

Delegated Decision
Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0932	Case Officer:	Katherine Williams
Application Type:	Full Application		
Proposal:	Change of use from residential to business use class E(c)(iii).		
Site:	Upper Garstons, Cowfold Road, Bolney, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5QT, ,		
Validation Date	21 May 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	17 Jun 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	15 Jul 2025
Target Date:	16 Jul 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	Katherine Williams

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	0
---	--	------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	15 Jul 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0932

**Upper Garstons, Cowfold Road, Bolney, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5QT,
Change of use from residential to business use class E(c)(iii).**

Tina Davey

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION

None received

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Ecologist Protection - No objection, recommend conditions

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No objection subject to Highways being satisfied that it has safe access from the A272.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for the change of use of the property from residential to business use class E(c)(iii).

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None relevant

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site forms a two storey detached dwelling located to the north of Cowfold Road, with an extended private driveway. The property is located within the countryside and Archaeological Notification Area of the Parish Church of St Mary Magdalene and the historic core of Bolney.

The locality is characterised by open fields and sporadic residential and commercial properties, which contribute to the character of the area. The proposed is separated from the highway by large paddocks with a central access driveway which extends along the western side elevation of the dwelling to a parking area to the north of the building. There are also a group of outbuildings to the west of the building.

To the east of the site is a group of residential properties which access onto the western side of The Street and the south of these properties is Bolney Place, which has been converted to offices and has a pedestrian access to the application site.

The existing residential property consists of a 3-bed unit with a pitched hipped roof and is constructed in stone, interlocking roof tiles and white fenestration.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks planning permission for the conversion of the dwellinghouse to a business use under use class E(c)(iii), which is defined as: other appropriate services in a commercial, business or service locality

The proposal would create 3 No. office rooms with an associated kitchen and W.C.s.

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) And 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, Bolney Neighbourhood Plan and Site Allocation DPD.

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
- DP4 - Housing
- DP5 - Planning to Meet Future Housing Need
- DP6 - Settlement Hierarchy
- DP12 - Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside
- DP14 - Sustainable Rural Development and the Rural Economy
- DP21 - Transport
- DP26 - Character and Design
- DP29 - Noise, Air and Light Pollution

Site Allocations DPD

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

No relevant policies.

Bolney Neighbourhood Plan (made September 2016)

Relevant policies:

BOLBB1 - Built up area Boundary
BOLEE2 - Protect and Enhance the Countryside
BOLD1 - Design of New Development and Conservation
BOLT1 - Transport Impact of Development

Other Legislation

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039 Consultation Draft

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 (Regulation 19) is currently at Examination and stage 1 hearings were concluded on the 31st October 2024. There are unresolved objections to some of the policies in the draft District Plan and as such, 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:

DPS1 - Climate Change
DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction
DPN7 - Noise Impact
DPC1 - Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside
DPB1 - Character and Design
DPT4 - Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure
DPE1 - Sustainable Economic Development
DPE8 - Sustainable Rural Development and the Rural Economy
DPH1 - Housing

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) (December 2024)

Paragraph 12 of the NPPF states 'The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.'

Paragraph 39 of the NPPF states 'Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.'

With specific reference to decision-taking paragraph 48 states that planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

National Planning Policy Guidance

National Design Guide

Ministerial Statement and Design Guide

On 1 October 2019 the Secretary of State for the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government made a statement relating to design. The thrust of the statement was that the Government was seeking to improve the quality of design and drive up the quality of new homes. The Government also published a National Design Guide, which is a material planning consideration.

The National Design Guide provides guidance on what the Government considers to be good design and provides examples of good practice. It notes that social, economic and environmental change will influence the planning, design and construction of new homes and places.

ASSESSMENT

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

- Principle of Development
- Design and Character
- Impact on neighbour amenities
- Biodiversity Net Gain
- Impact on Parking Provision
- Other Matters

Principle of Development

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

Using this as the starting point, the development plan in Mid Sussex consists of the Mid Sussex District Plan (2018), together with the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan and the Site Allocation DPD.

This application would effectively result in the loss of a one 3-bed dwelling outside the built up area of Bolney, with a new office use.

