

Planning Application to erect a 44.64kW Solar Array on land to the South of Need's Farm House, RH13 8ED.

PLANNING SUPPORT STATEMENT

Contents

1. Introduction
 2. Design Statement
 3. Planning Statement
 4. Heritage Statement
 5. Ecology Statement
 6. Planning Precedents
 7. Access
 8. Planning Balance and Conclusion
 9. Appendix
-

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This is a Planning Statement prepared to accompany a Full Planning application to install a 44.64kW solar system on a field to the south of Need's Farm House.

1.2 The proposal will be accompanied by associated plant work and a small battery array located in the existing plant room of the nearby Stables building (which is a holiday let, following a conversion under planning consent DC/21/0628). The Stables plant room lies outside the application site and the battery installation within it involves no external alteration or change of use. It is mentioned here for completeness but does not itself require planning permission and does not form part of this application.

1.3 The proposal includes minimal trenching to run underground cables from the proposed location of the PV array to the Stables building plant room. The route of the cabling trenching will not follow the shortest route, but rather be routed around the end of an existing hedge to minimise ecological impact. This can be seen clearly in the "U" shaped route of the trenching on the location and block plans. All trenching will be filled in at the end of the project, leaving no lasting impact at all.

1.4 The proposal has been developed to help reduce the carbon footprint of our property, as well as our energy bills. It builds on other work we have undertaken in recent years to decarbonise our energy, particularly through the replacement of oil-fired heating with heat pumps. For 5 months of the year it will produce more than we use, while for the remaining 7 months of the year it will produce less than we use, but still materially reduce the grid electricity we use.

1.5 The proposal has been developed following the rejection of a previous application (DC/24/1566), with significant changes made in direct response to the reasons that application was rejected. The previous application was rejected due to the visual impact on two listed buildings - the West Grinstead War Memorial and Need's Farm House.¹ The new proposal is on a site previously suggested by the Conservation Officer as being much further away from the War Memorial, and screened from Need's Farm House by the Stables. As well as changing the site, we have chosen a lower profile solar mounting system, which is a little over half the height (877mm as opposed to 1450mm, a 40% reduction) of the previous proposals. This will dramatically reduce the visibility of the site from all relevant angles. More details of how this application responds to the concerns expressed by the Conservation Officer in the previous application process - and why we believe any residual effect on the setting of either listed building would now be negligible - are outlined in the Heritage Statement below.

1.6 This proposal also benefits from the recent changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to increase the weighting given in decision making to low carbon measures, as outlined in section 3 below.

1.7 The proposed site is in a rural location. The design and materials in the proposal have been chosen to ensure that the proposals will have little to no impact on the area's ecology. The size of this Planning Application falls below the threshold for a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) plan, but it does include an Ecology Plan and Statement below. We note that the previous proposal did not raise any objections on ecological grounds.

1.8 The proposed development is considered to comply with both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the relevant Horsham District Planning Framework policies, as set out in section 3, below. In particular, the provision of low-carbon energy to our property will make a substantial positive contribution to reducing the impact of climate change through carbon reduction, in line with both local and national planning priorities.

¹ The sole reason for refusal is reproduced in full in the appendix in Section 9, along with the Conservation Officer's comments on the application.

1.9 There are no known adverse implications to the proposal beyond the very limited - and, in our view, negligible - effect on the setting of the two nearby listed buildings addressed in the Heritage Statement (section 4), and loss of approximately 5m² of modified grassland owing to the mounting of the solar panels addressed in the Ecology Statement (Section 5). Even to the extent any such effects were found to go further than we anticipate, we consider it clearly and amply outweighed by the benefits described throughout this statement, particularly the substantial weight the NPPF now gives to renewable and low carbon energy schemes.

2. DESIGN STATEMENT

2.1 System Design

The proposed solar system has been designed specifically to respond to the needs and energy consumption of our property. It is projected to provide a little under 95% of the energy we use throughout the year. However, owing to the inconsistencies of sunlight through the year, this will actually mean that we over-produce electricity during the summer months, and under-produce electricity during the winter. Even with the installation of an accompanying battery system we would still need to draw electricity from the grid for an estimated 7 months of the year, while we would overproduce and look to export electricity to the grid during the remaining 5 months of the year.

