Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DC/24/1564
Mannings Heath Golf Club, Hammerpond Road, Mannings Heath, West Sussex, RH13 6PG

DESCRIPTION:
Creation of an access track (Retrospective).

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/22/1027	Creation of an access track to provide access to vineyard (Retrospective).	Application Refused on 16.01.2024
DC/21/0603	Retention of the barn currently under construction, to provide a dual-purpose facility for vineyard staff welfare/vineyard storage, and vineyard tours. Associated hard and soft landscaping works.	Application Refused on 04.06.2021
DC/20/2531	Retention of existing barn currently under construction, to provide a dual-purpose facility for vineyard staff welfare/vineyard storage, and vineyard tours. Associated hard and soft landscaping works.	Withdrawn Application on 15.02.2021
DC/20/0756	Retrospective application for the demolition of existing barn, and erection of a replacement barn for agricultural storage use, and laying of hardcore for access track	Application Permitted on 13.08.2020
DC/22/1553	Internal alterations to convert existing meeting rooms, stores and office spaces to form 9no guest bedrooms with en-suites with associated external alterations.	Application Permitted on 14.11.2022
DC/23/1175	The proposed use of the building for viticulture, specifically the production and storage of wine constitutes an agricultural practice (Certificate of Lawful Development Proposed)	Withdrawn Application on 07.08.2023
DC/23/1791	The proposed use of the building for viticulture, specifically the production and storage of wine constitutes an agricultural practice (Certificate of Lawful Development Proposed)	Application Permitted on 21.11.2023

SITE LOCATION & DESCRIPTION:

The application relates to a site within the Mannings Heath Golf Course and Vineyard. The track accessed via the existing PROW which travels south to north on the western boundary of the site (Bridleway 2822) and is formed of compacted hardcore at 100mm in depth. The application does not include areas outside of the redline, such as the area of the PROW which appears to have been widened. The track travels on the western perimeter of the vineyard within two fields, cutting through pre-existing field boundaries and ancient woodland (AW) (Millfield Copse), opening onto a large hardstanding area serving the vineyard building. The site is wholly rural in character, sited within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The application seeks retrospective planning permission for the creation of an access track to provide access to vineyard. The track is a private access road, sitting adjacent to both the Golf club (Manning's Heath) and Hawkins Pond and is existing. The track runs in a North Easterly direction for a distance of approximately concluding at a barn structure.

The track follows the pre-existing route with the adjacent vegetation, shrubbery and trees providing visual screening from Hammerpond Road.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):
Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development
Policy 10 - Rural Economic Development
Policy 11 - Tourism and Cultural Facilities
Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
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
Policy 34 - Cultural and Heritage Assets
Policy 37 - Sustainable Construction
Policy 38 - Strategic Policy: Flooding
Policy 39 - Strategic Policy: Infrastructure Provision
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking
Policy 42 - Strategic Policy: Inclusive Communities
Policy 43 - Community Facilities, Leisure and Recreation

Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan:
14 Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

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 2.9 years. 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 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 24: Sustainable Transport
Policy 25: Parking
Strategic Policy 27: Inclusive Communities, Health and Wellbeing
Policy 28: Community Facilities, Leisure and Recreation

Strategic Policy 29: New Employment
Strategic Policy 30: Enhancing Existing Employment
Policy 31: Rural Economic Development

Supplementary Planning Guidance:
Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD (2017)
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2017)

Parish Design Statement:

Planning Advice Notes:
Facilitating Appropriate Development
Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

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 Arboricultural officer: 30/10/2024
If an application had been received for a new access track engineered by excavation/compaction and infill with hardcore in this position it would not have been recommended for permission without reasons for applying exceptional need and appropriate mitigation that outweighed the constraint on development posed by an irreplaceable landscape resource (Ancient Woodland - AW).

Therefore, I recommend a standard reason for refusal in respect of failure to conform with both Local and National requirements for conservation of AW that is a material consideration in the assessment of landscape impact.

