DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DC/25/0566
Wood Reeves , Mill Lane, Lower Beeding, West Sussex, RH13 6PX

DESCRIPTION:
Extensions and alterations to existing building to provide 'Fishery Managers' dwellinghouse.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/21/2012	Erection of a cabin for storage	Application Permitted on 16.11.2021

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE
The site comprises a lake/reservoir known as Furnace Lake, which is surrounded by woodland, and accessed from Mill Lane. From research of the existing lawful use of the site, the lake is one of several belonging to a fishing club, essentially being a leisure facility for use by paid members.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION
The application seeks alterations and extensions to the existing buildings which are incidental to the existing use of the site. The proposal would also include a change of use of the buildings, to convert them to a dwellinghouse to be used by the a 'fishery' manager. The width of the building would be 20.3 metres, the depth would be 2.8 metres and the proposal would have two bedrooms. The externals would be timber cladding over 'brick upstand'.

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 4 - Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion
Policy 10 - Rural Economic Development
Policy 15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision
Policy 20 - Rural Workers Accommodation
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection
Policy 30 - Protected Landscapes
Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles

Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan
Policy 1 – Biodiversity
Policy 2 – Landscape Character
Policy 3 -Green Infrastructure

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old, the most important policies for the determination of this application must be considered as to whether they are 'out of date' (NPPF paragraph 11d).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 year. 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 9: Water Neutrality
Strategic Policy 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Strategic Policy 14: Countryside Protection
Strategic Policy 16: Protected Landscapes
Strategic Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Strategic Policy 19: Development Quality
Strategic Policy 20: Development Principles
Strategic Policy 37: Housing Provision
Policy 44: Rural Workers Accommodation

Planning Advice Notes:
Facilitating Appropriate Development

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:
HDC Aboricultural: Object. The proposed development site is situated within the Southern tip of the Minepits Wood Ancient replanted woodland. The proposal involves direct loss of a section of the AW following the pre-emptive denudation of the wider area of AW over the past decade or so, from the physical change associated with the extent of groundworks undertaken. Pre-emptive denudation of the adjacent AW is not a sound reason for permitting subsequent development.

Future pressures associated with the proposed change of use to provide a dwelling with habitable curtilage would foreseeably see further denudation of this irreplaceable landscape resource, also contrary to the NPPF guidance.

The land remains subject of AW designation until such time as Natural England deem otherwise. Provided underlying soils have not been destroyed, the woodland could likely re-colonise given time.

Natural England: Standing Advice issued.

Ecology: Object. Further information would be required on European protected species. We have reviewed the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Roost Assessment (Arbtech Consulting Ltd.,

November 2024), relating to the likely impacts of development on designated sites, protected and Priority species & habitats, and identification of appropriate mitigation measures. The assessment highlights that further surveys are required. These have no been provided.

Reading Agricultural consultants: Insufficient information has been provided to outline justification for a workers dwelling.

WSCC Fire & Rescue: The nearest fire hydrant for the supply of water for firefighting is 405-metres away, 230-metres further than the 175-metre distance required for a domestic premises. If an alternative water supply for firefighting is to be considered it will need to conform with the details identified in Approved Document-B (AD-B) Volume 1: B5 section 14 and agreed with West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service.

Evidence will also be required to show the Fire Service vehicle access meets with the requirements identified in Approved Document B Volume 2: B5 Section 15, including Table 15.2 and diagram 15.3. A fire appliance requires a minimum width of 3.1 m through any gateway or narrowing and 3.7m between road edge or curbs, capable of supporting 18-Tonne axial weight of the fire appliance and capable of being located within 45-metres of all points within the property. A fire appliance should not need to revers more than 20m to reach either a turning facility or an exit point form the site.

WSCC Highways: 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 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Representations:
Two representations have been received, objecting to the proposal for the following reasons: -

- The septic tank to be installed
- AONB bordering property
- Privacy, light and noise

Parish 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

Principle of Development:

Paragraph 84 of the NPPF states that "Planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply [including] 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".

Paragraph 88 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should enable sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversions of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings as well as enabling the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses, sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside.

