as the site is of archaeological significance and it is important that it is recorded by excavation before it is destroyed by development in accordance with Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

PARISH COUNCIL

3.7 **Parish Council Consultation: No objection** on the condition that the impact on the environment of the house and its curtilage is mitigated.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

3.8 **Rudgewick Preservation Society:** No objection

3.9 13 letters of support were received from 13 separate households. The nature of these supporting letters can be summarised as follows:

- The existing building is unsightly
- The new dwelling would improve the site and setting.
- The proposal will reduce vehicular movements
- Design is considered to be appropriate for this location

3.10 3 letters of objection were received from 3 separate households. The nature of these objections can be summarised as follows:

- The residential development is not appropriate for the countryside

- The removal of the existing structure would have a negative impact on the character of the area
- Drainage concerns
- Impact on neighbouring amenity
- Increase in vehicular movements
- Impact on wildlife and biodiversity
- Impact on archaeological site

3.11 1 letter neither supporting or objecting to the application was also received.

MEMBER COMMENTS

3.12 Councillor Landeryou: Support.

4. HOW THE PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION WILL PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS

4.1 Article 8 (Right to respect of a Private and Family Life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to this application, Consideration of Human rights forms part of the planning assessment below.

5. HOW THE PROPOSAL WILL HELP TO REDUCE CRIME AND DISORDER

5.1 It is not considered that the development would be likely to have any significant impact on crime and disorder.

6. PLANNING ASSESSMENTS

6.1 The main issues are the principle of the development in the location and the effect of the development on:

- The character of the development and the visual amenities of the street scene.
- The amenities of the occupiers of adjoining properties.
- Highways impact and other material considerations.

Principle of development

6.2 The application site lies in the countryside outside of the defined built-up area of any settlement. Given this location, the initial principle of the proposal needs to be considered in the context of Paragraph 79 of the NPPF and policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF).

6.3 Paragraph 79 of the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas and advises that new isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided unless there are special circumstances. On the basis of the available information, it is not apparent that the schemes architectural quality would be sufficient to significantly enhance its immediate setting, and the proposed dwelling, by virtue of its design, size and positioning, would be a clearly noticeable feature in the landscape, which currently benefits from an open feel and undeveloped nature. It is not therefore considered that the proposal could be regarded as a special circumstance under Paragraph 79 of the NPPF that would allow the construction of an isolated dwelling in the countryside to be supported.

6.4 Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF set out that development will be permitted within the towns and larger villages in the District which have defined built up areas, and outside of these areas, the expansion of settlements will be limited to those sites that are, amongst other criteria adjoining a settlement edge and allocated in either the local plan or a neighbourhood plan. Policy 26 of the HDPF states that the rural character and undeveloped nature of the

countryside will be protected against inappropriate development, and that any proposal must be essential to its countryside location. The application site is located within the countryside, outside of any defined settlement, and is not allocated for residential development within the HDPF or a 'made' Neighbourhood Plan (no current Neighbourhood Plan covering Rudgwick Parish). The proposal for the construction of a new dwelling in this location does not therefore meet the aims of these policies.

