PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

TO:	Planning Committee South
BY:	Head of Development and Building Control
DATE:	3rd June 2025
DEVELOPMENT:	Change of use, removal of dilapidated shelter and the erection of new dog kennel and associated works (Part Retrospective).
SITE:	Ridge View, Spinney Lane, West Chiltington, West Sussex, RH20 2NX
WARD:	Storrington and Sullington PC
APPLICATION:	DC/24/1292
APPLICANT:	**Name:** Mr P Marchant **Address:** Ridge View, Spinney Lane, West Chiltington, West Sussex, RH20 2NX

REASON FOR INCLUSION ON THE AGENDA: More than eight persons in different households have made written representations within the consultation period raising material planning considerations that are inconsistent with the recommendation of the Head of Development and Building Control.

RECOMMENDATION: To refuse planning permission

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

To consider the planning application.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

1.1 Retrospective planning permission is sought for a change of use, removal of dilapidated shelter and the retention of a new dog kennel and associated works. The dog kennels would be for personal use, for shelter for the Applicant's racing Greyhounds. There are 4 kennels which can house up to 4 dogs at a time. The new building is a large timber outbuilding with associated timber fencing of approximately 2 metres in height. The building has fenestration and internal divisions to accommodate separate dogs, and adjoining each of these separate dividers is a door to a small run. There is a sink within the building that appears to be attached to mains.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

1.2 This application concerns a small section of land to the south of Ridge View outside of the respective residential curtilage of this dwelling. The dwellinghouse itself is within the Built-Up Area Boundary area of West Chiltington Common. The proposed kennels are shown located outside of the built-up area boundary on land to the south of the dwelling. To the south of the application site is the dwelling Perretts, a grade II listed building, but this is

situated some distance from Ridge View. The dwellinghouses within the wider locality to the north are characterised by large detached dwellinghouses set within large plots. There is a public right of way running to the east of the application site. The application site is within a red zone for the Great Crested Newt. The dwelling is within close proximity to the boundary with West Chiltington Conservation Area to the east. Ancient Woodland at Perretts Copse is opposite the site, on the other side of Spinney Lane. The kennels are within the parish of Storrington and Sullington. The existing dwelling is within the parish of West Chiltington.

1.3 The site is within the 'bat sustenance zone'. This is consideration for ecological impacts for developments related to The Mens Nature Reserve and Ebernoe Common Nature Reserve, which are both classed as Special Areas of Conservation, within the district of Chichester. One of the special qualities of these areas is that they host protected species, including the Barbastelle and Bechstein's bats, which use the bat sustenance zone.

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:

National Planning Policy Framework

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 7 - Strategic Policy: Economic Growth
Policy 10 - Rural Economic Development
Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection
Policy 27 - Settlement Coalescence
Policy 28 - Replacement Dwellings and House Extensions in the Countryside
Policy 30 - Protected Landscapes
Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles
Policy 34 - Cultural and Heritage Assets
Policy 35 - Strategic Policy: Climate Change
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking

Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Awaiting examination)
Policy 1: Sustainable Development
Policy 2: Development Hierarchy
Policy 3: Settlement Expansion
Policy 6: Climate Change
Policy 7: Appropriate Energy Use
Policy 8: Sustainable Design and Construction
Policy 9: Water Neutrality
Policy 12: Air Quality
Policy 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character

Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 19: Development Quality
Policy 20: Development Principles
Policy 23: Infrastructure Provision
Policy 24: Sustainable Transport
Policy 25: Parking
Policy 37: Housing Provision
Policy 38: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Policy 40: Improving Housing Standards in the District

Storrington Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood plan 2018-2031
Policy 2 – Site allocations for development
Policy 8 – Countryside protection
Policy 9 – Green Gap

PLANNING HISTORY AND RELEVANT APPLICATIONS

DC/23/1371	Change of use, removal of dilapidated shelter and the erection of new dog kennel and associated works (part retrospective)	Withdrawn Application on 22.05.2024.

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

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

3.2 **HDC Landscape:** Supportive subject to recommendations (summarised)
Whilst we recognise the constraints of development within the Green Gap and outside the BUAB, we judge that visual amenity and character impacts of the new building are limited and therefore have minimal concerns regarding the proposal. We do however advise that additional mitigation measures are proposed to ensure that the impacts are minimised.