HDC Arboricultural Officer: 20/11/2024
The applicant's response (dated 04/11/24) to my observations on the direct and indirect impacts on the Ancient Woodland (AW) resource from the construction and use of the access track are noted.
The impact of engineering within the key rooting areas of trees and specifically within the minimum recommended root protection areas (RPA's) of trees, can have both direct and indirect impacts in terms of tree root loss/death and future tree health.

The effects of these impacts can take many years to show clear signs of tree health decline. Nonetheless, the impacts are recognised facts and hence the relevant British Standard (BS:5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition, and construction – Recommendations) recognises that the RPA should be an area of construction exclusion and no excavation into the soil or compaction of the rooting medium should be considered appropriate.

In addition, the guidance accompanying the NPPF recommends that the minimum buffer between new engineering and Ancient Woodland should be 15m. This is partly to ensure that the rooting environments of the trees within the woodland are not foreseeably likely to be affected.

Therefore, to re-iterate my earlier observations, if an application had been received for a new access track engineered by excavation/compaction and infill with hardcore within the RPA of trees situated within the AW I would not have been able to support it as a sustainable form of development that complied with either National planning policy or Local plan policy.

Archaeology Consultant:
Although part of the access track is within an Archaeological Notification Area, it is unlikely that the work has impacted upon buried archaeological remains and so we have no concerns regarding this application

Ecology Consultant:

Recommend grant permission subject to conditions
Subject to Natural England's formal comments on the conclusion of the Water Neutrality Appropriate Assessment

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 115), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

WSCC Rights of Way:
In light of the above information my recommendation is one of 'Objection' pending implementation of measures to mitigate the risk of conflict between motor vehicle traffic and lawful users of the Public Right of Way.

District Newt Licensing Officer:
Thank you for consulting me on the above planning application. The type of development is not considered to be relevant to the District Licensing Scheme as in a retrospective application, any and all works that have the potential to impact great crested newts have already occurred. I therefore have no comments to make at this time. If the proposal changes, then please seek further advice from me if necessary.

Woodland Trust:
The Trust objects to this planning application on the basis of loss and deterioration of Millfield Copse (grid ref: TQ 21571 29504), designated as Ancient Semi Natural Woodland on Natural England's Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI).

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:

Representations:
12 letters of Objection have been received from 9 addresses, objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Loss of General Amenity
- Other
- Trees and Landscaping
- Imact on ancient woodland
- Highway safety
- impact on area of natural beauty
- Highways access and parking
- Overdevelopment
- Impact on the PROW Bridleway.
- Privacy Light and Noise

Parish Comments:
In the event that the officers are minded to propose the acceptance of this application, Nuthurst Parish Council would ask for it to go to full committee and that the Parish Council is allowed to speak to their objections at the meeting.

It was RESOLVED to STRONGLY OBJECT to this application using wording from the last representation made at the first application.

The Parish Council strongly objects to this retrospective application for a roadway to achieve access to the vineyard and a barn owned by Mannings Heath Golf Club for the following three reasons:

1. The road within the vineyard has been created across land of special and protected significance. It is within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and very near St Leonards Forest which is a Site of Special Scientific Interest, as well as part of the nature corridor initiative, Weald to Waves, which

is supported by HDC. No tree survey or ecological report has ever been provided. This road was a cavalier act that has urbanised the area and should not be supported.

2. This road within the vineyard has been connected to a public highway (Hammerpond Road) by utilising a stretch of the public bridleway 2822 for vehicular use, without permission from WSCC's Public Rights of Way Officer. This bridleway is used by walkers, horse-riders and cyclists and there has been no consideration given to their safety when faced with commercial lorries taking away grapes, delivering fertilisers etc.

3. Mannings Heath Golf Club has, in effect, created a new vehicular access onto a public highway without even applying for or gaining permission from WSCC Highways. Please refer to EN/24/0015 Alleged: Use of unauthorised track subject of refused application DC/22/1027 and PROW 2822 by vehicular traffic in connection with vineyard tours.

It should be noted that Mannings Heath Golf Club already has a perfectly good access to its vineyard via its own track across the Kingfisher Golf Course. Using a stretch of the public bridleway for its vehicles and creating a new vehicular access onto Hammerpond Road are therefore completely unnecessary.

For all these reasons, the Parish Council trusts that HDC will refuse this very tardy retrospective application.

Member Comments:
A request has been received from Councillor Livingstone that the application be taken to Planning Committee North should the officer be minded to recommend approval.

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:

Policies 25, 32, and 33 of the HDPF promote development that protects, conserves and enhances the landscape character from inappropriate development. Proposal should take into account landscape characteristics, with development seeking to provide an attractive, functional and accessible environment that complements the locally distinctive character of the district.

The provision of HDPF Policies 10 (rural economic development), 11 (tourism and cultural facilities) and 26 (countryside protection) also apply to this application; and given the site is located within the High Weald AONB the provisions of Policy 30 (protected landscape) are also relevant in the assessment.

Policy 26 of the HDPF supports development in the countryside provided it is considered to be 'appropriate' and 'essential' to its countryside location, as well as meeting one of 4 criteria including supporting the needs of agriculture. In addition, development in these areas must not lead to a significant increase in activity in the countryside, and must conserve the existing countryside character.

Policy 10 encourages sustainable rural economic development, provided it maintains the quality and character of the area, and provided it contributes to the wider rural economy and/or promotes recreation and enjoyment of the countryside.

Policy 11 supports measures which promote tourism, but requires development to be of a scale and type appropriate to its location. Tourism proposals within the High Weald AONB must be in keeping with the countryside around them.

Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) discusses the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment. Paragraph 180(a) requires planning decisions to seek to protect and enhance valued landscapes, and this follows at paragraph 182 which notes that Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) have the 'highest status of protection' with regard to landscape matters, and states that 'great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty' in these areas. Paragraph 182 further states that the 'scale and extent of development [within an AONB] should be limited'.

The proposed track in this application leads to an erected barn that has previously been refused permission and appeal dismissed in May 2022 for retention of the barn to provide a dual-purpose facility for vineyard staff welfare/vineyard storage, and vineyard tours with associated hard and soft landscaping works. This followed planning permission being granted in August 2020 for demolition of an existing barn, and erection of a replacement barn for agricultural storage use, and laying of hardcore for access track. A certificate (DC/23/1791) was granted on 21.11.2023 confirming that the use if the building for the purposes serving a vineyard does not constitute development, therefore confirming lawful use of the building in connection with an agricultural enterprise.

Given the tracks use in connection with an existing agricultural use (as approved under certificate DC/23/1791), the use can therefore be considered to be essential, thus the principle of the development accepted in principle (notwithstanding other material planning considerations as detailed below).

Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

Policy 30 of the HDPF states that the natural beauty and public enjoyment of the High Weald AONB will be conserved and enhanced and opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of their special qualities will be promoted. Proposals should have regard to any management plans for these areas and must demonstrate:

a. How the key landscape features or components of natural beauty will be conserved and enhanced. This includes maintaining local distinctiveness, sense of place and setting of the protected landscapes, and if necessary providing mitigation or compensation measures.
b. How the public enjoyment of these landscapes will be retained.
c. How the proposal supports the economy of the protected landscape and will contribute to the social wellbeing of the population who live and work in these areas.

Policy 33(6) of the HDPF states that development shall be required to presume in favour of the retention of existing important landscape and natural features, for example trees, hedges, banks and watercourses. Development must relate sympathetically to the local landscape and justify and mitigate against any losses that may occur through the development.

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.