Advances in battery technology and reductions in cost mean that it is now viable to install a larger accompanying battery system with the proposed PV array. That system will not be externally visible, as it will be located within the plant rooms of an existing building (the Stables, Need's Farm House), with no changes made to the external alterations made to the existing building. However, it does make it viable for us to install a system capable of producing a larger share of our electricity needs than before, and we have increased the proposed system size as a result.

Fortunately, we have sourced a mounting system that minimises the visual profile of the array. The new mounting system is much lower, reducing the height of the system by 40% (from 1450mm to 877mm), and significantly reducing the visual impact.

The mounting system also allows us to mount 3 panels on each frame, rather than one. This allows us to accommodate an increase from 54 to 96 panels with only a modest increase in the array's overall footprint: its width is essentially unchanged, while its length has increased from approximately 20m to 30m. This modest increase in footprint is more than offset by the substantial reduction in the overall height of the system described above and by the benefits of the new location (discussed in Section 2.2 and the Heritage Statement below), meaning that the visual impact of the new system will actually be less than that of the previous proposals. The lower profile does cause some drop in efficiency (a further reason for the increase in panel numbers), but we consider this a worthwhile trade-off given the benefits set out above.

Each mount sits on top of the ground, held in place by weights and not requiring groundworks or foundations to be dug.

2.2 Location

The location of the PV array was suggested by the Conservation Officer as an acceptable alternative to the site of our previous application for the reasons laid out in the heritage statement below.

As before, the site is in a hay field to the south of the rest of our property, which is ecologically almost identical to the previous site. We have once again chosen a mounting system that does not use a concrete or other permanent base. The mounts are instead fixed to the ground using weights and pegs. This minimises the ecological impact of the proposals during the lifetime of the array. It also means that the system can then be decommissioned completely, without leaving any trace behind. This will mean that the impact on the surrounding ecology will be minimal, and there will be no permanent and irreversible changes to the local landscape (see ecology statement, section 5, for further details).

The proposal includes minimal trenching to run underground cables within and from the proposed location of the PV array to the Stables building plant room. The route of the cabling trenching will not follow the shortest route, but rather be routed around the end of an existing hedge to minimise ecological impact. This can be seen clearly in the "U" shaped route of the trenching on the location and block plans. All trenching will be filled in at the end of the project, leaving no lasting impact at all.

2.3 Neighbour, Amenity and Impact

The location is screened at ground level by both substantial mixed-species hedgerows and by the long grass in the field where it is sited (in summer the grass will be a similar height to the system). In summer the screening will render the system almost totally hidden. Even in winter, the thick hedgerows will mean that there is extremely limited visibility for the general public - the system would only be visible looking through the thick hedgerow and across the field.

The location is also only visible to the public from Steyning Road, which is around 150m away at the nearest point. Anyone driving along the road, or walking along the footpath on the other side of the road, would need to turn through almost 90 degrees and look through the hedgerow in order to see the site.

The proposed site is more than 100m away from all neighbouring properties, except the applicants' own. In addition the view of the location from those neighbouring properties would be screened by either the applicants' own property or mature hedges and trees, making the site difficult to view from them.

3. PLANNING STATEMENT

3.1 Planning Overview

The proposals are a small-scale answer to some of the key needs and policies highlighted in both national (NPPF) and local (Horsham District Council) planning policy.

The proposals have also been developed in response to the reasons for the refusal of our previous application (DC/24/1566), which was rejected on heritage grounds. We have paid very careful attention to the Conservation Officer's concerns with the previous proposals, and believe that all of those concerns no longer apply to the new proposals. More details are given in the Heritage Statement below.

3.2 Planning Policy

National Policy

The proposed scheme will help achieve the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to increase low-carbon energy. The latest version of the NPPF (August 2026) places considerable and increased weight on its importance, with two entire sections dedicated to it (Section 5, *Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change*, and Section 10, *Securing clean energy and water*). There are also significant changes elsewhere in the NPPF which further support the provision of clean energy.

In Section 5, *Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change*, the benefits of low carbon energy sources are emphasised, and the weighting given to that in decision making has been increased from "significant" to "substantial". The key policy is CC 2.2, which states that:

"substantial weight should be given to the benefits of improving the energy efficiency of existing buildings and/or drawing energy from district heat networks, renewable and low carbon sources (including through the installation of heat pumps and solar panels where these do not already benefit from permitted development rights)."