The new building is located outside of the built-up area boundary (BUAB) of West Chiltington Common and is also located within the Green Gap (Policy 9) as per the Storrington, Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst we acknowledge that the development imposes on the Green Gap, we judge that the type and scale of development would not contribute to the coalescence of the rural settlements.

3.3 **HDC Environmental Health**: Comment
This department does not object to this application provided that the building is only used for the occupier of Ridge View's own pet dog. It must not be used in the course of a business or any commercial use. This is to protect the amenity of residential neighbours.

3.4 **HDC Arboriculture**: Advice
The mature trees along the laneside adjacent to the new building mainly consist of ash in various states of decline due to infection with ash dieback disease. These trees would not be considered a significant constraint on site development due to their condition. They will foreseeably require removal within the next 10 years in any event.

There is a mature oak off the SE corner of the building in the hedgerow line. This tree may have suffered some root disturbance from construction and associated process. The submissions state that the building sits on ski's with no function or excavation of the underlying soil.

A lightweight structure supported on the existing ground levels in the current build position would not have been a reason for refusal on Arboricultural impact grounds, subject to control of the development process and construction as proposed.

The building and associated use is recognised within the accompanying ecological assessment as being partly within the minimum recommended buffer from new development (15m) to the adjacent Ancient Woodland, Perrett's Copse, situated on the Eastern side of Spinney Lane. An ecological assessment of indirect impacts associated with the change is advised in this respect.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

3.5 **Ecology Consultant**: Recommend grant permission subject to conditions.
We note that no baseline information is available for this application as works are already complete and therefore the Ecology Statement (Arun Ecology Ltd., August 2024) does not comment on the impact of works on protected species.

The mitigation and enhancement measures identified in the Ecology Statement (Arun Ecology Ltd., August 2024), should be secured by a condition of any consent, and implemented in full. This is necessary to conserve and enhance protected and Priority Species.

3.7 **Natural England**: No Objection
We concur with the conclusion of your authority's HRA appropriate assessment insofar that adverse effects on the integrity of the Arun Valley Designated sites can be ruled out, as such:

We have no objections subject to the: delivery, management and maintenance of measures identified in the water neutrality statement to achieve water neutrality.

3.8 **NatureSpace (District Newt Licencing Scheme):** Comment
A retrospective application is not considered relevant to the District Licence as any impacts that would result from the development have already occurred. I therefore have no comments to make at this time.

3.9 **West Chiltington Parish Council**: Objection
The Parish Council wishes to lodge a strong objection to this application. Should the planning officer be minded to approve it, the Parish Council requests that the application be referred to HDC's Planning Committee (South).

This is effectively a reprise of withdrawn application DC/23/1371 with the only real change being that the applicant is now claiming that the dilapidated shelter which was allegedly removed and replaced by the new kennels which was previously used to house the same dogs (racing greyhounds).

The description of the 'removed' shelter in the original application makes it very clear that this was not the case - the Design and Access Statement said 'The existing dilapidated shelter, now removed, was no longer fit for purpose. It was of timber frame construction, with horizontal timber board cladding and a flat roof. The studs and rafters were open internally with no cavities or concealed areas. There were two large openings on the west elevation, facing the prevailing wind.'

As such, and without any other material changes to the application, the same reasons for refusal are maintained.

- *No justification has been provided with respect to the siting of the kennel building outside of the existing residential curtilage, and it has not been demonstrated that the development could not be appropriately located within this area.*

As such, the proposed development represents inappropriate development within a countryside location, outside of the BUAB, within the buffer zone of the ancient woodland at Perrett's Copse, and on a site allocated as a Green Gap within the Storrington Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031 and is has not been demonstrated that the development would meet any of the criteria listed within Policy 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015). There are no material considerations which would outweigh harm arising from conflict with Policies 1, 2, 3 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- *The proposal does not satisfy Water Neutrality, as required.*

- *Sufficient information is unable to be submitted to establish the protection of the ecological and biodiversity interests of the site and whether suitable mitigations or enhancements are necessary and achievable, contrary to Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).*

The inclusion of 188 sq m of land to be considered for change of use (when the dog kennel only represents about 40 sq m) is both 'peculiar' and unacceptable. The applicant should be questioned about the reason for this request - are they planning subsequent applications for extended living accommodation/new development? This has happened with this applicant in the past with the creation of Ridge View. Any development by stealth in this protected countryside location needs to be firmly resisted. West Chiltington residents rely on officers of the LPA to protect them from such activity.

3.10 **Storrington, Sullington and Washington Parish Council:** Objection
Members strongly OBJECTED to this application at the Storrington and Sullington Parish Council meeting held on 21st October 2023. The reasons for the objection included:

No material changes to SDSPC's 2023 objection to the same application. Support for West Chiltington PC's comments. The original SSPC objection is listed below.

Having reviewed the application and all letters of representation, Committee Members fully endorse the views of many nearby residents that this planning application regards a site located outside the built-up area of West Chiltington and outside the settlement boundary, instead being located within the 15 m buffer zone of the ancient forest of Perrett's Copse and within the Green Gap identified in the Storrington, Sullington, and Washington Neighbourhood Plan. Concerns are also appreciated that this application would require a change in use from agricultural to residential, and this could create a dangerous precedent for a residential 'creep' into currently protected agricultural land in which development is not allowed. If the Planning Officer is minded to grant permission for this application then Members request that the application goes before the HDC Planning Committee.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

3.11 35 letters of representation were received in conjunction with the proposal. 14 letters of representation received from 11 separate addresses supporting the proposal on the following grounds:

- Improvement over replacement shelter
- Improve the surroundings.
- Structure not overbearing.
- Does not infringe on privacy.
- No evidence that there would be negative impact on local wildlife.
- The use of the land not changing

3.12 19 letters of representation received from 16 separate addresses objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- Encroachment into the countryside
- Outside curtilage of Ridge View
- Contrary to neighbourhood plans
- Contrary to development plan
- Retrospective application
- Preservation of the Green Gap
- Harm to trees and landscaping
- Loss of general amenity
- Highways and Parking
- Overdevelopment
- Allows further urbanisation within Wells' Cottages Conservation Area

3.13 1 letter of representation received from 1 separate address neither objecting to nor supporting the proposal stating:

- No complaints were received regarding noise nuisance arising from the applicants' dogs.

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

4.1 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.

4.2 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.

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

Principle of Development

6.1 The proposal seeks retrospective permission to retain kennels for personal use. The host dwellinghouse is within the built-up area boundary of West Chiltington Common. However, the kennels are located south of the dwelling on a separate field, outside of the built-up area. The application site is therefore considered to be within a countryside location.

6.2 Policy 26, Countryside Protection, of the HDPF states that all proposals (in the Countryside) *must* be essential to its countryside location and 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.

6.3 In addition, proposals must be of a scale appropriate to its countryside character and location. The policy also notes that development will be considered acceptable where it does not lead, either individually or cumulatively, to a significant increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside, and protects, and/or conserves, and / or enhances, the key features and characteristics of the landscape character area in which it is located.

6.4 The application site is also located within an area designated as Green Gap under Policy 9 of the Storrington Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood plan 2018-2031. This seeks to resist development between Storrington and West Chiltington for the prevention of coalescence of the settlements. Whilst the proposal would be sited within the Green Gap under Policy 9, given the scale of the proposal which is limited to what can be considered a residential outbuilding, it would not represent a degree of harm to conflict with this policy.

6.5 It is noted that Ridge View benefits from a reasonably sized curtilage which extends to the north and west of the dwelling. There appear to be no existing detached buildings within the curtilage, save from a detached garage is located to the north-east of the dwelling. A design and access statement submitted within the application details a number of reasons for the justification of the kennel building being located outside of the existing curtilage of the dwelling. It is noted that the Council's Landscape Consultant commented that the visual amenity and character of the new building would be limited and there would be minimal concerns, subject to additional mitigation measures.

6.6 It should be noted that the present application is a resubmission of ref: DC/23/1371, following a withdrawal of the previous application due to need for additional information. The Design and Access Statement now provides justification for the kennels being situated outside of the residential curtilage, namely that the kennel is a replacement structure replacing an existing dilapidated shelter which was used for the shelter of greyhounds. This use has been carried out for years previously. While it is acknowledged that the new building would be in the same location as the previous timber structure and using the same access; the existing structure was 2.43m tall, 4.45m wide and extended 8.85m in length. Therefore, the new building would be a sizeable replacement, with the proposed timber boarding fencing extending the perceived appearance of the building further.