Policy 14 of the Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan states that *"Development proposals will be permitted provided that:*

I. they do not significantly affect habitats for flora and fauna and wildlife corridors and if they do appropriate measures are taken to mitigate the effects in agreement with the relevant authorities;

II. they use, for example, natural Sussex post/rail fencing or hedges and not close boarded fencing in order to preserve wildlife corridors;

III. they do not affect ponds and lakes (natural and man-made), streams and rivers (surface and underground) and that adequate measures are taken, in consultation with appropriate authorities, to prevent localised flooding; and

IV. IV. public footpaths and bridleways are retained."

The access track has been constructed with the southern tip of The Millfield Copse Ancient Woodland where it extends to another track which meets the Hammerpond Roadside. The Council's Arboricultural Officer has advised that the woodland is over 600m long and provides valuable landscape linkage to other woodland and hedgerows in the surrounding area. It is not possible to ascertain the extent of direct vegetation removal that has occurred, though it is known that this resulted in the loss of some AW. There has been historic vehicle access for maintenance vehicles across/through the woodland both at the northern infringement and in the southern section, from when the vineyard formed part of the golf course. However, no formal access intersected the AW.

The proposal has resulted the removal of some woodland, and the current heightened levels of vehicle access and parking are expected to lead to activities that will further strip the vegetative woodland edges through ground disturbance. A portion of the development falls within the AW, and nearly the entire development is situated within the minimum recommended buffer (of 15m) from any new development adjacent to AW. If an application had been submitted for a new vehicle access point in this location, it would not have been recommended for approval without a thorough assessment of its impact on the AW. The Woodland Trust have commented on the proposal and concur with the above. Furthermore, compelling reasons for an exceptional need and appropriate mitigation would need to be provided, demonstrating that they outweigh the constraints on development imposed by the irreplaceable landscape resource.

Paragraph 180 (a) states that Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: *"protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan)".* Paragraph 182 of the NPPF goes on to state that ".*Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads*

The proposal does not provide a Landscape Impact Assessment. The impact of the proposal on the landscape has been included within the Design and Access Statement. The statement ascertains that an agricultural track is not an uncommon feature within a rural location and the natural material used reflect other tracks within the estate. It also asserts that it is not possible to confirm the amount of trees lost or removed is minimal, and in terms of loss not observable. Replacement tree planting is also proposed to mitigate any arboricultural loss. While it may have been considered when the survey was carried out that no observable loss had occurred the Arboricultural Officer has stated that "*The effects of these impacts (on the AW) can take many years to show clear signs of tree health decline."*

As per paragraph 180 and 182 of the NPPF expect development to protect and enhance landscapes, such as the application site. The policies assign great weight to the conservation and enhancement of the landscape. Paragraph 182 expects "*. The scale and extent of development within all these designated areas should be limited, while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas".*

While the LPA recognise that a track of some kind would not be uncommon in a rural area, and some mitigation has been provided, it is not considered sufficient justification has been provided for the

landscape harm. No justification or information has been given to demonstrate the scale and extent of the development has been limited or that the access track has been sensitively located. Furthermore, the use of the tracks materials across the rest of the site is not considered significant justification as to its acceptability given the tracks proximity to the PROW and AW.

Turning to the mitigation and compensation proposed, the Ecologist has confirmed this would be acceptable. Were the proposal supportable these would be secured by condition. The LPA accepts that the mitigation and compensation proposed is accepted by the Ecologist; however, the Arboricultural Officer's concerns remain.

This circumstance creates a balance in which the LPA have proceeded to use the NPPF to aide in assessing the proposal further.

Paragraph 186 c of the NPPF states" *development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists*"

While it may be that a suitable compensation strategy is attainable via condition the LPA do not consider that a wholly exceptional reason has been provided for the loss and potential deterioration of AW has been provided. The LPA recognise that the track is considered necessary by the applicant to allow them to access the vineyard and vineyard barn related to the business use of the site. While this would have some benefit in regards to economic gain, the benefit would be primarily private. While, this need is appreciated the LPA does not consider this to be a wholly exceptional reason. The submission does not include information on the reasons for the accesses exact location, or evidence that other less harmful locations and construction methods have been considered and the reasons for their dismissal.

