

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/23/2493	Case Officer:	Hamish Evans
Application Type:	Full Application		
Proposal:	Retention for use of site as long stay airport car parking (Sui Generis).		
Site:	Acacia Grove, Copthorne Road, Copthorne, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 3PD, ,		
Validation Date	26 Sep 2023	Overall Expiry Date:	7 May 2024
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	27 Aug 2026
Target Date:	21 Nov 2023	Recommending Officer Signature:	Hamish Evans

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	1
---	--	------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	28 Aug 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/23/2493

**Acacia Grove, Copthorne Road, Copthorne, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 3PD,
Retention for use of site as long stay airport car parking (Sui Generis).
Ash Properties Ltd**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Nine third-party representation letters have been received in respect of this application and they are all from the same postal address. The representation letters object to the application due to insufficient visibility splays being provided, land ownership disputes and inaccurate information being submitted with the application.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

WSCC Highways

No objection.

MSDC Ecology

Recommend approval subject to conditions.

MSDC Planning Policy

Comments on policies DP1, DP12 and DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policy SA34 of the Site Allocations DPD, policy CNP15.4 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan, policy GAT3 of the Crawley Local Plan and the Airport Surface Access Strategy from Gatwick Airport Limited.

Crawley Borough Council

Object due to non-compliance with policies GAT3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 and policy GAT3 of the Submission Crawley Borough Local Plan 2024 - 2040.

WSCC FRS Water and Access

Concern raised regarding potential fire risk and no suitable turning facility for a fire appliance.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Worth Parish Council

Defer to officer.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks retrospective planning permission for the use of the site for long stay airport car parking at Acacia Grove Copthorne Road Copthorne Crawley.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

09/01915/FUL. Formalisation of existing scaffolding contractor's store, business car sales area, portaloo hire storage, skip hire storage and associated parking. Proposed enhanced landscaping throughout the

site. (Additional information submitted and amended site plan received 4th Nov 2009 to add the formalisation of the use of the site by EKA concrete). Permission.

AP/11/0037. Appeal against Enforcement Notice for BCON: Breach of condition 1 of 09/01915/FUL. Required to remove cars and comply with drawing 3100-012 Rev E. Appeal Allowed and Notice is Quashed.

14/00571/FUL. Development of a bus depot including erection of a vehicle maintenance building with offices and stores, bus and car parking, bus wash down area, diesel tank and new landscaping. (Corrected plans received 5/12/2014 showing site layout and revised visibility splays). Refused.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site is located to the northeastern element of the wider industrial site. The application site is located within the countryside, with the built-up area of Copthorne 60 metres to the north of the site. It should be noted that the built-up area boundary of Copthorne is some 690 metres from the access of the site. There is Ancient Woodland to the north, east and west of the site with the northern and eastern boundaries of the site being located within the 15 metre Ancient Woodland buffer zone. A Tree Preservation Order Area is also located to the north, east and west of the site. The site is located within an existing industrial unit which has a variety of industrial and sui generis uses. The site is surrounded by metal fencing and the access is located to the south of the site and leads to Copthorne Road. There are residential properties located to the southeast and southwest of the site. There is existing long stay airport car parking to the east of the site.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks retrospective planning permission for the use of the site for long stay airport car parking at Acacia Grove Copthorne Road Copthorne Crawley.

The submitted planning statement states that the development is for the storage of cars for long stay airport car parking. Staff will collect cars from Gatwick Airport, where they drive and store the cars at the site. Then on their return staff will return customers car to them at the airport. The agent has confirmed that the site would hold 116 vehicles.

It is clear from publicly available satellite imagery and site visits undertaken at the site that the site was extended to the north at some point after 2021 and before 2023. This extension raised the land by some 2.0 metres and extended the hardstanding into the TPO Area and Ancient Woodland Buffer zone to the north of the site. The agent has advised that the applicant purchased the site after these works were undertaken and had no knowledge of these works. The agent has confirmed that the application site does not include the site to the east however from site visits it does appear that the site is used as one long stay airport car parking facility.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND LIST OF POLICIES

Planning legislation holds that the determination of a planning application shall be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Specifically Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states:

'In dealing with such an application the authority shall have regard to:

- a) The provisions of the development plan, so far as material to application,*
- b) Any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and*
- c) Any other material considerations.'*

Section 38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides:

'If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purposes of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.'

The requirement to determine applications "in accordance with the plan" does not mean applications must comply with each and every policy, but is to be approached on the basis of the plan taken as a whole. This reflects the fact, acknowledged by the Courts, that development plans can have broad statements of policy, many of which may be mutually irreconcilable so that in a particular case one must give way to another.