Policy DP12 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states:

'The countryside will be protected in recognition of its intrinsic character and beauty. Development will be permitted in the countryside, defined as the area outside of built-up area boundaries on the Policies Map, provided it maintains or where possible enhances the quality of the rural and landscape character of the District, and:

- *it is necessary for the purposes of agriculture; or*
- *it is supported by a specific policy reference either elsewhere in the Plan, a Development Plan Document or relevant Neighbourhood Plan.*

Agricultural land of Grade 3a and above will be protected from non-agricultural development proposals. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, detailed field surveys should be undertaken and proposals should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of higher quality.

The Mid Sussex Landscape Character Assessment, the West Sussex County Council Strategy for the West Sussex Landscape, the Capacity of Mid Sussex District to Accommodate Development Study and other available landscape evidence (including that gathered to support Neighbourhood Plans) will be used to assess the impact of development proposals on the quality of rural and landscape character.

Built-up area boundaries are subject to review by Neighbourhood Plans or through a Site Allocations Development Plan Document, produced by the District Council.

Economically viable mineral reserves within the district will be safeguarded.'

The ethos of this policy is echoed in policies BOLBB1 and BOLEE2 Bolney Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy DP14 relates to sustainable rural development and the rural economy and states:

'Provided it is not in conflict with Policy DP12: Protection and Enhancement of Countryside and DP13: Preventing Coalescence:

- *new small-scale economic development, including tourism-related development, within the countryside (defined as the area outside of built up area boundaries as per the Policies Map) will be permitted provided:*
 - o *it supports sustainable growth and the vitality of the rural economy; and*
 - o *where possible, utilises previously developed sites.*
- *diversification of activities on existing farm units will be permitted provided:*
 - o *they are of a scale which is consistent to the location of the farm holding; and*
 - o *they would not prejudice the agricultural use of a unit.*
- *the re-use and adaptation of rural buildings for business or tourism use in the countryside will be permitted provided:*
 - o *the building is of permanent construction and capable of re-use without substantial reconstruction or extensive alteration;*
 - o *the appearance and setting is not materially altered; and*
 - o *it is not a recently constructed agricultural building which has not been or has been little used for its original purpose.'*

Paragraph 88 of the NPPF states:

'Planning policies and decisions should enable:

- a) the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings;*
- b) the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses;*
- c) sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside; and*
- d) the retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.'*

The Council has over a long period of time sought to maintain and increase housing supply, to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes in accordance with paragraph 61 of the NPPF. District Plan Policy DP4 sets a minimum housing provision figure for the plan period.

Whilst there is an overall strategy in the Development Plan to provide new housing, there is no policy reference in the District Plan or Bolney Neighbourhood Plan regarding the loss of dwellings.

As per planning legislation, a decision must be made in accordance with the development plan unless there are any material planning considerations which indicate otherwise.

The policies contained within the NPPF are material considerations which should be taken into account in the determination of this application. This is confirmed within paragraph 231 of the NPPF.

Paragraph 232 clarifies that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with this Framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

Paragraph 11 of the NPPF sets out that plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and states;

'For decision-taking this means;

*c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or
d) where there are no relevant development policies, or the policies which are most important for the determining the application are out-of-date, granting planning permission unless;*

i. The application of policies within this Framework that protect areas of assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing development proposed; or

ii. Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.'

Footnote 7 of paragraph 11(i) clarifies that the policies referred to are those in this Framework (rather than those in development plans) and relate to habitats sites (and those and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, a National Landscape, a National Park (or within the Broads Authority) or defined as Heritage Coast; irreplaceable habitats; designated heritage assets and other heritage assets of archaeological interest; and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change.

Footnote 8 of paragraph 11 clarifies that for applications involving the provision of housing, in situations where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year land supply of deliverable housing sites (with an appropriate buffer) or where the Housing Delivery Test indicates that delivery of housing has been substantially below (less than 75%) of the housing requirement for the last three years, then relevant policies for the supply of housing should be considered out-of-date.

Having regard to the above, while the Council has performed excellently in respect of the Housing Delivery Test, a new standard method formula was published alongside the NPPF which gives Mid Sussex a significantly higher housing requirement than the current District Plan. As a result, and having regard for the need for an appropriate buffer, the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites as per the requirements of paragraph 78 of the NPPF.