- 6.5 The site is situated outside of any of the defined settlement as categorised under Policy 3 of the HDPF. The principle of the proposed development outside of any defined built-up area boundary is contrary to the overarching spatial strategy and principles of the NPPF and HDPF. As the site lies outside of any defined built up area, it is therefore considered to be within a countryside location in policy terms. In this countryside location, the site is required to be considered against Policy 26 of the HDPF which seeks to protect the countryside against inappropriate development unless it is considered essential and appropriate in scale, whilst in addition meeting one of the following criteria: support the needs of agriculture or forestry; enable the extraction of minerals or the disposal of waste; provide for quiet informal recreational use; or enable the sustainable development of rural areas. The proposed development does not meet any of the criteria set out in the policy, nor is it considered to be essential to its countryside location.
- 6.6 The application site is located approximately 2.4km away (as the crow flies) from the closest built up area boundary of Rudgwick located to the west. As such, it is considered that there is a clear separation and a significant difference in character when comparing the application site and its immediate surrounds, which is considered to be very rural in nature, with the closest built up area of Rudgwick. The application site would not be well related to the defined settlement of Rudgwick or the District centre of Horsham to the south-east, with future occupiers of the dwelling likely to be highly dependent on the use of private vehicle in order to access services and facilities.
- 6.7 Recent appeals decisions have backed up this approach where sites outside of built up area boundaries, particularly in rural locations such as this, have been considered to be contrary to the locational strategy policies of the HDPF and result in an unsustainable form of development. In addition, the Council can demonstrate a full 5-year housing land supply against the required number of dwellings per annum, which will be corroborated by the Annual Monitoring Review (AMR) to be produced by the end of December.
- 6.8 It is considered that the scheme would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchical approach of concentrating development within the main settlements as set out in the HDPF. The proposal for a new dwelling on the site is not considered to be essential to its countryside location and consequently represents an inappropriate, unsustainable and unacceptable form of development in this location. Additionally, the site has not been allocated for housing within a 'made' Neighbourhood Plan and has therefore, at present not been deemed to be appropriate for housing at a local level.
- 6.9 It is noted that the supporting information provided purports that a potential fall-back position exists as the existing building/structure to be removed could benefit from permitted development rights for conversion to residential under Classes P/PA of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order (GPDO). Class P relates to conversions of storage buildings to dwellings (Use Class B8 to C3) and Class PA relates to conversions of light industrial buildings (Use Class B1 to C3). In order to benefit from permitted development rights, the building/proposal would need to meet a number of criteria.
- 6.10 As detailed above, the most recent Planning decision for the site granted planning permission for the use of the building for B8 and B1 purposes in 2017. Whilst this permission allowed for the building to be used freely within the parameters of these uses, there was a restrictive

condition attached prohibiting changes to other uses. The condition attached reads as follows –

Regulatory Condition: *Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order amending or revoking and/or re-enacting that Order), the premises hereby permitted shall be used for B1 and B8 purposes only; and for no other purposes whatsoever, (including steel stockholding, or those falling within any other class; as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) without express planning consent from the Local Planning Authority first being obtained.*

Reason: *Changes of use as permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order or Use Classes Order 1987 are not considered appropriate in this case due to (insert with reasons) under Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).*

- 6.11 It is further noted that a previous application, allowing restricted B8 storage use of the building, also included a condition which prohibited changes of use outlined within the provisions of the GPDO. The Town (GPDO) states at paragraph 3(4) “Nothing in this Order permits development contrary to any condition imposed by any planning permission granted or deemed to be granted under Part 3 of the Act otherwise than by this Order”. A change of use to residential (Use Class C3) would constitute a breach of the planning conditions in place. As detailed above, the GPDO does not permit such a change of use where it is contrary to a planning condition. On this basis, it is considered that the existing building would not benefit from a Prior Approval Fall-Back.
- 6.12 Further to this, it is noted that the PD provisions under Class P of the GPDO ceased in June 2019. In addition, looking over previous site photos and taking into account a case officer visit from September 2019, officers are of the opinion that the building on site is in the same condition at the time of the previous site visit in 2017 and that the permission granted under planning reference DC/13/0468 has not been implemented. Given this situation, it is also considered that the building would not benefit from PD rights under Class PA of the GPDO.
- 6.13 For the reasons set out, it is considered that the proposed development would not accord with the core principles of sustainable development, contrary to policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 15 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework. It is also considered that the proposed development would not be of such exceptional quality or innovative design as to meet the tests of Paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework. It has also been determined that the purported fall-back position to allow for the building to be converted to residential, therefore establishing the principle of this use on site, does not exist as planning conditions in place and the current situation on site do not allow for this.
- 6.14 It is therefore recommended that the application is refused on the grounds that the proposed dwelling is located in the countryside, outside of any defined built-up area boundary, on a site not allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework, or an adopted neighbourhood plan. Therefore, the proposal represents unsustainable development contrary to policies 1, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and guidance within the NPPF.