Under section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 if a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published.

Using this as the starting point the development plan for this part of Mid Sussex consists of the District Plan, Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan.

National policy (which is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance) does not form part of the development plan, but is an important material consideration.

Mid Sussex District Plan

The District Plan was adopted at Full Council on 28th March 2018.

Relevant policies:

DP1 - Sustainable Economic Development
DP12 - Protection and Enhancement of Countryside
DP14 - Sustainable Rural Development and the Rural Economy
DP21 - Transport
DP26 - Character and Design
DP37 - Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
DP38 - Ecology

Site Allocations DPD

The SADPD was adopted on 29th June 2022. It allocates sufficient housing and employment land to meet identified needs to 2031.

Relevant policies:

SA34 - Existing Employment Sites

Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan (adopted September 2021)

Relevant policies:

CNP1 - General Development Requirements
CNP10 - CA3: Copthorne Common and Woodland
CNP16 - New Parking Areas

Other Material Considerations

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021 - 2039 - Submission Draft (Regulation 19)

The District Council is reviewing and updating the District Plan. Upon adoption, the new District Plan 2021 - 2039 will replace the current District Plan 2014-2031 and its policies will have full weight. In accordance with the NPPF, Local Planning Authorities may give weight to relevant policies of the emerging plan according to the stage of preparation; the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the relevant policies; and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the NPPF. The draft District Plan 2021-2039 is currently at Examination with initial hearings held in

February/March 2026. The Council is consulting on Main Modifications which are required to ensure the plan is legally compliant and sound. The District Plan remains at Examination until the Inspector has published his report, until that time only minimal weight can be given to the Plan and this planning application has been assessed against the policies of the adopted District Plan.

Relevant policies:

DPN4: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
DPC1: Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside
DPB1: Character and Design
DPT5: Off-Airport Car Parking
DPE1: Sustainable Economic Development
DPE2: Existing Employment Sites

Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The Council has adopted a 'Mid Sussex Design Guide' SPD that aims to help deliver high quality development across the district that responds appropriately to its context and is inclusive and sustainable. The Design Guide was adopted by Council on 4th November 2020 as an SPD for use in the consideration and determination of planning applications. The SPD is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (August 2026)

ASSESSMENT

It is considered that the main issues that need to be considered in the determination of this application are as follows;

- Principle,
- Highways,
- Ecology, Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows,
- Design and Impact on character of the area,
- Impact on Residential Amenity,
- Other Matters, and
- Biodiversity Net Gain.

Principle

Planning legislation holds that the determination of a planning application shall be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

In terms of policy designations, the starting point for this assessment is that the application site falls outside of the built-up area of Copthorne as defined by the District and Neighbourhood Plans. As such the site is located within the defined countryside.

Policy DP1 of the Mid Sussex District Plan relates to sustainable economic development and policy DP14 of the Mid Sussex District Plan relates to sustainable rural development and the rural economy. Policy DP12 of the Mid Sussex District Plan relates to the protection and enhancement of the countryside.

Whilst located within the countryside the use of the site is not considered to be a rural development or support the sustainable growth and the vitality of the rural economy. The use does not relate to a rural use and is not required to be located within a rural setting. It is not considered that the development is supported by any specific policy within the development plan as required by policies DP1 and DP12 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.

Policy SA34 of the Site Allocations DPD identifies the wider site as an existing Employment Site. This policy requires the protection of B2, B8 or Class E(g) uses within the site. As the development consists of a sui generis use it is not considered to comply with the above policy.

Taking into account the above the development is considered to be contrary in principle to the development plan.

Whilst the above is noted it is considered that these policies of the development have very limited weight as they are materially inconsistent with the NPPF. Greater weight should be given to policies S5 and E4 of the NPPF instead.

Policy E4 of the NPPF states that the sustainable growth of business needs in rural areas should be supported and that in the circumstances where this form of development is not well served by public transport it should use previously developed land, and sites that are physically well-related to existing development and its siting and design should have appropriate regard to the character of its surroundings. The sustainability of the site is assessed within a subsequent section of this report however it is not considered that the use results in the provision of a use where there is a demonstrable need. The application documents are not considered to demonstrate that there is a need of the use that is being applied for. As such the application is therefore considered to be contrary to policy E4 of the NPPF.

Policy S5 of the NPPF states that only certain forms of development should be approved outside of settlements, which includes previously developed land. It should only be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects. Long stay airport parking is not a use that is considered to be a rural business or service, that is required to be located outside of a settlement, thus it is not considered that the proposal falls within any of supported categories of development set out in policy S5.

However, Policy CNP16 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan states that the provision of additional or replacement airport-related parking, including long and short-term parking for passenger vehicles, will not be permitted. The development comprises precisely the form of development that the policy seeks to resist, namely airport-related parking outside the airport boundary. The application is therefore in direct conflict with Policy CNP16. As the Neighbourhood Plan forms part of the Development Plan, significant weight should be attached to this conflict. It should be noted that the NPPF is silent on the specific use that the application is applying for and as such it is considered that policy CNP16 maintains full weight.

In addition, regard must be had to other material considerations. Crawley Borough Council has objected to the application due to conflict with Policy GAT3 of both the adopted and emerging Crawley Local Plan, which seek to restrict additional airport-related parking provision outside the airport boundary. Whilst these policies do not form part of the Development Plan for Mid Sussex, they are material considerations and demonstrate a consistent strategic approach to managing airport parking demand and encouraging sustainable travel patterns associated with Gatwick Airport.

Further weight is afforded to emerging Policy DPT5 of the Mid Sussex District Plan Review. Although limited weight can currently be attached to the emerging District Plan as it remains under examination, the policy specifically addresses off-airport car parking and reflects concerns regarding the sustainability impacts of airport-related parking uses. The application would conflict with the objectives of that emerging policy and this attracts some weight against the development.

The concerns identified above are further reinforced by Gatwick Airport's Surface Access Strategy, which seeks to encourage modal shift away from private car use and increase the proportion of journeys undertaken by public transport and other sustainable modes. The provision of additional off-airport parking has the potential to undermine those objectives. Whilst the strategy does not form part of the Development Plan, it is a relevant material consideration.

Taking all matters into account, it is considered that the development is contrary to the development plan in principle, it is not considered that there is a need for the use and the use is not one that supports a rural business. The development directly conflicts with Policy CNP16 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan, which seeks to resist additional airport-related parking. The application is also contrary to policies

E4 and S5 of the NPPF. Further weight is also attached to the conflict with Policy GAT3 of the Crawley Local Plan and emerging Policy DPT5 of the Mid Sussex District Plan Review, both of which seek to restrict off-airport parking associated with Gatwick Airport. The principle of the development is therefore considered unacceptable.

Highways

Policy DP21 of the District Plan relates to transport. However, this policy is considered to have very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF and greater weight should be given to policies TR3 and TR6 of the NPPF instead.

Policy TR6 of the NPPF relates to assessing transport impacts and part 4 of this policy states that development should be refused if there would be a severe adverse impact on the transport network or an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Policy TR3 of the NPPF requires development that involves a significant amount of movement should be located within sustainable locations and that locations should limit the need to travel by private car.

The application relates to the use of the site for long stay airport car parking associated with Gatwick Airport. In this regard, the development facilitates airport travel by private motor vehicle and does not support the objective of encouraging a modal shift towards more sustainable forms of transport. The Council's Planning Policy Team has identified that the provision of airport parking does not support the objective of minimising the need to travel or promoting the increased use of alternative means of transport to the private car. As such, the application is considered to be in conflict with the sustainable transport objectives of Policy TR3 of the NPPF.

Notwithstanding the above, West Sussex County Council, in its capacity as Highway Authority, raises no objection to the application. The Highway Authority is satisfied that the development would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety or a severe residual cumulative impact on the operation of the local highway network. Accordingly, there is no technical highways evidence before the Local Planning Authority which would justify withholding planning permission on highway safety or capacity grounds.

Third-party representation letters have been received which object to the proposal in part due to insufficient visibility splays. Whilst these comments are noted the Highway Authority have raised no objection to the development on these grounds and as such the visibility splays are considered to be acceptable.

Therefore, whilst the application is considered acceptable in terms of highway safety and network capacity, it nevertheless conflicts with the wider sustainable transport objectives of policy DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and Policy TR3 of the NPPF due to its airport-related nature and reliance upon travel by private car. This weighs against the application in the overall planning balance.

Ecology, Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

Policy DP37 of the District Plan relates to trees, woodland and hedgerows. However, this policy is considered to have very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF and greater weight should be given to policy N6 of the NPPF instead.

Policy N6 of the NPPF relates to areas of particular importance for biodiversity and geodiversity. Within this there is a requirement that proposals which would entail 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.

Policy DP38 of the District Plan relates to biodiversity. However, this policy is materially inconsistent with national decision-making policies and should be given very limited weight. Great weight should be given to policy N2 of the NPPF.

Policy N2 of the NPPF seeks to improve the natural environment. It requires development conserve and enhance existing natural features of value including established trees and hedgerows. Part 1f of this policy requires proposals to minimise any adverse impacts on biodiversity and include features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs.

The site is located adjacent to areas of Ancient Woodland to the north, east and west. Furthermore, the northern and eastern boundaries of the site are located within the recognised 15 metre buffer to Ancient Woodland. A Tree Preservation Order Area is also located immediately adjacent to the site. As such, the site occupies a sensitive location where particular regard must be had to the requirements of Policies N2 and N6 of the NPPF.

The Council's Ecologist has raised no objection to the use of the site subject to conditions and, on this basis, it is not considered that the continued use of the site for airport parking would result in unacceptable ecological harm.

Notwithstanding the above and as set out within the application details it is apparent from publicly available aerial imagery and site inspections that physical works have previously been undertaken at the site. Whilst the applicant advises that these works were undertaken before their ownership of the site and do not form part of the current application, the resulting site conditions nevertheless form part of the planning context within which this application must be assessed.

The encroachment of hardstanding and engineered land into the buffer associated with the adjacent Ancient Woodland is a matter of concern. Ancient Woodland is an irreplaceable habitat afforded significant protection through both national and local planning policy. The creation and retention of extensive areas of hardstanding in close proximity to Ancient Woodland has the potential to adversely affect the setting of the woodland and may result in indirect impacts upon root protection areas, hydrology and ecological function.

Whilst the Council's Ecologist is satisfied that the application can be approved subject to conditions, officers nevertheless attach moderate negative weight to the evidence of previous encroachment into the Ancient Woodland buffer and Tree Preservation Order Area. This weighs against the application in the overall planning balance, although not to such an extent that it would justify refusal in its own right given the consultee response received.

Character and Appearance

As the site falls outside of the built-up area (within the countryside) it is therefore necessary to consider the impact of the proposal in the local landscape in terms of the visual impact on the area. Policy DP12 of the District Plan and policies CNP1 and CNP10 of the Neighbourhood Plan relate to these issues. Due to the publication of the NPPF these policies are considered to be materially inconsistent with national decision-making policies and should be given very limited weight. Great weight should be given to Policy N2 of the NPPF.

Policy N2 of the NPPF relates to improving the natural environment. Part 1a requires proposals to contribute positively to the natural environment and to '*Consider the environmental qualities of land proposed for development, including habitats, landscape character and the natural beauty of the countryside, and identify opportunities for those qualities to be conserved or enhanced*'.

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design. In addition, policies CNP1 and CNP10 of the Neighbourhood Plan have a similar ethos. However, these are considered to have very limited weight due to the publication of the NPPF, and greater weight should be given to policy DP3 of the NPPF.

Policy DP3 of the NPPF sets out the key principles for well-designed places. This sets out in part that proposals should respond to their context, so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets.

The application site is located within the countryside and lies adjacent to areas of Ancient Woodland to the north, east and west. The site forms part of a wider established employment area containing a variety of industrial and commercial uses and, as such, the principle of a commercial use on this part of the wider site is not considered incongruous within its immediate context. The use of the site for vehicle storage and parking is also characteristic of activity already present within the wider industrial area.

The extension of hardstanding and raising of land levels has resulted in a more engineered and urbanised appearance along the northern part of the site, reducing the transition between the developed area and the adjoining woodland setting. This has diminished, to some extent, the contribution that this part of the site previously made to the woodland edge character which Policies N2 and DP3 seek to protect and enhance. The proximity of the development to Ancient Woodland and the encroachment into the woodland buffer area are matters of concern in landscape and visual terms.

Nevertheless, significant weight is attached to the fact that the site forms part of an established industrial area which already contains extensive areas of hardstanding, vehicle parking, storage and commercial activity. Consequently, whilst the previously undertaken engineering works and resulting site appearance are considered to give rise to some localised harm to the character of the site and its relationship with the adjacent woodland, officers do not consider that the harm identified is of such magnitude as to warrant refusal on character and appearance grounds alone.

Overall, the application has some non-compliance with the objectives of Policies N2 and DP3 of the NPPF due to the site's relationship with the surrounding woodland and the physical alterations that have occurred on the land. However, having regard to the established industrial character of the wider site, these impacts attract limited weight against the development in the overall planning balance.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy DP26 in part seeks to ensure that new development does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings. It is considered that this policy has very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF and greater weight should be given to policy P3 of the NPPF.

Policy P3 of the NPPF relates to living conditions and pollution. Part 2(b) of this policy requires proposals *'Not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, or unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water, soil or other forms of pollution on or beyond the site'*.

The development is set a significant distance from any residential properties within the locality and is located within an existing industrial estate as such it is not considered to give rise to or contribute to an unacceptable level of harm to existing residents. It is therefore considered to comply with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and policy P3 of the NPPF.

Other Matters

Third-representation letters have raised objection to the development due to land ownership disputes and inaccurate information being submitted with the application. Land ownership issues are not material planning considerations and it is considered that the information submitted with the application is sufficiently accurate to determine the application.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Biodiversity net gain is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This planning permission is being granted on an application made under Section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out). This application is therefore exempt from the requirement to provide biodiversity net gain.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

Planning legislation requires the application to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is therefore necessary for the planning application to be assessed against the policies in the Development Plan and then to take account of other material planning considerations including the NPPF. The Development Plan in this instance consists of the Mid Sussex District Plan, the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan.

Courts have confirmed that the Development Plan must be considered as a whole, not simply in relation to any one individual policy. It is therefore not the case that a proposal must accord with each and every policy within the Development Plan. Rather, the decision maker must consider whether the proposal accords with the Development Plan when read as a whole.

Taking into account the above assessment the development is considered to be contrary to the development plan when read as a whole, specifically in relation to policies DP1, DP12, DP14 and DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policy CNP16 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan and policy SA34 of the Site Allocations DPD.

The NPPF is a material consideration and Policy S5 (4) requires that development that does not fall within one of the categories set out within policy S5 should only be approved in exceptional circumstances, where the benefits of the proposal would substantially outweigh the adverse effects, including to the character of the countryside and in relation to promoting sustainable patterns of movement.

In terms of benefits, it is set out that the proposal would result in 15 full-time jobs, however, it is not clear how many jobs were associated with the previous permitted use of the site and would be lost as a result of the proposal. As such this is only given limited positive weight.

West Sussex County Council, in its capacity as Highway Authority, has raised no objection on highway safety or capacity grounds and the Council's Ecologist has recommended approval subject to conditions. The development would not cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of nearby residents. These matters are neutral in the planning balance.

Against the application, significant weight is attached to the direct conflict with Policy CNP16 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan, which specifically seeks to resist additional airport-related parking provision. The development comprises additional off-airport parking associated with Gatwick Airport and therefore conflicts with a recently adopted component of the Development Plan.

It is not considered that the use results in the provision of a use where there is a demonstrable need and it is therefore considered to be contrary to policy E4 of the NPPF. Long stay airport parking is not a use that is considered to be a rural business or service and is not referred to with policy S5 of the NPPF and as such it is considered to be contrary to policy S5.

Further weight is attached to the conflict with Policy TR3 of the NPPF. Whilst there is no evidence that the development would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety or a severe residual cumulative impact on the highway network, the development facilitates travel by private motor vehicle and does not support the policy objective of limiting the need to travel by private car or encouraging the use of more sustainable modes of transport.

Additional weight is afforded to the material considerations arising from Policy GAT3 of the adopted and emerging Crawley Local Plan and emerging Policy DPT5 of the Mid Sussex District Plan Review. Whilst these policies do not form part of the Development Plan for Mid Sussex, they demonstrate a consistent strategic approach to restricting additional off-airport parking provision and encouraging more sustainable patterns of travel associated with Gatwick Airport. The application is contrary to the objectives of these policies and this weighs against the development.

The physical alterations that have occurred at the site, including the extension of hardstanding and encroachment into the Ancient Woodland buffer area, also attract some negative weight in the planning balance. Whilst officers acknowledge that these works do not form part of the current application and that no objection has been raised by the Council's Ecologist, they nevertheless contribute to concerns

regarding the site's relationship with the adjacent woodland and the objectives of Policies N2 and N6 of the NPPF. However, having regard to the established industrial character of the wider site, only limited weight is attached to these matters.

Having considered the application against the Development Plan as a whole, it is contrary to the Development Plan and in relation to policy S5(4) of the NPPF there are no exceptional circumstances for the development to be approved and the adverse effects are considered to substantially outweigh the benefits.

As such the application is considered to conflict with policies DP1, DP12, DP14 and DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, SA34 of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document, policies E4, S5 and T3 of the NPPF and Policy CNP16 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan. The development is therefore contrary to the Development Plan when read as a whole and there are no material considerations which indicate that planning permission should be granted.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Hamish Evans