6.7 Furthermore, the kennels are for personal and incidental use, for the purpose of keeping the applicant's own dogs. The design and access statement reiterates that the kennels would not be used for commercial purposes and that the incidental use can be conditioned. However, as the kennel falls outside the bounds of the defined residential curtilage, the incidental use cannot be conditioned and would not have a connection to the main dwellinghouse which is located over 30m away. The granting of permission for the kennels would effectively be allowing the curtilage of the dwelling to expand beyond the built-up-area boundary, which is unacceptable in principle, as it is not deemed essential to the countryside location. Furthermore, the grant of permission would affectively result in the extension of the residential curtilage into the countryside of some 0.14acres (568m2), the resultant arrangement of which would not appear consistent with the prevailing character of the area (further discussed below), and use of this scale not being essential to the countryside location.

6.8 While justification has been provided for the position of the kennel by comparison to the previous proposal, it has not been demonstrated that the development subject of the application could not be appropriately accommodated within the existing residential curtilage of Ridge View. In addition, it is not considered that there is justification for the extension of the private garden into the countryside. It is considered unacceptable to expand the curtilage of the dwelling into the countryside, beyond the built-up boundary. The development would not meet any of the criteria listed in Policy 26 of the HDPF and the development and is therefore considered unacceptable.

<u>Design and Appearance</u>

6.9 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.

6.10 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.

6.11 Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.

6.12 The character of the area to the north of the site within the built-up area boundary is large detached dwellinghouses set back within their plots. To the south of the site, the area is rural with some sporadic development. The plans submitted indicate the amount of fencing erected on site. The kennels are 3.17m at its tallest, with an eaves height of 2.19m. The building is 5.45m wide, and 9.86m long, which is a sizeable building. The materials are horizontal stained timber cladding, with brown onduline corrugated roof sheets.

6.13 The site and neighbouring properties are located on the edge of the built-up area boundary, with properties along the boundary contained within residential curtilages located inside of the built-up area. The granting of permission would authorise the retention of an extended residential curtilage which, although relatively small, would create an awkward projection into the countryside. The enlargement would form an anomalous feature in the landscape, with little resemblance to the pattern and field divisions present in this location. The layout of the resulting curtilage would not therefore follow a clear or logical subdivision of the field and would appear at odds with the prevailing siting / layout of surrounding development.

6.14 The siting and scale of the building in conjunction with the kennel access, pen areas and overall level of residential paraphernalia within an otherwise rural field is considered to harm the character and appearance of the site. The Council's Landscape Consultant has commented, advising that the wider landscape impact would be localised and not significantly adverse. The Consultant has though identified a number of mitigations which would be necessary to mitigate the urbanisign effect of the development on the rural landscape edge of West Chiltington Common, these mitigations include the removal of closeboarded fencing and its replacement with post and rail fencing, and additional hedgerow and tree planting along the boundary of the site with the adjoining public right of way (which would be outside of the red line of the application site but within the blue line of the applicant's wider ownership). It would not be possible to secure the totality of the identified mitigations through condition, and as submitted the proposal does not make provision for improved screening at the edge of the field boundary. As such there are concerns that the scale of the development is inconsistent with the prevailing character of the area.

<u>Amenity Impacts</u>

6.15 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.

6.16 Given the proximity of the proposal and the nearest PROW, it is relevant to consider the impact of the proposal on the PROW. Given the design of the proposal, and site boundary treatment, it is considered that the proposal would not give rise to any unacceptable impact from the Public Right of Way.

6.17 Furthermore, it is acknowledged that the kennels would accommodate up to 4 dogs at a time for personal use only. The nearest neighbouring amenity is located approximately 83m north of the site and 134m to the South. Therefore, while it is considered that the kennels are large, there would not be significant noise impacts to nearby residential properties due to the sufficient distance. It is also noted that the Council's Environmental Health Office had no objection to the building, as long as was not used for commercial use, to protect the amenity of residential neighbours. Overall, there are no objection to the proposal in regards to Policies 32 or 33 of the HDPF.

Highways and Parking

6.18 Policy 40 of the HDPF state that development should provide safe and adequate access suitable for all users. Policy 41 of the HDPF provides that development should provide adequate parking facilities to meet the needs of anticipated users, including appropriate provision to support electric vehicles and to meet the needs of cyclists and motorcyclists.

6.19 No additional parking has been included within the proposal. However, there are alterations to the site access which links the proposal with the rest of the site. The access to the site is from a path to the main dwellinghouse and also in connection with the Public Right of Way. Had this proposal been otherwise acceptable, the parking and access would have been dealt with by way of a suitably worded condition.

6.20 With the above in mind, there are no highways grounds to resist the proposal.

Water Neutrality

6.21 In September 2021 the Local Planning Authority received a 'Position Statement' from Natural England pertaining to the use of groundwater within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone and the effects of groundwater supply on the Arun Valley Ramsar, Special Area of Conservation and Special Protection Area habitat sites. The 'Position Statement' advises that groundwater abstraction supplying the public mains-network may be adversely affecting the integrity of Arun Valley habitat sites.

6.22 The advice issued by Natural England, within the Position Statement, is that Planning Authorities within the Supply Zone pause decisions until a strategy is devised, in partnership with Natural England, to offset increased water-use associated with new development within the Supply Zone. Where it is critical that individual applications proceed Natural England advise that any application needs to demonstrate 'water-neutrality', such to provide certainty that new development will not further contribute to the existing adverse effect known from public groundwater abstraction.

6.23 The application site falls within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone, where increased demand for mains-water would exacerbate demand for the continued use/scale of public groundwater abstractions at Hardham Water Works contributing to associated adverse effect upon the integrity of the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites.

6.24 The applicant has provided Water Neutrality calculations in support of this application. The daily water demand of six dogs will be 50ml per kilogram of the dog's weight. The water demand required for each dog will be 1.25 litres/dog/day, which would result in a water demand of 7.5 litres/day for the proposed kennel. Rainwater harvesting would offset the increased water demand, with this collecting 16.41 litres/dog/day. A 300-litre rainwater harvesting tank would be installed and this would be sufficient to offset the increased usage on site, reducing it down to 0 l/day. This is considered sufficient and would make the proposal water neutral. Officers are content that this mitigation could be adequately controlled by way of condition in the event that permission were to be granted.

Ecology

6.25 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.

6.26 No baseline information was provided within the application as the works are already completed and the potential impact on protected species would be retrospective. The site lies 8.3km southeast of The Mens Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and falls within the 12km Wilder Conservation Area for the SAC. The surrounding mature trees would be retained and there would be no severance to the flight lines of foraging or commuting bats from the SAC and habitat connectivity within the site will be maintained.

6.27 The Ecology report details that retrospective ecological enhancements are proposed to the design of the development to incorporate artificial habitat boxes for wildlife. These include two solitary bee boxes installed within a sunny location, and two boxes suitable for nesting birds. These are considered acceptable enhancement and the Ecology consultant was content that enhancement measures could be secured by condition.

Conclusion

6.28 The application seeks retrospective permission for the change of use of land from agricultural to residential with the construction of the kennels.

6.29 While justification for the site's location has been provided within the Design and Access Statement, it is not considered that this reasoning has satisfactorily demonstrated that the development could not be appropriately located within the curtilage of the main house. The proposal would not meet any of the criteria listed under Policy 26 of the HDPF, and there is considered to be no benefits that would outweigh the harm. The proposal would extend the curtilage of the dwellinghouse into the countryside, beyond the built up area boundary. This has implications for the further development and use of this area. As such, the development is considered unacceptable in principle.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 To refuse the planning application for the following reason:

1. It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the siting of the development in a countryside setting, outside of the curtilage of the existing dwelling, would be acceptable as the site is located beyond a defined built-up area boundary, and is therefore not considered to represent an essential form of development to its rural location. Furthermore, the resultant use of the site at this scale remains inconsistent with the prevailing character of the area. The principle of development is therefore considered unacceptable, with the proposed development

deemed contrary to the overarching spatial strategy of the development plan outlined within Policies 25, 26 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).