Policy 20 of the HDPF states that outside of the defined built-up area new housing for rural workers will be supported provided that:

- There is a functional need for the dwelling and the occupation of the dwelling is to support the established business use.
- Evidence is submitted to demonstrate the viability of the rural business for which the housing is required

Policy 26 of the HDPF requires development in the countryside be of a scale that is appropriate to its countryside character and location and not lead, either individually or cumulatively, to a significant increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside. It also needs to be essential to its countryside location and to meet 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 primary test established by the above policies is whether there is an essential need for a rural worker to live at, or near, their place of work. This assessment requires an evaluation of the risks involved; the frequency and type of out-of-hours emergency that might arise; the scale and loss that could be incurred should that emergency situation occur; the potential for an on-site worker to identify the problem; and the ability of that resident worker to rectify the problem.

The application sets out that there is a need for the fish to be managed but provides no detailed rationale as to why this management would create an essential need for a permeant on-site presence, other than to manage oxygen levels. There is however limited information as to whether the lake is aerated manually or by automatic pumps, and any related alarm system which could notify of oxygen crashes or temperature drops which would affect the fish. It is also not clear how any emergencies at the site are currently managed and their frequency, the fish stock levels in the ponds and labour calculations. The submitted site location plan also suggests the existing dwelling of Wood Reeves is within the same ownership as the ponds and the application building, it is not clear why this existing dwelling would not meet the accommodation and labour requirements of the business.

Policy 20 of the HDPF also requires evidence ‘to demonstrate the viability of the rural business for which the housing is required’. There is no evidence, in the form of a business plan or historic accounts to demonstrate that any commercial use of the lakes is viable.

Overall, for the reasons set out above, it has not been adequately justified that there is an essential need for a fulltime rural worker to live on the site. A rural worker dwelling on the site would not therefore be supported by the above policies. The application is also made on the basis that even if the dwelling were not essential for a rural worker, the conversion of the existing building to a dwelling would be supported by other relevant policies. This is considered further below.

Policy 10 of the HDPF relates to rural economic development, and states that development should be contained within suitably located buildings which are suitable for conversion, and that proposals for the conversion of rural buildings to business and commercial uses will be considered favourably over residential in the first instance.

The existing building(s) were granted planning permission for purposes connected to the wider use of the site. There is no evidence to suggest there is no longer a need for the existing use(s) provided by the buildings and there is conflicting information within the submission as to the nature of the proposal, with the ecology assessment suggesting building one would be demolished. While this may not be

determinative, it has not been demonstrated that the existing buildings are redundant for their current use, or why alternative business / commercial use would not be suitable.

In respect of housing, Policy 2 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) sets out the overarching growth strategy, focusing development within the District's main settlements. The adopted settlement hierarchy represents the most sustainable approach to accommodating growth, directing the majority of new housing to Horsham, Southwater and Billingshurst, with only limited development elsewhere, and only where it accords with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy 3 seeks to retain the existing settlement pattern and ensure that development takes place in the most sustainable locations possible. Policy 4 supports limited settlement expansion outside built-up area boundaries only where: the site is allocated in the Local Plan or a Neighbourhood Plan and adjoins an existing settlement edge; the scale of growth is appropriate to the settlement; the proposal meets identified local needs; and the development is contained within defensible boundaries that respect landscape character.

In this countryside location, Policy 26 is also engaged. It seeks to protect the rural area against inappropriate development unless it is essential to a countryside location and meets one of the following criteria: supporting agriculture or forestry; enabling mineral extraction or waste disposal; providing for quiet informal recreation; or enabling the sustainable development of rural areas.

The proposal conflicts with the spatial strategy of Policies 2, 3 and 4 of the HDPF, which direct new growth to the most sustainable settlements to minimise reliance on the private car and promote access to services. The site is located in an unsustainable rural location, remote from day-to-day services and public transport connections. Any residential redevelopment would be heavily dependent on the private car and would not represent a sustainable pattern of growth. Further, and as set out elsewhere, no essential need for a dwelling in this countryside location has been demonstrated, and the conversion would therefore conflict with Policy 26 of the HDPF.

Although it is recognised that the Council currently cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, recent appeal decisions for single dwellings outside built-up area boundaries (e.g. DC/20/2086 – Lancasters Cottage, Partridge Green; and DC/20/2128 – Marringdean Barn, Billingshurst) confirm that such shortfall does not automatically justify development in unsustainable locations. In those cases, Inspectors acknowledged limited economic and housing benefits, but found these outweighed by conflict with the adopted spatial strategy.

In this context, the proposal does not satisfy the criteria for countryside development under Policy 26, nor does it meet the exceptions listed in NPPF paragraph 84. While the proposal would make limited contribution to housing supply through the reuse of brownfield land, these benefits are insufficient to outweigh the significant conflict with the spatial strategy of the Development Plan.

It is therefore concluded that the principle of development is unacceptable, as the proposal would constitute unsustainable residential development in the countryside, contrary to Policies 2, 3, 4, 20 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Design and Appearance:

Policy 25 of the HDPF states that the natural environment and landscape character of the District, including landscape, landform and development pattern, together with protected landscapes, will be protected against inappropriate development. Proposals should protect, conserve and enhance the landscape character, taking into account areas identified as being of landscape importance. In addition, policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF promote development that is of a high quality design, which is based upon a clear understanding of the local, physical, social, economic, environmental, and policy context.

Development will be expected to provide an attractive, functional, and accessible environment that complements locally distinctive characters and heritage of the District. Development should contribute to a sense of place both in the buildings and spaces themselves and in the way they integrate with their surroundings and the historic landscape in which they sit. Development should ensure that the scale,

massing and appearance of the development relates sympathetically with the built surroundings, landscape, open spaces and routes within and adjoining the site.

The existing buildings are modest in scale, and consisting of a fisherman's storage hut, machinery store, feed store and kayak store. The earlier planning permission for the storage building considered that the building would appear be of a temporary construction, given that it was described as a "shed with no foundations, electricity, water or sewage system", and while concerns were raised that the proportions and fenestration would give rise to a building with a somewhat domestic appearance (rather than a purely functional storage cabin) no objections were raised.

The proposed conversion entails remodelling of the two buildings to create a single-built form with a steeper (and therefore higher) pitched roof form. The submission does not detail whether the existing buildings are capable of conversion but the development if approved would not allow a new-build to take place. In the context of the existing appearance of the buildings the proposed conversion would not result in any further demonstrable harm, with the increase in height not appearing visually dominant or intrusive.

There would though be a reasonable expectation that future occupants would require outdoor amenity space and that this would generate associated domestic paraphernalia, including car parking and garden items. However, it is acknowledged that the context is isolated away from public views such that there would be an absence of any wider visual impact or harm.

As such, there is some conflict identified with policies 25, 32 and 33 of the HDPF, however given the extent to which this is visible within the wider surrounds, the harm is limited.

Residential Amenity:

Policy 32 of the HDPF states that development will be expected to provide an attractive, functional, accessible, safe, and adaptable environment that contributes 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.

Given the siting of the subject building and the distance from neighbouring residential properties and users of land, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any further harm to the amenities and sensitivities of neighbouring properties and users of land. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with 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.

Highways have been consulted during the course of the application and have no objections. Given that there are no alterations to the access to the site, and that there is sufficient provision within the site to provide for the parking requirements for a two bedroom house, there is no objection to the proposed development in regards to access and visibility.

For these reasons, it is considered that the proposal would result in no adverse harm to the function and safety of the public highway, in accordance with Policies 40 and 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

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.

Circular 06/2005 identifies that the presence of protected species is a material consideration when considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat. Therefore, it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed application, is established before planning permission is granted. Information on biodiversity impacts and opportunities should inform all stages of development, and an ecological survey is usually necessary where the type and location of development are such that the impact on biodiversity may be significant and existing information is lacking or inadequate.