Section 10, *Securing clean energy and water* emphasises the importance of *"support[ing] the transition to clean power by planning positively for the increased supply and use of renewable and low carbon energy"* (W2.1). Specifically the section states that:

"in considering proposals for renewable and low-carbon energy development and electricity network infrastructure, substantial weight should be given to:

a. the benefits for improving energy security...and/or the transition to a net zero future...

... c. the contribution that small-scale and community-led renewable and low carbon energy projects can make to reducing greenhouse gas emissions"

The current proposals clearly *"improve energy security"*, contribute meaningfully to *"the transition to a net zero future"* and are a *"small-scale"* project that will contribute to *"reducing greenhouse gas emissions."*

The heritage section of the NPPF (section 20) now also explicitly lists *"enabling energy efficiency and low carbon heating measures to be employed"* as an *"important public benefit"* that should be weighed against any harm to the significance of a listed building in decision making (NPPF HE 6.4). We believe that our new proposals no longer cause the harms to the setting of Need's Farm House and the West Grinstead War Memorial that led to our previous application being rejected, but the new additions to HE 6.4 do lend further support to the proposal.

Horsham District Policy Priorities

The proposed scheme also clearly meets the objectives of the specific priorities of Horsham District Council (HDC), which has declared a climate emergency, and prioritised carbon reduction

in both its current (2015) Local Plan (The Horsham District Planning Framework, HDPF) and proposed future Local Plan.

Policy 35 of the HDPF states that *“development will be supported where it makes a clear contribution to mitigating and adapting to the impacts of climate change and to meeting the district’s carbon reduction targets.”* It specifically encourages *“3. The use of decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy supply systems.”* These proposals clearly fulfil these objectives.

Policy 36 of the HDPF states under the heading “renewable energy schemes” that *“The Council will permit schemes for renewable energy (e.g. solar) where they do not have a significant adverse effect on landscape and townscape character, biodiversity, heritage or cultural assets or amenity value.”* These proposals clearly fall under this policy, and their small size and the changes to location and height since the previous planning proposal ensure that they will not have “a significant adverse effect” on the landscape, heritage or cultural assets or amenity value.

Policy 37 of the HDPF states that proposals should *“minimise construction and demolition waste and utilise recycled and low-impact materials.”* The proposed PV panels are constructed to unusually high ethical standards, including in the use of high levels of recycled materials, and made with a low CO₂ footprint. A data sheet for the panels is included with this application.

They will also be mounted on low impact mounting structures (also on the same data sheet, accompanying this application). They are laid on top of the ground, and fixed to it using low impact mounting structures that can be easily and completely removed, with no concrete base or permanent fixings. They will therefore produce minimal demolition waste and have a very low impact.

Policy 37 goes on to say that proposals should *“be flexible to allow future modification of use or layout, facilitating future, adaptation, refurbishment and retrofitting.”* The nature of the ground mountings ensures maximum flexibility for future use and modification - indeed the whole array could be easily removed without leaving any trace that it ever existed.

The priority placed on carbon reduction and low-carbon energy is also reflected in HDC’s proposed new Local Plan, with most of the policy priorities from the HDPF outlined above reflected in very similar form in the proposed new plan.

Overall

The provision of low-carbon energy clearly aligns strongly with both the NPPF and HDC’s priorities as expressed in the HDPF (and proposed new plan).

3.3 Planning Precedent

Please see Section 6 for Planning Precedents

3.4 Design and impact

See section 2, above.

4. HERITAGE STATEMENT

The location of the proposed solar array has been chosen following the suggestion made by the Conservation Officer in his response to our previous proposals (DC/24/1566), in which he proposed this new site and said that *“if the applicant is willing to change the location to this part of the field then I will no longer object to the proposal.”*²

In addition to relocating the array to this site, we have also adopted a significantly lower profile mounting system, reducing the overall height of the array by 40% (from 1450mm to 877mm, as set out in section 2.1), specifically to reduce the visual and heritage impact of the scheme further still.