Character and appearance of the proposal and visual amenities of the street scene

- 6.15 Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states that – ‘Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.’

- 6.16 Policy 32 of the HDPF requires high quality design that complements the locally distinctive character of the district and contributes a sense of place in the way they integrate with their surroundings. Policy 33 of the HDPF sets out the Council's development principles in order to conserve and enhance the natural and built environment. The policy, amongst other criteria, requires proposals to ensure that the scale, massing and appearance of the development is of a high standard of design and layout and where relevant relates sympathetically with the built surroundings, landscape, open spaces and routes within and adjoining the site, including any impact on the skyline and important views and be locally distinctive in character and respect the character of the surrounding area.
- 6.17 The proposed dwelling would consist of brickwork, Horsham Stone and timber cladding to the external walls, natural roof tiles and timber framed fenestration. The proposed dwellinghouse would be designed in an 'L' shaped configuration and would incorporate a pitched roof design, mimicking a barn conversion style dwelling. Given the size and footprint of the existing building to be removed, it is considered that the proposed dwelling would be appropriately a sympathetically designed, scaled and sited within the plot, allowing for appropriate outdoor amenity space.
- 6.18 The overall proposals with regards to the design and scale of the dwelling and the resultant curtilage, would be in keeping with the existing residential properties within the vicinity. Looking within the wider street scene, it is noted that there is a Public Right of Way (PROW) located directly to the east of the site and the proposed dwelling would be visible from this vantage point. Whilst visible from this perspective, the proposed dwelling is considered to be of an appropriate design and would relate appropriately when viewed against existing development within the immediate area.
- 6.19 Overall, it is considered that the proposal as submitted would result in a sympathetic and appropriate addition to the site and would be in keeping with the character the countryside location in design terms. Although the agricultural appearance of the existing building is not inappropriate in this countryside setting, on balance, the proposals are considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and Policies 25, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) in this regard.
- 6.20 Notwithstanding the suitability of the proposed design of the dwelling, this consideration would ultimately be outweighed by the conflict with the development plan with regards to the principle of development in the countryside as detailed in the section above.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

- 6.21 Policy 33 of the HDPF states that development should consider the scale, massing and orientation between buildings, respecting the amenities and sensitivities of neighbouring properties. Given the relationship of the proposed dwelling with neighbouring properties and the distances maintained, it is considered that the proposals would not have a detrimental on the amenities of neighbouring properties, in accordance with Policy 33 of the HDPF (2015).

Quality of the resulting environment for future occupiers

- 6.22 It is considered that the proposed development would provide adequate indoor and outdoor living space for future occupants. Suitable distances would be preserved to neighbouring development to ensure that there would not be any harmful overlooking and other properties would not appear as overbearing on the proposed dwelling. As such, it is considered that there would be an appropriate quality level of environment for the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling in accordance with Policy 33 of the HDPF (2015).

Parking, transport and highways implications

- 6.23 Policies 40 and 41 of the HDPF states that development should provide safe and adequate access and parking, suitable for all users. The proposed dwelling would be served by an existing access point from the access leading which leads from Horsham Road to the east. 2no garage spaces as well as a hardstanding area would be incorporated into the design allowing for on-site parking. The parking provision proposed would be in-line with WSCC Parking Standards 2019 in this rural location. Following consultation with WSCC Highways, who raised no objection to the proposal on highways or parking grounds, it is considered that the proposal would be acceptable in this regard, and therefore accord with policies 40 and 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
- 6.24 Notwithstanding the above, the application site is located within a rural location outside of any built up area boundaries. Due to the location, the proposals present limited opportunities to promote walking, cycling or public transport in accordance with the transport policies of the NPPF and HDPF. As such, any future occupants of the dwelling would be heavily reliant on the private car for transportation to and from the site. It is therefore considered that the site is an unsustainable location for new housing provision and would not be acceptable in this regard.
- 6.25 It is also noted that a number of representations have been received in support of the development on the grounds that a residential use would result in less trip activity to and from the site compared to the current/extant use. Whilst this has also been suggested within the comments provided by WSCC Highways, it is not considered that this potential benefit would outweigh the overall principle objection to the development. Vehicle movements associated with a countryside use are acceptable in the countryside. In any event this does not weigh against the overall principal objection to a new residential use in the open countryside.

Other Considerations

Ecology

- 6.26 Policy 31 of the HDPF states that proposals will be required to contribute to the enhancement of existing biodiversity, and should create and manage new habitats where appropriate. The Council will support new development which retains and/or enhances significant features of nature conservation on development sites. An Ecological Impact Assessment has been provided with this application which identifies that whilst the site is considered to be of low ecological value. The Council's ecology consultant has not raised any objections to the proposals and suitable conditions have been recommended to ensure ecological mitigation measures and enhancements are put in place, if recommended for approval. It is considered that the proposals would not have a detrimental impact on ecology, and overall the proposals are considered to be acceptable in this regard

Archaeology

- 6.27 Policy 34 of the HDPF states that proposals shall ensure appropriate archaeological research, investigation, recording and reporting of both above and below-ground archaeology, and retention where required, with any assessment provided as appropriate. It is noted that a historic Roman Road runs directly through the site, south-east to north-west. The Council's archaeology consultant has not raised any objections to the proposals and a suitable condition has been recommended to ensure that appropriate archaeological investigations take place prior to the erection of the proposed dwelling, if recommended for approval. As such, the proposals are considered to be acceptable in this regard.

Drainage

- 6.28 The site is located within Flood Zone 1 where there is a low probability of flooding and where residential development is considered acceptable by the NPPF. Southern Water have commented that there is no public sewer in the vicinity of the site. If recommended for approval, a condition could be imposed requiring the submission and approval of details relating to the proposed means of foul and surface water drainage for the site prior to commencement of development.

Conclusion

- 6.29 It is considered that the scheme, for the demolition of the existing barn/commercial building and construction of a new dwelling, would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchical approach of concentrating development within the main settlements as set out in the HDPF. The proposal for a new dwelling on the site is not considered to be essential to its countryside location and consequently represents an inappropriate, unsustainable and unacceptable form of development in this location.
- 6.30 Additionally, the site has not been allocated for housing development within a 'made' Neighbourhood Plan and is therefore not currently deemed to be appropriate for housing at a local level. As outlined above, the applicant's fall-back argument regarding the potential to convert the barn to residential use under the current provisions of the GPDO do not exist. There is no valid fall-back position on this site which adds weight to approve the scheme. Whilst the proposal would be acceptable on design and amenity grounds, it is not considered that these material considerations would outweigh the principle objection to the development of a dwellinghouse in the countryside. Overall, the proposals would be contrary to Policies 1, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015)
- 6.31 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. At the time of drafting this report the proposal involves the following:

Use Description	Proposed	Existing	Net Gain
District Wide Zone 1	327	429	0
	Total Gain		
	Total Demolition		429

Please note that 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.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 It is recommended that planning permission is refused for the following reasons:

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed dwelling is located in a countryside location, outside of any defined built-up area boundary, on a site not allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework or an adopted neighbourhood plan. The Council is able to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply and consequently the proposed development would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchy approach of concentrating development within the main settlements of the District. Furthermore, the proposed development is not essential to its countryside location. Consequently, the proposal for a new dwelling on the site represents unsustainable development contrary to policies 1, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework (2018).

Background Papers: DC/19/1623