The proposed development site is situated within the Southern tip of the Minepits Wood Ancient replanted woodland. Ancient woodland is an irreplaceable habitat with a buffer zone of at least 15 metres necessary to prevent adverse impacts such as pollution and disturbance, and to ensure avoidance of root damage. There is a lack of detailed information in the application regarding associated infrastructure, including parking, foul drainage provision, other utilities and amenity space. The Council's Aboricultural Officer has commented that the proposal would result in a loss of a section of the Ancient Woodland, following the pre-emptive denudation of the wider area over the past decade or so given the physical change associated with the extent of groundworks undertaken. In this instance the pre-emptive denudation of the adjacent Ancient Woodland would not be a reason for permitting subsequent development.

In addition, future pressures associated with the proposed change of use to provide a dwelling with habitable curtilage would foreseeably see further denudation of this irreplaceable landscape resource, also contrary to the NPPF guidance.

The land remains subject of AW designation until such time as Natural England deem otherwise. Provided underlying soils have not been destroyed, the woodland could likely re-colonise given time. There are concerns that development would encroach on the root systems and rooting environments of trees within the ancient woodland, with this linked to installation of utilities, landscaping, and vehicular traffic, intensification of human activity resulting in increased disturbance to breeding birds and other sensitive fauna, vegetation damage, predation and disturbance from pets, trampling, litter or fire damage, where the wood edge overhangs public areas, trees can become safety issues and be indiscriminately lopped/felled, resulting in a reduction of the woodland canopy and threatening the long-term condition of the woodland. It can also result in a greater need for management of important habitat features in the woodland such as deadwood, which reduces the ecological integrity of the site.

The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Roost Assessment outlines that further surveys would be required to properly assess how the site would be used by foraging and commuting bats. It is further considered that given the immediate Ancient Woodland to the application site, the surrounding trees should have been included for assessment as part of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Roost assessment such that the report submitted does not satisfactorily demonstrate that the proposal would not harm potential protected species. The further recommended surveys do not appear to have been undertaken, and in their absence it cannot be concluded that there would be no adverse impacts on bats.

There are no wholly exceptional reasons for the deterioration of irreplaceable habitat. Furthermore, the council have not been presented with sufficient information to reasonably conclude that there would be no harm arising to potential protected species. The proposed development is harmful to the character and appearance of the landscape and conflicts with the objectives and requirements of policies 23, 24, 25, 26 and, 33 of the HDPF and is contrary to paragraph 193 of the NPPF.

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.

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. Natural England have been consulted on this Appropriate Assessment and have provided standing advice which raises no objection to this approach.

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 s.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.

The application form has outlined that the proposal would be exempt from Biodiversity net gain requirements by way of the self-build exemption. How this (self-build) would be secured would need to be considered were the application to be approved.

Planning Balance:

The application proposes a dwelling on a rural site not allocated for development within the HDPF or made Neighbourhood Plan and where no essential need has been demonstrated. The proposal in principle therefore runs contrary to Policies 2, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

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 built-up area boundary;
- 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 with 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 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 away from the nearest amenities and facilities with 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 harm arising from the development, and taking into account the identified ecology and ancient woodland impact(s), is not considered to be outweighed by the modest benefits of the single residential dwelling, and the application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. The 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. Further, it has not been demonstrated that the development would be essential to its countryside location. 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 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

2. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would have no adverse impact on protected species and its habitat, contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The development is situated within the Southern tip of the Minepits Wood Ancient replanted Woodland. The development would directly impact on and create future pressure for works within the Ancient Woodland. There are no wholly exceptional circumstances to outweigh the impact on ancient woodland and no details of mitigation or compensation have been provided. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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/25/0566
(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
Location & Block plan	Existing and Proposed	2407WO_R0_000	04.04.2025
Elevation & Floor plan	Existing	2407WO_R0_100	04.04.2025
Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed	2407WO_R0_200	04.04.2025

Design & Access Statement		NONE	04.04.2025
Supporting Statement	Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Roost Assessment	NONE	15.04.2025
Supporting Statement	Needs Appraisal	KCC3739 NA Oct 24 Draft	15.04.2025

DELEGATED

Authorising Officer sign/initial Guy Everest Date: 08.12.2025