

Statement of Case for the Local Planning Authority

Prepared by Daniel Holmes, MSc, MRTPI

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE: 6009817
HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL REFERENCE: DC/26/0206

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Planning appeal by **Mr Stephen Jupp** at:
Woodside Equestrian Centre, Forest Road, Colgate, RH12 4TF

The appeal relates to application DC/26/0206 for the retention of top surface to majority of existing hardcore area and its use for the parking of vehicles in connection with the use of the equestrian centre and re-siting of lorry containers onto historic hardsurfaced area

29th June 2026

Table of Contents

1.0	Main Issues	3
2.0	Introduction and Appeal Procedure.....	3

3.0	Planning History	3
4.0	The Appeal Site and Surroundings	4
5.0	The Proposal	4
6.0	Relevant Planning Policy Framework	5
6.0	Main issue 1: Principle of Development and Rural Economic Development	6
7.0	Main Issue 2: Impact on the Character and Appearance of the High Weald National Landscape	7
8.0	Response to the Appellants Case	9
9.0	Planning Balance and Overall Conclusion	12
10.0	List of Conditions	14

1.0 Main Issues

1.1 The main issues are considered to be:

- i. Whether the development represents an appropriate form of rural economic development having regard to its countryside location, with particular reference to Policies 10 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF).
- ii. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the site and the wider High Weald National Landscape, having regard to Policies 25 and 30 of the HDPF and national policy.

These reflect the reasons for refusal and the matters disputed within the appellant's case.

2.0 Introduction and Appeal Procedure

2.1 This Statement of Case is submitted on behalf of Horsham District Council ("the Council"), the Local Planning Authority, in response to an appeal made under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against the refusal of planning permission for:

Retention of top surface to majority of existing hardcore area and its use for the parking of vehicles in connection with the use of the equestrian centre and re-siting of lorry containers onto historic hard surfaced area (retrospective).

2.2 The Planning permission was refused on 31 March 2026 for two reasons relating to:

- The unjustified nature of the storage use in a countryside location; and
- Harm to the character and appearance of the High Weald National Landscape.

2.3 The appeal is proceeding by way of the written representations procedure. The LPA relies on the evidence presented in the officer report and this Statement of Case. For the reasons set out in this Statement, the Council respectfully requests that the appeal be dismissed.

3.0 Planning History

3.1 The site has a relevant planning history, most notably:

- DC/24/1405 – Retention of hardstanding and use of land for storage of lorry containers and touring caravans. Refused September 2025.
- Appeal ref. APP/Z3825/W/25/3374616 – Dismissed. The Inspector concluded that the development resulted in harm to the character and appearance of the area and failed to demonstrate an essential need for a countryside location.

3.2 The current proposal represents a revised scheme, including the removal of touring caravans, a reduction in the number of containers, and relocation of storage away from the site frontage. However, a similar amended scheme was put forward during the appeal process and was not considered as it was materially different.

3.3 Accordingly, the previous appeal decision remains a significant material consideration in the determination of this appeal.

4.0 The Appeal Site and Surroundings

- 4.1 A full description of the site and its context is set out within the Officer's Report, which the Council relies upon for the purposes of this appeal. The summary below is provided to establish the agreed baseline against which the appeal proposal should be assessed.
- 4.2 The appeal site comprises a long-established equestrian centre located outside any defined built-up area and therefore within the countryside.
- 4.3 The site is irregular in shape and comprises areas of hardstanding, including recently resurfaced areas forming part of a wider parcel of land. The northern boundary abuts Forest Road and beyond this lies Spurs Orchard Wood, an area of designated Ancient Woodland.
- 4.4 The surrounding landscape is rural in character and forms part of the High Weald National Landscape, specifically within the St Leonard's Forest Landscape Character Area, which is characterised by a strongly wooded, enclosed and tranquil environment with high sensitivity to change.
- 4.5 Boundary treatments include stock fencing to the western and southern edges, and vegetation and mature roadside trees to the north. These trees contribute positively to the sylvan and enclosed character of the area.
- 4.6 The site, whilst containing built equestrian infrastructure, remains experienced as part of a wider rural landscape.