The array is modestly larger than that proposed in the refused application, with its length increasing from approximately 20m to 30m (its width is essentially unchanged), to accommodate the additional panels described in Section 2.1. This modest increase in size is more than offset by two factors: the far greater distance and screening of the new site from both the War Memorial and Need's Farm House compared with the site of the previous application, and the 40% reduction in the overall height of the mounting system. Taken together, we consider the visual and heritage impact of the current proposals is significantly less than for the previous application.

The site is now both far removed and very considerably screened from the Grade II listed West Grinstead War Memorial. The new site is around 130m from the War Memorial, with both a mature hedge (c.2m high and c.1.5m wide) and a copse of mature oak trees obscuring it from the War Memorial. Also, as the Conservation Officer noted regarding the proposed new site *“the copse of trees and hedge will act as a foil when looking beyond the war memorial to the west.”* As a result, it would no longer be visually contiguous with the War Memorial when walking or driving along Steyning Road. Taking the distance, the screening and the reduced height of the array together, we do not consider the proposals would have any harmful effect on the setting of the War Memorial.

The site is significantly closer to the Grade II listed Need's Farm House. However, the Stables sits between the Farm House and the proposed site, almost completely obscuring each from the other. As the Stables themselves are a late 20th Century addition to the site (later converted to a holiday let), the historical significance of the view of the elevation from beyond it to the south is also significantly less than elsewhere, as it is already significantly impacted by the stables. Further, the parts of the system which are not obscured from Need's Farm House by the Stables will be largely obscured by trees and hedge. In his response to the previous proposals the Conservation Officer also noted that in the new location the panels *“will also be out of line of sight from Steyning Road when looking towards the house”* - so even on the rare occasion the array might be glimpsed from the road, it would not affect the setting of the listed building.

There are no other listed buildings, or other features of heritage significance which can be viewed from the proposed site.

In light of the above, we believe the proposals would preserve the setting of both the War Memorial and Need's Farm House. To the extent any residual effect on their setting remains, we consider it would be negligible, and at most at the lowest end of what the NPPF describes as “less than substantial harm.” Even on that basis, we consider any such harm is clearly and amply outweighed by the public benefits of the proposals set out in this statement, in particular the substantial weight the NPPF now gives to enabling low carbon energy measures as a public benefit to be weighed in heritage decision-making (NPPF HE 6.4, discussed in section 3 above). We have considered the reasons for refusal of our previous application and we are confident that none of them apply to this revised proposal.

² The Conservation Officer's comments on the previous application are quoted in full in Section 9.1 below.

5. ECOLOGY STATEMENT

The proposed site is only 790m², and does not include or impact on any priority habitats. As a result it falls well below the new thresholds for the requirement for Bio-Diversity Net Gain plans and mitigation measures.

However, we believe that we are stewards of the natural landscape on our property and all jointly stewards of our local environment. We are therefore still keen to ensure that our proposals have minimal negative impact on the Biodiversity and Ecology of the area. In the statement below we have used the UK Habitat Classification terminology and units.

While the installation of a solar array will not directly improve the ecology of the local area, we do believe that collective efforts to reduce our carbon footprints can have a dramatic indirect impact on efforts to safeguard the ecology of our local area. Our changing climate is one of the biggest threats to our local ecology that there is.

We also believe that our proposals will not have any significant negative impact on the local ecology and wildlife.

The site of the proposed solar system is in the middle of a field of grass, normally used for hay. The field is dominated by a single species of fast growing perennial rye grass and has few other species in it. It clearly falls into the category of “modified grassland” (g4) under the UK Habitat Classification. The trenching does also cross a small area of lawn, but this also falls under the category of “modified grassland” (g4). The whole area is therefore modified grassland. Using the UK Habitat Classification for modified grassland that means that the site as a whole consists of 0.31 habitat units.

However, our plans are to leave both the area around the panels and the area under the panels as grassland as before. Under the UK Habitat Classification there would therefore be no change to the vast majority of this area. It would only be the area actually under the weights and struts and pegs of the mounting system that was lost. That area is roughly 5m² in total, accounting for 0.002 habitat units, which is well under 1% of the habitat units onsite.

The only other permanent fixture of the system will be buried cabling, with the trenches filled in at the end of the project for the grass to grow back as before. There will therefore be no permanent ecological impact. We have also routed the line of the trenches/cabling around the nearby hedge, to ensure that the hedge is outside of the works completely and is not impacted in any way.