In light of the above, this development needs to be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. If a development is found to be sustainable, that would weigh heavily in favour of granting permission in the paragraph 11(d) balance. If however the development is not found to be sustainable, that is not the end of the matter; the Local Planning Authority still need to go through the weighing up process between the positive benefits of the scheme against any harm that may be caused, having particular regard for the key policies indicated in paragraph 11(d)(ii).

As part of this process, the weight to be given to development plan policies will need to be assessed against the degree of conformity with the NPPF.

Policies DP4 (Housing) and DP6 (Settlement Hierarchy) are relevant to this application. These policies are considered to be policies relating to the supply of housing and as such can be considered to be out of-date, having regard to the NPPF tests. As such, these policies can be given limited weight in the determination of the application.

Policy DP12 (Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside) seeks to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. While it does seek to restrict certain forms of development, it is not considered to be a policy directly related to the supply of housing, however it is recognised that given the Council's is unable to demonstrate a five year land supply and given the aim of the NPPF to boost significantly the supply of housing, the weight that can be afforded to this policy is moderate.

The appeal decision at 78B West Street in East Grinstead (Planning ref DM/18/4711, Appeal ref W/4000136) is also considered relevant in the determination of this application. It relates to an application for the conversion of two flats to form a single dwelling, returning the property to its original

state. In the Inspector's assessment of that case it was recognised that a residential unit would be lost as a result of the proposal. In paragraph 4-7 of the Appeal Decision letter the inspector states:

'4. Policy DP4 of the Mid Sussex District Plan (2018) sets a minimum figure for housing provision over the development plan period 2014 to 2031. The net loss of one unit of residential accommodation would have a modest effect on the Council's housing delivery calculations and conflict with its overall strategy for housing supply. However, the Council advises that there are no specific policies within its development plan that preclude the loss of a residential unit.

5. The Council has drawn my attention to paragraph 59 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing. However, this paragraph recognises the importance of a sufficient amount and variety of land being brought forward rather than preventing the reversion of the host dwelling to a single unit of accommodation. Similarly, the housing land supply position is concerned with a deliverable supply of land for housing being able to come forward rather than maintaining the total housing stock of existing dwellings within the District.

6. Furthermore, paragraph 11(d) of the Framework states that where there are no relevant development policies, planning permission should be granted. The Council assessed the proposal and concluded that there were no adverse impacts arising from its effect on highways and parking, the character and appearance of the surrounding area, nor the living conditions of existing and future occupants, and I see no reason to disagree with their professional assessment.

7. Overall, in the absence of any demonstrable harm arising from local or national policy that directs against the proposal I find that there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to justify withholding planning permission'. The Appeal was allowed.

With the above in mind, it is considered that although the application will result in the loss of a flat, there is no policy justification to refuse this application on that basis.

The proposed change of use would create a business premise and contribute to the rural economy. The proposal is considered to amount to small scale development and would not result in the enlargement of the existing building or any external alterations. The proposal would therefore support the sustainable growth and vitality of the rural economy. It is therefore considered that the proposal would comply with policies DP12 and DP14, and acceptable in principle.

Design and Character

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states:

'All development and surrounding spaces, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings and replacement dwellings, will be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages while being sensitive to the countryside. All applicants will be required to demonstrate that development:

- *is of high quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;*
- *contributes positively to, and clearly defines, public and private realms and should normally be designed with active building frontages facing streets and public open spaces to animate and provide natural surveillance;*
- *creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;*
- *protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*
- *protects valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of towns and villages;*
- *does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution (see Policy DP27);*
- *creates a pedestrian-friendly layout that is safe, well connected, legible and accessible;*
- *incorporates well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment, particularly where high density housing is proposed;*
- *positively addresses sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design;*

- *take the opportunity to encourage community interaction by creating layouts with a strong neighbourhood focus/centre; larger (300+ unit) schemes will also normally be expected to incorporate a mixed use element;*
- *optimises the potential of the site to accommodate development.'*

The Mid Sussex Design Guide requires all development to be of a high standard of design.

Policy BOLD1 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan echoes the ethos of this policy.

The proposed change of use would not result in any external changes to the building and would maintain the existing character and appearance of the building. The property is set back significantly from the public highway with restricted and distant public views. The proposal is therefore considered to be in keeping with the rural locality and landscape and complies with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.

Impact on neighbouring properties

DP26 states:

"does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution (see Policy DP29);"

Noise pollution:

- It is designed, located and controlled to minimise the impact of noise on health and quality of life, neighbouring properties and the surrounding area;
- If it is likely to generate significant levels of noise it incorporates appropriate noise attenuation measures;

Noise sensitive development, such as residential, will not be permitted in close proximity to existing or proposed development generating high levels of noise unless adequate sound insulation measures, as supported by a noise assessment are incorporated within the development.

In appropriate circumstances, the applicant will be required to provide:

- an assessment of the impact of noise generated by a proposed development; or
- an assessment of the effect of noise by an existing noise source upon a proposed development;
- ...

The degree of the impact of noise and light pollution from new development or change of use is likely to be greater in rural locations, especially where it is in or close to specially designated areas and sites.'

The closest neighbouring residential properties include Coach House Cottage, Pendle Cottage, The Coach House and The Music Room, which are to the east of the application site.

Environmental Health have been consulted on the application, and has provided the following comments:

'The applicant has proposed restricting the hours of operation and deliveries to 09:00 to 17:00, Monday to Friday, in recognition of the site's proximity to neighbouring residential cottages.

While this is a positive and responsible offer, there is limited noise from the business other than people arriving, leaving and deliveries. There is also likely to be considerable noise from Cowfold Road. I recommend the timings are condition, but with some extension, in order to provide the business with greater operational flexibility while still protecting residential amenity.'

Conditions are recommended to restrict the hours of use and deliveries.

Given the existing relationship between the buildings and the proposed office use, it is considered that the proposal would not have a greater impact on neighbour amenities than the existing residential use of the building. The proposal is therefore considered not to cause harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Impact on Parking Provision

Policy DP21 of the District Plan relates to transport and requires proposals to be sustainably located and provide adequate parking. Policy BOLT1 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan echoes the ethos of this policy.

Paragraph 115 of the NPPF is relevant in respect of transport matters and states that:

'In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

- a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be - or have been - taken up, given the type of development and its location;*
- b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;*
- c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code; and*
- d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.'*

In addition, para 116 states; *'Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.'*

The WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments require 1 parking space per 30sqm and 1 cycle space per 100sqm for staff and 1 space per 100sqm for customers. This would equate to 6 car parking spaces and 2 cycle spaces.

The proposed change of use of the property would utilise the existing access onto the highway and no changes to this have been changed. The property benefits from a long driveway up to and around the building which provides sufficient space for vehicles and cycle parking to meet the WSCC minimum standards. It is therefore considered that the proposal would comply with policy DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policy BOLT1 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan and the WSCC Guidance.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Biodiversity net gain is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Under the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain this application comprises development below the de-minimis threshold meaning that this development is exempt from providing biodiversity net gain.

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 East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan.

For the reasons set out within the assessment section, it is considered that the application complies with Mid Sussex District Plan policies DP1, DP4, DP5, DP6, DP12, DP14, DP21, DP26, and DP29 and Bolney Neighbourhood Plan policies BOLBB1, BOLEE2, BOLD1 and BOLT1.

As a result, it is considered that the application complies with the development plan. This is not the end point as planning law requires that 'where in making any determination under the planning Acts, regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material consideration indicates otherwise'.

As the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, it follows that the relevant policies for the supply of housing from the development plan are out-of-date (footnote 8 of paragraph 11 NPPF). As such, reduced weight should be given to these policies.

In these circumstances paragraph 11 of the NPPF provides for a presumption in favour of sustainable development which means that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse effects of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole (having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination), or specific policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a strong reason for refusing the development.

Weighing in favour of the scheme are the economic benefits of that would arise from the conversion works and the contribution the proposal would make to the rural economy.

The proposed development as amended is considered to have a neutral impact in respect of a number of issues. The proposal is considered to conserve the appearance and character of the area and should not be harmful to neighbouring amenities. Nor should the proposal be detrimental to highway safety.

Weighing against the scheme are the concerns that the proposal would result in the loss of a C3 dwellinghouse at a time when there is a general need for Local Authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing. However, there is no specific policy justification to resist the conversion of the dwelling to a commercial use.

In weighing up these issues, when taken together, it is not considered that the adverse impacts of the development would significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal.

In these circumstances the NPPF states that permission should be granted, and this is a material consideration of sufficient weight to overcome the proposal's conflict with the development plan.

There are no other material considerations that would alter the above planning balance.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Katherine Williams