Though the principle of the development would be accepted, the applicant has not suitably demonstrated that the proposal would not result in adverse landscape harm, nor balanced any potential benefits against this harm, nor justified the visual harm resulting from the loss of the AW on the site. Policy 30 is clear in setting out the requirements needed for proposals to demonstrate that development would conserve or enhance the setting of the AONB. The submission is not clear in how this has been achieved. Furthermore, the loss of trees (AW) has not been justified. Therefore, based on the current level of information it is considered that the proposal is not acceptable due to failure to comply with both Local and National requirements for conservation of AW that is a material consideration in the assessment of landscape impact, contrary to Policies 30 and 33(6) of the HDPF and Paragraph 180(a) and 182 of the NPPF.

Highways

Access to the proposed retrospective surfaced track is demonstrated on the block plan to be across the golf course. Permission is not sought for the surfacing of this element, but the track from the vineyard barn to the vineyard. Permission has not been sought for the area adjoining the surface which then provides access to Hammerpond Road.

The Local Highway Authority have confirmed that the proposal is not anticipated to give rise to a material intensification of use of the existing access point, and no capacity concerns have been raised. They have also confirmed that there is no evidence to suggest the existing access has been operating unsafely, or that the proposals would exacerbate an existing safety concern. As such the LHA do 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.

Given the comments for the LHA, with an amended redline when compared with DC/22/1027, the proposal is considered acceptable on highway grounds. Concerns have been raised about the access to the road in objections, this element is not within the redline and therefore cannot be considered within this assessment.

Public Right of Way

The PROW Officer has confirmed that while the use and crossing of the bridleway maybe lawful (provided the express permission of the landowner is given) the users of the PROW have priority over vehicular traffic. The officer has raised concerns that a lack of signage is present to warn vehicle drivers of the presence of other users. Were the application supportable the implementation of measures to mitigate the risk of conflict between motor vehicle traffic and lawful users of the Public Right of Way could be secured by condition. The impact on the public right of way is therefore not considered to be a reason for refusal.

Amenity Impacts:

Policy 33(2) of the HDPF states 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, for example through overlooking or noise, whilst having regard to the sensitivities of surrounding development. Whilst it is appreciated that the use of the access has likely resulted in an increase level of activity to and from the site, this would not be considered out of the ordinary given the agricultural use of the site within a rural setting. As such, no objection is raised to the proposal with regards to amenity impact.

Water Neutrality:

There is no clear or compelling evidence to suggest the nature and scale of the proposed development would result in a more intensive occupation of the site necessitating an increased consumption of water that would result in a significant impact on the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. The grant of planning permission would not therefore adversely affect the integrity of these sites or otherwise conflict with policy 31 of the HDPF, NPPF paragraph 186 and the Council's obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

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) and that every planning permission granted for the development of land in England shall be deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that development must not be begun unless a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority and the planning authority has approved the Plan.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must show how the development will achieve the required minimum 10% BNG using the statutory biodiversity metric tool, and must demonstrate how the habitats will be managed and maintained for 30 years, starting from the date the development is completed. Off-site gains and significant on-site enhancements will be secured over this period by way of a Legal Agreement.

The application is retrospective made under Section 73(A) of the Town and Country Planning Act.

Conclusions:

Whilst the principle of the development is accepted, owing to its use in connection with an agricultural enterprise, the proposal has not suitably demonstrated or justified resultant landscape harm or loss of ancient woodland. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 30 and 33 of the HDPF and Paragraphs 180, 182 and 186 of the NPPF.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason for Refusal:

1 The retrospective works has resulted in the loss of Ancient Woodland within a wholly rural location within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which has caused wider adverse visual

impact on the countryside, insufficient justification for this loss of woodland and landscape harm. The proposal therefore fails to protect or enhance the protected landscape character and rural setting, contrary to Policies 30 and 33(6) of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), and Paragraphs 180, 182 and 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

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/24/1564

Schedule of plans/documents **not approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location plan		NONE	08.10.2024
Block plan		NONE	08.10.2024
Supporting Statement		Retrospective Arboricultural Impact Assessment	06.11.2024
Supporting Statement		ECOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT	17.10.2024
Supporting Statement		PRELIMINARY ECOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT	17.10.2024

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Alice Johnson Date: 06.12.2024

Authorising Officer sign/initial RHERMITAGE Date: 13.12.2024