There would be no new lighting or other permanent additional above ground installations beyond the installation of the solar panels themselves.

As can be seen our proposals result in negligible ecological loss, and what losses there would be are clearly outweighed by the substantial benefits of the provision of low-carbon energy.

6. PLANNING PRECEDENTS

This application is submitted with a number of relevant precedents in mind.

The first, and most directly relevant, is our own previous application on this site (DC/24/1566). While that application was rejected, it was rejected on a single ground: that it would cause harm to the setting of two listed buildings, the West Grinstead War Memorial and Need's Farm House. There were no other reasons for refusal on ecological, amenity, or any other grounds. We consider that decision already establishes that there is no obstacle to this development in principle, save on heritage grounds - a point we rely on directly, rather than needing to draw an analogy with a different site.

We would particularly note that the ecological footprint of the new site is almost identical to the old one, since it sits within the same field, so the read-across on that point is especially strong. We would also note that visibility and neighbour amenity are, if anything, improved under the new proposals, since the site is now significantly further from both the nearest neighbour and the road.

As set out in the Heritage Statement (section 4 above), we believe we have addressed and resolved the heritage concerns raised in respect of that application.

We are also aware of the following recent decisions elsewhere, which are directly relevant to how those heritage considerations should be weighed:

Clapham House, Litlington, East Sussex (SDNP/19/02055/FUL, approved 2019).

This application, for a mixed ground- and roof-mounted solar array at a Grade II listed dwelling in the South Downs National Park, is a closer parallel to our own proposals than the larger schemes discussed below. The planning officer's report drew a clear distinction between the two elements: the ground-mounted array was found to cause no harm at all to the setting of the listed building, while the roof-mounted panels were found to cause only modest, less than substantial harm - which was in any event outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme. Our proposal is, in effect, the more straightforward half of this precedent: a ground-mounted array only, sited and screened so as to avoid any harm to the setting of the listed buildings nearby, exactly as was found acceptable here.

Littywood Farm, South Staffordshire (APP/C3430/W/24/3339805, allowed 28 October 2024).

On appeal, a large ground-mounted solar farm affecting the setting of a Grade II listed farmhouse was allowed, even though the Inspector found the scheme would cause "less than substantial harm" to the listed building's setting. Substantial weight was given to the renewable energy and carbon-reduction benefits of the scheme, and this was found to clearly outweigh the identified heritage harm. Our own proposals are vastly smaller in scale (around 900x smaller capacity), and we believe (as set out in our Heritage Statement) that they would cause negligible or no harm at all to the setting of Need's Farm House or the War Memorial - but even applying the more cautious position taken in this appeal, where real harm was identified and still found to be outweighed, the same balance applies with even greater force to our modest scheme.

High Dike Road, Loundthorpe, Lincolnshire (APP/E2530/W/24/3357607, allowed 18 July 2025).

This appeal, for a solar farm near a Grade I listed house and a Grade II* listed tower, was allowed on the basis that existing screening - mature tree belts, hedging and topography - meant the setting of the listed assets would not be harmed at all, with visibility "largely confined to the site itself." This mirrors the core of our own case: our site is screened from the War Memorial by a mature hedge and oak copse, and from Need's Farm House by the intervening Stables, with visibility from the public highway limited to a single, oblique viewpoint. If mature landscape screening was sufficient to protect the setting of a Grade I and a Grade II* asset from a vastly larger installation (over 1,000x greater capacity), it should be more than sufficient to protect two Grade II assets from our 44.64kW array.

The Old Rectory, Little Bardfield, Essex (APP/C1570/W/23/3317588 and APP/C1570/Y/23/3322253, dismissed 3 May 2024).

We are aware of this appeal, which concerned a slightly larger ground-mounted array within the grounds of a Grade II listed rectory, dismissed because the panels would remain clearly visible within, and would significantly change the character of, the historic grounds themselves. We raise it because our proposal differs in exactly the respects that led to its dismissal: our site sits outside the curtilage or historic grounds of Need's Farm House, in a working hay field with no or very limited visibility from any principal or elevated viewpoint of the listed building, and is substantially screened by an intervening building and mature trees and hedgerows. Properly distinguished, this appeal supports rather than undermines our case.