5.0 The Proposal

- 5.1 The proposal seeks retrospective planning permission for two principal elements:
 - The retention of a top surface applied to an existing hardcore area and its use for vehicle parking associated with the equestrian centre; and
 - The siting of up to 7–8 lorry storage containers within the southern part of the site.
- 5.2 The proposal follows a previously refused scheme (DC/24/1405), which was dismissed at appeal. The current scheme differs in that it:
 - Removes touring caravans;
 - Reduces the number of containers;
 - Relocates storage away from the roadside boundary; and
 - Defines part of the site as parking associated with the equestrian use.
- 5.3 Notwithstanding these amendments, the development continues to comprise hardstanding and commercial storage use within a countryside location.

6.0 Relevant Planning Policy Framework

- 6.1 In determining this appeal, Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the decision be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 6.2 The statutory Development Plan for the purposes of this appeal comprises the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) ("HDPF"), prepared and adopted by Horsham District Council. The policies of the HDPF carry full weight.

Key Development Plan Policies

- 6.3 Policy 10 – Rural Economic Development - This Policy supports rural economic development where it is appropriate to its location, contributes to the rural economy, and maintains countryside character, including where development is suitably related to existing rural enterprise.
- 6.4 Policy 25 – The Natural Environment and Landscape Character – This Policy requires development to conserve and enhance the natural environment, including landscape character, and to ensure that proposals respect the distinctive qualities of the District's landscapes.
- 6.5 Policy 26 – Countryside Protection – This Policy sets out a clear objective to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside by restricting development outside built-up area boundaries unless it is demonstrably appropriate and compatible with its rural setting.
- 6.6 Policy 30 – Protected Landscapes – This Policy requires development within the High Weald National Landscape to conserve and enhance natural beauty.
- 6.7 These policies are interrelated and should be read as a whole. Collectively, they seek to ensure that development within the rural area is limited, appropriately scaled, and does not result in the gradual erosion of countryside character through the introduction of urbanising forms of development.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 6.8 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration. It requires great weight to be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes.
- 6.9 The NPPF does not override the Development Plan in this case; rather, it reinforces the importance of protecting valued landscapes and ensuring that development is appropriately located and designed.

6.0 Main issue 1: Principle of Development and Rural Economic Development

Policy Context

- 6.1 The appeal site lies outside any defined built-up area and is therefore located within the countryside, where development is subject to strict policy control. In this context, Policies 10 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) are of primary relevance.

- 6.2 Policy 26 seeks to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside by restricting development to that which is essential to its countryside location. The policy also requires that development does not result in a significant increase in activity, and that it conserves and enhances the characteristics of the relevant landscape.
- 6.3 Policy 10 supports rural economic development where it is appropriate in scale and nature to its location, contributes positively to the rural economy, and maintains the quality and character of the countryside. The policy generally supports development that is closely related to existing rural enterprises or uses land and buildings in a manner that is compatible with their rural context.
- 6.4 These policies, when read together, establish that whilst rural diversification is supported in principle, it must remain appropriately linked to the countryside, both functionally and in land-use terms, and must not undermine its character

Policy Conflict

- 6.5 The proposal comprises the retention of extensive hardstanding and the use of part of the site for the storage of lorry containers, representing a commercial storage use. Whilst the appellant places significant reliance on the economic benefits of the development, including its role in supporting the equestrian enterprise, this does not in itself satisfy the requirements of Policies 10 and 26.
- 6.6 Fundamentally, the storage use is not functionally or operationally dependent on a countryside location. It is a form of general commercial storage that could be accommodated within established employment areas, and there is no inherent requirement for it to be located on an equestrian site or in a rural setting. The appellant's case relies primarily on financial considerations; however, it is well established that economic benefit alone does not equate to an essential need for a countryside location.
- 6.7 The previous appeal decision is highly material in this regard. The Inspector explicitly concluded that, whilst the storage use may support the viability of the equestrian business, this did not amount to a justification for locating the development in the countryside. The current submission does not introduce any materially new evidence that would warrant a departure from that conclusion.
- 6.8 Furthermore, the storage use operates in practice as a separate commercial activity, rather than one that is closely integrated with or subordinate to the equestrian use. Whilst some overlap in site use exists, the nature of container storage, including the renting of units to third parties, is materially different from the primary equestrian function of the site.
- 6.9 In addition, the proposal results in a material intensification of use, through the introduction and continued operation of commercial storage activity on the land. This is contrary to Policy 26, which seeks to avoid significant increases in activity in countryside locations.
- 6.10 The appellant's argument that the level of activity associated with the containers is limited does not overcome this policy conflict. The issue is not solely the quantum of movement, but the introduction of a distinct commercial use and associated activity which is unrelated to the intrinsic function of the countryside.

Main Issue 1 Conclusion

- 6.11 For these reasons, the development fails to demonstrate that it is essential to a countryside location, nor that it represents an appropriate or policy-compliant form of rural economic development.
- 6.12 Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with Policies 10 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework, and the findings of the previous appeal decision remain directly applicable. This weighs significantly against the proposal.

7.0 Main Issue 2: Impact on the Character and Appearance of the High Weald National Landscape

Policy Context

- 7.1 The appeal site is located within the High Weald National Landscape, which carries the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.
- 7.2 Policy 25 of the HDPF requires development to protect, conserve and enhance landscape character, taking into account the key characteristics of the relevant landscape.
- 7.3 Policy 30 applies specifically to designated landscapes and requires that development conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the High Weald National Landscape, with particular regard to its landscape character, local distinctiveness and setting.
- 7.4 At a national level, the National Planning Policy Framework requires that great weight is given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes, reflecting their national importance.
- 7.5 The site lies within the St Leonard's Forest Landscape Character Area, which is characterised by a strongly wooded, enclosed and tranquil landscape, with a high sensitivity to change and a particular vulnerability to incremental suburbanisation.

Policy Conflict

- 7.6 The proposal involves the retention of extensive hardstanding and the siting of commercial storage containers, together with the associated use of the site for storage purposes. These elements introduce urbanising and suburbanising features into a rural and highly sensitive landscape.
- 7.7 While the appellant seeks to emphasise that the site is already in equestrian use and contains built form, this does not negate the harm identified. The key issue is not whether the site is entirely undeveloped, but whether the nature of the proposed use and its physical manifestations are compatible with the character of the National Landscape.
- 7.8 The introduction of large areas of exposed hardstanding, together with storage containers of a utilitarian appearance, represents a form of development that is incongruous with the prevailing landscape pattern, which is defined by woodland, pasture and dispersed, low-intensity rural uses.
- 7.9 It is acknowledged that amendments to the scheme, including the relocation of containers away from the roadside boundary and the removal of touring caravans,

have reduced some of the more immediate visual effects, particularly along Forest Road. However, both the Council's Landscape Officer and the previous Inspector have made clear that the principal harm arises not solely from visibility, but from the erosion of the site's rural character and the introduction of inappropriate land uses.

- 7.10 In this respect, the appellant's focus on screening and limited visual receptors does not address the fundamental policy issue. Mitigation planting may reduce intervisibility, but it cannot alter the intrinsic nature of the development, which remains urbanising in form and character.
- 7.11 Furthermore, the proposal contributes to a gradual suburbanisation of the countryside, a key concern identified in the landscape character assessment for this area. The cumulative effect of hardstanding, storage containers and associated paraphernalia results in a perceptible erosion of the site's rural qualities, including its sense of openness, tranquillity and natural character.
- 7.12 The previous appeal decision concluded that such development caused harm to the character and appearance of the National Landscape. The current proposal, despite amendments, retains the same fundamental components of harm and does not represent a materially different form of development in landscape terms.

Main Issue 2 Conclusion

- 7.13 The proposal fails to conserve and enhance the natural beauty and special qualities of the High Weald National Landscape. The harm arises fundamentally from the introduction of urbanising features and the erosion of rural character, rather than from visual effects alone.
- 7.14 This harm carries great weight, in accordance with national policy and the statutory duty to conserve and enhance designated landscapes.
- 7.15 Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with Policies 25 and 30 of the Horsham District Planning Framework and the National Planning Policy Framework, and this weighs heavily against the appeal.

8.0 Response to the Appellants Case

- 8.1 The Local Planning Authority (LPA) has carefully considered the matters raised within the appellant's Statement of Case. However, it remains of the view that the proposal conflicts with the development plan, and that the appellant has not provided sufficient evidence to justify a different conclusion from that reached at the application stage or within the previous dismissed appeal.

Historic Hardstanding and "Permitted Development" Argument

- 8.2 The appellant places significant emphasis on the assertion that the site has historically been hard surfaced and that the works undertaken represent maintenance of that surface. The LPA acknowledges that areas of hardstanding have existed on the site; however, this does not negate the need for planning permission for the current use of the land, including its use as a car park and as part of a wider commercial storage operation.

- 8.3 The appeal proposal must be assessed on the basis of the development as a whole, including both operational development and the material change of use. The fact that some form of hard surface may previously have existed does not justify the intensification of use nor the introduction of a distinct commercial storage activity within the countryside.
- 8.4 Furthermore, this matter does not address the principal concerns arising from Policies 10 and 26, namely whether the development is appropriate to its countryside location and whether it preserves rural character.

Need and Financial Justification

- 8.5 The appellant asserts that there is an essential need for the development to provide income to support the equestrian business, supported by financial information and letters from storage users.
- 8.6 The LPA acknowledges that the proposal may provide a degree of financial benefit and contribute to the viability of the business. However, it is a well-established principle that financial need or business benefit does not, in itself, justify development in the countryside where it conflicts with policy.
- 8.7 As set out in the officer report and confirmed in the previous appeal decision, the key test is not whether the development is financially beneficial, but whether it is functionally or operationally dependent on its countryside location.
- 8.8 In this case, the storage use is a general commercial activity that could be accommodated within established employment areas. The appellant has not demonstrated that there is any functional requirement for this use to be located at the appeal site.
- 8.9 The suggestion that the development represents rural diversification does not override this conclusion. Policy 10 supports diversification where it is compatible with the rural context and closely aligned with the existing enterprise. In this instance, the storage use operates as a largely separate activity, and its reliance to subsidise the equestrian business does not make it policy compliant.

Scale of Activity and Intensification

- 8.10 The appellant contends that the level of activity generated by the storage containers is minimal when compared to the existing equestrian use and therefore should not be considered harmful.
- 8.11 The LPA does not agree with this characterisation. The policy concern is not limited to a numerical comparison of vehicle movements but relates to the nature of the use and the intensification of activity within a rural setting.
- 8.12 The introduction of a commercial storage use, including the renting of containers to third parties, represents a material change in the character and function of the site, regardless of the precise number of daily visits. It is this introduction of a distinct commercial activity, rather than the quantum of traffic alone, that gives rise to conflict with Policy 26.

Landscape Impact and Visual Effects

- 8.13 The appellant argues that the visual effects of the development are limited, that screening is effective, and that additional planting could mitigate any harm.
- 8.14 The LPA acknowledges that the amendments to the scheme, including the relocation of containers and removal of caravans, reduce some of the more immediate visual impacts. This position is consistent with the advice of the Council's Landscape Officer.
- 8.15 However, the appellant's case places undue emphasis on visual effects alone, whereas both local and national policy, and the findings of the previous appeal decision, make clear that the primary issue is one of landscape character.
- 8.16 As identified by the Inspector, the harm arises fundamentally from the introduction of urbanising and suburbanising features and land uses within a highly sensitive rural landscape.
- 8.17 Mitigation through planting may reduce visibility from certain viewpoints, but it does not address the underlying change in character of the site or its incompatibility with the key characteristics of the High Weald National Landscape.
- 8.18 The appellant's reliance on limited visual receptors and seasonal screening does not overcome this fundamental issue.

Baseline Conditions and Existing Use

- 8.19 The appellant also suggests that the site is already a busy commercial equestrian operation and therefore the introduction of storage containers does not materially alter its character.
- 8.20 The LPA acknowledges that the site contains equestrian development and activity; however, this does not establish that further forms of development or additional commercial uses are acceptable.
- 8.21 The equestrian use is itself a rural land use that is typically compatible with countryside locations. By contrast, the storage use introduces a markedly different land use typology, characterised by static industrial-style structures and a commercial rental function. This change materially alters the character of the site and contributes to the incremental suburbanisation of the countryside.

Previous Appeal Decision

- 8.22 The appellant seeks to distinguish the current proposal from the previous appeal scheme, noting amendments such as the removal of caravans and relocation of containers.
- 8.23 The LPA acknowledges these changes; however, it remains the case that a similar amended scheme was put forward during the appeal process and was not considered, and that the fundamental issues identified by the Inspector remain directly relevant.

- 8.24 The current proposal continues to involve:
- The use of land for commercial storage;
 - The presence of containers; and
 - The retention of extensive hardstanding within the countryside.
- 8.25 These elements were central to the Inspector's findings of harm, and their continued presence means that the previous decision retains substantial weight.

Overall Response

- 8.26 For the reasons set out above, the LPA considers that the appellant's case does not overcome the identified policy conflicts or the harm arising from the development.
- 8.27 In particular:
- Financial need has not been demonstrated to equate to policy compliance;
 - The use remains unjustified in a countryside location; and
 - The harm to the character and appearance of the High Weald National Landscape persists.
- 8.28 Accordingly, the appellant's submissions do not alter the LPA's position that the appeal should be dismissed.

9.0 Planning Balance and Overall Conclusion

- 9.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning decisions are made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 9.2 The development plan in this case is the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), with particular weight given to Policies 10, 25, 26 and 30. In addition, national policy requires that great weight is given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty within National Landscapes, reflecting their highest status of protection.
- 9.3 Furthermore, significant weight is afforded to the previous appeal decision relating to this site, which considered substantially the same form of development and reached clear conclusions on both principle and landscape impact.
- 9.4 In support of the proposal, it is acknowledged that the development would provide a degree of economic benefit through the support it offers to the existing equestrian enterprise. The revised scheme has also reduced some of the more immediate visual effects, particularly through the removal of touring caravans and the relocation of storage away from the site frontage. In addition, limited arboricultural benefits may arise from changes to the site layout. These factors weigh moderately in favour of the development.
- 9.5 However, these benefits must be considered in the context of the clear and significant policy conflicts identified.
- 9.6 Firstly, the proposal represents an unjustified form of development in the countryside. It has not been demonstrated to be essential to its rural location, nor to constitute a policy-compliant form of rural economic development. The storage use remains a

general commercial activity that is not functionally or operationally dependent on a countryside setting. This results in conflict with Policies 10 and 26 of the HDPF.

- 9.7 Secondly, and more significantly, the development results in harm to the character and appearance of the High Weald National Landscape. The introduction and retention of extensive hardstanding and storage use, together with associated activity, gives rise to urbanising and suburbanising influences which are fundamentally at odds with the wooded, undeveloped and tranquil qualities of the landscape. This harm arises from the erosion of rural character, rather than from visual impact alone, and cannot be adequately addressed through mitigation measures such as planting.
- 9.8 In this respect, the harm to the National Landscape is afforded great weight, in accordance with national policy and the Council's statutory duty to conserve and enhance natural beauty.
- 9.9 The previous appeal decision is a highly material consideration and reinforces these conclusions. The current proposal, whilst amended in some respects, does not materially alter the fundamental nature of the development or overcome the concerns previously identified by the Inspector. As such, the appeal decision weighs heavily against the proposal.
- 9.10 When the proposal is assessed against the development plan as a whole, the limited economic and operational benefits, together with the modest visual improvements achieved through amendment, are clearly and decisively outweighed by the identified harm.

Overall Conclusion

- 9.11 The proposal conflicts with Policies 10, 25, 26 and 30 of the Horsham District Planning Framework and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework. The harm identified, particularly to the High Weald National Landscape, carries substantial weight and significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits of the scheme.
- 9.12 Accordingly, the Local Planning Authority respectfully requests that the appeal be dismissed.

Yours sincerely,

Daniel Holmes
Senior Planning Officer

10.0 List of Conditions

- 10.1 The Council maintains that the identified harms are not capable of being made acceptable through condition. However, should the Inspector be minded to grant planning permission, the following conditions are recommended:

1. **List of Approved Plans:** The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing 2A - Block Plan.pdf
Drawing 1A - Location Plan.pdf
Drawing 3B - Proposed Site Plan.pdf

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

2. **Standard Time Condition:** The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. **Pre-commencement Condition:** Prior to the siting of any additional storage containers hereby permitted, a full and detailed landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include measures to mitigate the adverse landscape and visual effects of the development and shall have regard to the recommendations contained within the Council's Landscape Officer consultation response received 09.03.2026. The submitted details shall include:

Existing Vegetation and Retention Measures

- A plan identifying all existing trees, hedgerows, and vegetation to be retained and removed.
- Details of protective measures for retained trees and vegetation where required.

Proposed Planting and Green Infrastructure

- A planting plan showing the provision of additional native tree and hedgerow planting along the north-western boundary adjoining Forest Road.
- A schedule of all proposed trees, shrubs and hedgerow species, including planting sizes, densities, locations and establishment specifications.
- Details of soil preparation and planting methods.
- Details of measures to strengthen the site's integration within the surrounding rural landscape and the High Weald National Landscape.

Hard Landscaping and Site Boundaries

- Details of all proposed boundary treatments, including fencing, gates and hedgerow planting.
- Details of any proposed surfacing materials associated with the development.

Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan

A Landscape Management Plan for a period of not less than five years following implementation, including;

- Management objectives;

- Maintenance schedules;
- Replacement planting provisions;
- Watering and establishment measures; and
- Long-term management prescriptions for hedgerows and trees.

The approved landscaping scheme shall be carried out in full during the first planting season following approval of the details and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved Landscape Management Plan.

Any trees, shrubs or hedgerow plants which die, are removed, become seriously damaged or diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced during the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: To ensure that the development does not result in unacceptable harm to the rural landscape character, to mitigate visual impacts, and to enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policies 25 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and in the interests of visual amenity and nature conservation in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

4. **Regulatory Condition:** Within three months of the date of this permission, details of the external colour treatment of all storage containers hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall demonstrate how the proposed colours have had regard to the guidance contained within the High Weald Colour Study. The containers shall thereafter be finished and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To minimise visual intrusion and ensure the development conserves the character and appearance of the High Weald National Landscape in accordance with Policies 25 and 30 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

5. **Regulatory Condition:** At no time shall more than 8 storage containers be stationed, stored or sited within the application site.

Reason: To ensure that the scale of development remains limited to that assessed by the Local Planning Authority and to protect the character and appearance of the High Weald National Landscape in accordance with Policies 25 and 30 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

6. **Regulatory Condition:** The storage containers hereby permitted shall only be stationed within the area identified for container storage on approved drawing 'Proposed Site Plan3B' and shall not be relocated elsewhere within the site unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the visual and landscape impacts of the development remain limited and to safeguard the character and appearance of the High Weald National Landscape.

7. **Regulatory Condition:** The containers hereby permitted shall be used solely for storage purposes. They shall not be used as offices, workshops, industrial premises, retail premises, distribution facilities or for any other business activity.

8. Reason: To safeguard the character of the countryside and the High Weald National Landscape and to prevent a more intensive commercial use from occurring without proper planning assessment.

9. **Regulatory Condition:** No hazardous, explosive, flammable, toxic or otherwise dangerous materials shall be stored within any container stationed on the site.

Reason: In the interests of public safety and the protection of the rural environment.

10. **Pre-Occupation Condition:** No storage of containers, vehicles, equipment, machinery, caravans, trailers or materials associated with this permission shall take place outside the areas shown on the approved plans.

Reason: To prevent the uncontrolled expansion of storage activities and to safeguard the character and appearance of the countryside and the High Weald National Landscape.

11. **Regulatory Condition:** Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), no additional storage containers, shipping containers, portable buildings, portacabins or similar structures shall be brought onto the site without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over further development in the interests of the character and appearance of the High Weald National Landscape.

12. **Regulatory Condition:** No external lighting shall be installed on the site unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved lighting shall thereafter be installed and operated only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the character, tranquillity and dark skies of the High Weald National Landscape.