Taken together with our own previous application, these decisions confirm that heritage harm from small-scale, well-screened renewable energy schemes is not inevitable, and that even where genuine less than substantial harm is found, it is properly outweighed by the substantial weight now given to renewable energy under the NPPF - both principles that we consider apply, with particular force, to our proposals.

7. ACCESS

Once installed, the proposed solar system will not require regular access, except on foot for maintenance. The proposals will not therefore result in any new or increased access requirements.

During installation, the site can be accessed across the field from a farm gate onto Steyning Road from the field in the SE corner of the field. As all the solar panels and mounting systems are prefabricated elsewhere, the installation will only likely take 1-2 weeks, meaning that even the works themselves will cause negligible access considerations.

8. PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

In reaching a recommendation on this application, we ask that the following balance is considered. On one side, the proposal delivers clear and substantial public benefits: a meaningful contribution to decarbonising our property's energy supply, building on our replacement of oil-fired heating with heat pumps in recent years; a contribution to Horsham District Council's declared climate and ecological emergency and carbon reduction targets; and a scheme that squarely fulfils the substantially increased weight the NPPF now gives to renewable and low carbon energy generation, including the heritage chapter's recognition of low carbon measures as an important public benefit (HE 6.4).

On the other side, we do not consider the proposal causes any significant harm to biodiversity, ecology, or neighbouring amenity, for the reasons set out in the Ecology and Design sections above.

On heritage grounds, we believe the changes made since our previous application - relocating the array to the site suggested by the Conservation Officer, and reducing the height of the mounting system by 40% - mean that any residual effect on the setting of the West Grinstead War Memorial or Need's Farm House is negligible, and at most at the lowest end of what the NPPF describes as less than substantial harm.

On Ecology grounds there is a very small amount of harm, amounting to the loss of less than 1% of the habitat units onsite, and a very small absolute figure (0.002 units). We believe this barely registers at even the lowest levels of less than substantial harm.

Even if a decision-maker were to find some limited harm of this kind, we consider it is clearly and amply outweighed by the public benefits described above, consistent with the appeal decisions discussed in section 3.3. We therefore consider that the planning balance falls decisively in favour of this application, and ask that it be approved.

9. APPENDIX

9.1 - The Conservation Officer's Comments on the Previous Planning Application (DC/24/1566)

"Dear Halima,

I am fully supportive of the principal of ground mounted solar panels to support the energy requirement of Needs Farmhouse. However, the proposed location will mean they interfere with views of the listed house from Need's Hill and will be a conspicuous backdrop to the war memorial when viewed on foot. This will cause harm to the setting of both the house and the war memorial. The public benefits of localised and renewable energy production does not outweigh the harm to the setting of the listed buildings which will be less than substantial and moderately so. I am happy to speak with the applicant and their agent about an alternative location.

Regards,

Seán

Dear Halima,

Following our meeting with the applicant my objection remains. It was instructive to see the visibility of traffic beyond the boundary hedge and this reinforces my view that the panels will be visible at certain times of the year and interfere with views of the house and appear as a backdrop to the war memorial. The war memorial should be recognised as a rural monument and positioned in this location purposefully to be experienced in the countryside. The panels will be an incongruous feature within the setting of the war memorial and historic house. I do believe that there is an alternative location for the panels to the south of the converted stable building. In this location they will be screened from the house by the ancillary building but still enjoy a high degree of direct sunlight. They will also be out of line of sight from Steyning Road when looking towards the house and the copse of trees and hedge will act as a foil when looking beyond the war memorial to the west. If the applicant is willing to change the location to this part of the field then I will no longer object to the proposal.

Regards,

Seán"

9.2 - The reasons for the refusal of application DC/24/1566 in full

"The solar panels, by reason of their siting, would represent an incongruous feature within the setting of the Grade II listed war memorial and the Grade II Listed Building Needs Farmhouse. The proposal would be unduly prominent that would interfere with views of the listed house from Need's Hill and would appear as a conspicuous backdrop to the listed war memorial when viewed on foot along Steyning Road. The solar panels would have a harmful impact on the special interest of the listed building(s) and would fail to preserve, reflect or enhance their special character and distinctiveness. There are no public benefits which would outweigh the identified harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 32, 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework."