

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/24/3065	Case Officer:	Susan Dubberley
Application Type:	Full Application		
Proposal:	Re-positioning and minor amendments to the owners/ managers house, already permitted under planning application (Reference No: DM/18/2071). Resubmission of DM/21/0711		
Site:	Oaklands Farm, Slaugham Lane, Warninglid, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5TJ, ,		
Validation Date	24 Dec 2024	Overall Expiry Date:	6 Aug 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	4 Sep 2025
Target Date:	18 Feb 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Susan Dubberley</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Steven King</i>	Date:	3 Sep 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/24/3065

**Oaklands Farm, Slaugham Lane, Warninglid, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5TJ,
Re-positioning and minor amendments to the owners/ managers house, already permitted under
planning application (Reference No: DM/18/2071). Resubmission of DM/21/0711
Fiona Bigwood**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS

MSDC Drainage Engineer: No objection subject to conditions.

Ecologist: Objection, further bat surveys required.

WSCC Highway: No objection

MSDC Street naming and numbering: No objection subject to informative.

Parish Council

Slaugham Parish Council: No objection

INTRODUCTION

This application seeks planning permission for the resubmission of planning permission DM/21/0711, which expired in April 2024, which gave approval for the re-positioning and minor amendments to the owners/ managers house, already permitted under planning application (Reference No: DM/18/2071).

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The site has been used since 1989 as an equestrian property and has had various permissions granted relating to the expansion of equestrian facilities and use.

14/01871/FUL single storey five bedroom house with a habitable attic space to replace existing 3 bedroom bungalow. Approved 25/07/2019.

DM/18/2071 - Demolish existing buildings, erection of replacement equestrian facilities for stud, conversion of existing barn for grooms accommodation and staff facilities, erection of owners/managers house. Amended plans received showing reductions in size of house and garage. Approved 29/04/2019.

DM/21/0711 - Re-positioning and minor amendments to the owners/managers house, already permitted under planning application (reference no: DM/18/2071). Approved 21/04/2021.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site lies on the east side of Slaugham Lane and is an equestrian land holding of around 32 hectares. The site has been used since 1989 as an equestrian property and a commercial livery yard.

Permission was granted under DM/18/2071 for the demolition of some of the buildings on the site and for the erection of replacement equestrian facilities for stud, conversion of existing barn for grooms

accommodation and staff facilities and erection of owners/managers house. Most of the works granted consent under the 2018 permission have been constructed on the site apart from the new house.

The site is situated within the Countryside and within the High Weald AONB.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed development includes the removal of wooden chalet type accommodation, and erection of owners/manager house and is in essence a renewal of the expired planning permission DM/21/0711, which gave consent for the re-positioning and minor amendments to the owners/managers house, already permitted under planning application (reference no: DM/18/2071).

The new two storey 4 bedroom house would replace the existing chalet bungalow on the site and be located to the east of the indoor arena. The house would be of a fairly traditional design with pitched roof and feature entrance porch. A balcony is proposed at the rear over a flat roofed projection. To the side of the house would be a detached double garage with pitched roof. The proposed materials are brickwork with tiled roof.

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 the Slaugham 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:

Policy DP12: Protection and Enhancement of Countryside
Policy DP14: Sustainable rural development and the rural economy
Policy DP15: New Homes in the Countryside
Policy DP16: High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
Policy DP21: Transport
Policy DP26: Character and Design
Policy DP27: Space Standards
Policy DP37: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
Policy DP38: Biodiversity
Policy DP41: Flood Risk and Drainage

Site Allocations DPD

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

There are no relevant policies.

Neighbourhood Plan

The Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan was made in September 2019.

Relevant policies:

Policy 1 - Protecting the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

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 (Regulation 19) is currently at Examination and the stage 1 hearings were concluded on the 31st October 2024. There are unresolved objections to the majority of 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:

DPC4 - High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
DPB1 - Character and Design
DPN2 - Biodiversity Net Gain
DPN7 - Noise Impacts
DPT3 - Active and Sustainable Travel

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.

High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2024-2029

The legal framework for AONBs in England and Wales is provided by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (CRoW) 2000 which at Section 82 reaffirms the primary purpose of AONBs: to conserve and enhance natural beauty. Section 84 of the CRoW requires Local Planning Authorities to 'take all such action as appears to them expedient for accomplishment of the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB'.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)

The NPPF sets out the government's policy in order to ensure that the planning system contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. Paragraph 8 sets out the three objectives to sustainable development, such that the planning system needs to perform an economic objective, a social objective and an environmental objective.

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

Technical Housing Standards

Assessment

Principle of development

Policy DP12 of the 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:

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

Policy DP6 of the District Plan states in part that:

Outside defined built-up area boundaries, the expansion of settlements will be supported where:

- 1. The site is allocated in the District Plan, a Neighbourhood Plan or subsequent Development Plan Document or where the proposed development is for fewer than 10 dwellings; and*
- 2. The site is contiguous with an existing built up area of the settlement; and*

3. *The development is demonstrated to be sustainable, including by reference to the settlement hierarchy.'*

Policy DP15 of the District Plan relates to new homes in the countryside and allows for development:

'Provided that they would not be in conflict with Policy DP12: Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside, new homes in the countryside will be permitted where special justification exists. Special justification is defined as:

- o Where accommodation is essential to enable agricultural, forestry and certain other full time rural workers to live at, or in the immediate vicinity of, their place of work; or*
- o In the case of new isolated homes in the countryside, where the design of the dwelling is of exceptional quality and it enhances its immediate setting and is sensitive to the character of the area; or*
- o Affordable housing in accordance with Policy DP32: Rural Exception Sites; or*
- o The proposed development meets the requirements of Policy DP6: Settlement Hierarchy.'*

Policy DP15 continues:

'Replacement dwellings in the countryside will be permitted where:

- o The residential use has not been abandoned;*
- o Highway, access and parking requirements can be met; and*
- o The replacement dwelling maintains or where possible enhances the quality of the natural and/or built landscape particularly in the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, especially if a significant change in scale from the existing dwelling is proposed.'*

It is considered that the proposal would comply with DP15 as the replacement of the chalet bungalow on the site and a need for an owner/manager to live on the site has previously been accepted. The Council's Rural appraisal consultant had previously made comments on the lapsed planning permission on the site regarding the need for an owner/manager to live on the site in regard to Policy DP15 and it was considered that there was a demonstrated need for such accommodation. It is not considered that this position has changed since the approvals.

In addition, the principle of a dwelling on the site has been established by the two previous planning permissions on the site which both included a new dwelling (Reference No: DM/18/2071 and DM/21/0711 which gave permission for re-positioning and minor amendments to the approved dwelling).

Therefore, given the previous views of the Rural appraisal consultant and the fact that there are recent approvals for a dwelling on the site, which this application now seeks to renew, then the principle of an owner/manager to live on the site is considered acceptable and is in compliance with policy DP15.

Design and visual impact including AONB

The site lies within the the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The legal framework for AONBs, (also known as National Landscapes) in England and Wales is provided by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (CRoW) 2000 which at Section 82 reaffirms the primary purpose of AONBs: to conserve and enhance natural beauty. Section 84 of the CRoW requires Local Planning Authorities to *'take all such action as appears to them expedient for accomplishment of the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB'*. The Levelling-up and Regeneration Act (2023) amended section 85 of the CRoW Act, to create a new duty on relevant authorities to *'seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area' when discharging their functions in AONBs'*. A similar ethos is found within The High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan which is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications in the AONB.

In respect of the AONB Policy DP16 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states:

'Development within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), as shown on the Policies Maps, will only be permitted where it conserves or enhances natural beauty and has regard to the High Weald AONB Management Plan, in particular:

- the identified landscape features or components of natural beauty and to their setting;*
 - the traditional interaction of people with nature, and appropriate land management;*
 - character and local distinctiveness, settlement pattern, sense of place and setting of the AONB;*
- and*
- the conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage.*

Small scale proposals which support the economy and social well-being of the AONB that are compatible with the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty will be supported.

Development on land that contributes to the setting of the AONB will only be permitted where it does not detract from the visual qualities and essential characteristics of the AONB, and in particular should not adversely affect the views into and out of the AONB by virtue of its location or design.'

Policy 1 of the Slaughtam Neighbourhood Plan has a similar policy:

'Development proposals within the High Weald AONB will be supported where they conserve or enhance natural beauty and have regard to the High Weald AONB Management Plan.

Small scale proposals which support the local economy and social well-being of the AONB will be supported where they are compatible with the conservation and enhancement of the AONB.

Development proposals on land that contributes to the setting of the AONB will only be permitted where it does not detract from the visual qualities and essential characteristics of the AONB, and in particular does not adversely affect the views into and out of the AONB by virtue of its location and/or design.'

While Paragraphs 189 and 190 of the NPPF states that:

'189. Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and National Landscapes which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads. The scale and extent of development within all these designated areas should be limited, while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.

190. When considering applications for development within National Parks, the Broads and National Landscapes, permission should be refused for major development⁶⁷ other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

- a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;*
- b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and*
- c) any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.'*

In regard to design, policy DP26 requires development to be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages.

There is an overriding need to ensure that the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside is recognised and that development should contribute to protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment.

In this case it is considered that a house of the same design and similar size, has been approved under the extant permission DM/18/2071 on the site. Subsequently, a house of the of the same design and

similar size, albeit with re-positioning and minor amendments to the previously approved dwelling, (including an increase in height of 0.58m), was approved under DM/21/0711. This current application seeks to renew DM/21/0711.

The design and visual impact, including the impact on the AONB was considered to be acceptable when both the previous applications for an owner/managers house on the on the site were assessed. This position has not changed, and the application remains acceptable in regard to design and visual impact including on the AONB.

Therefore is considered that the application would comply with policies DP16 and DP26 of the District Plan, Policy 1 of the Slaughtam Neighbourhood Plan and Paragraphs 189 and 190 of the NPPF.

Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain

Para 193 of the NPPF highlights that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, amongst other things protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains where possible. In determining planning applications, para 180 sets out a number of principles that local planning authorities should apply in trying to conserve and enhance biodiversity, which include the following;

'- if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;'

Policy DP38 of the District Plan also seeks to ensure that biodiversity will be protected and enhanced.

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless;

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which means that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply.

The statutory requirement is that the relevant development must deliver at least 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat.

The application is supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Roost Assessment Ecological Impact Assessment, Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment and Great Crested Newt Reasonable Avoidance Measures statement.

The application and has been assessed by the Council's Consultant Ecologist who has raised a holding objection as the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Roost Assessment recommended that further surveys for roosting bats are required on the two buildings on site, which are to be demolished. This is because a Preliminary Roost Assessment for bats was not undertaken on Buildings B1 (single storey residential building) and B2 (livestock shelter) and the previous bat emergence survey undertaken on B1 in 2017 is more than three years old.

Following the submission of an updated Preliminary Roost Assessment for bats the ecologist is still raising a holding objection pending further bat surveys. stating:

'Our previous comments stated further information was required as the submitted ecological report was out of date to support this planning application. We have now reviewed the Preliminary Roost Assessment (Arbtech, May 2025), however, this document has assessed the two buildings as having bat roost potential (low and moderate) and as such has recommended a further two bat emergence surveys to inform the requirement for a European Protected Species Mitigation Licence, any mitigation and or

any compensation measures. Therefore, the results of the recommended further surveys are required prior to determination.

Additionally, we acknowledge that this application states there is a fallback position, under applications DM/18/2071 and DM/21/0711. However, as stated previously the ecological data supplied with those applications is now out of date and degradation of structures over time can be significant enough to form Potential Roost Features, which has been indicated within the updated Preliminary Roost Assessment (Arbtech, May 2025). As such even with the existing applications, the applicant has a legal duty to avoid harm upon protected species, following the mitigation hierarchy.'

While the comments of the ecologist are noted and while a condition would not normally be recommended and further bat surveys would be needed before the determination of the application, the particular circumstances of this case are relevant in that the previous approvals DM/18/2071 and DM/21/0711, did not have any ecology conditions attached to them. In addition, the earlier 2018 permission is still extant therefore demolition works could take place without any requirement to carry out any further surveys. Therefore, in view of the above it is recommended that a pre-commencement condition requiring further bat emergence/re-entry surveys to be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations of the Preliminary Roost Assessment (Arbtech, May 2025), with the results of the surveys, to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, is appropriate in this instance. The applicant is willing to accept such a condition. By adopting this approach, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) would have greater control over this matter in respect of the implementation of this planning permission compared to the extant 2018 planning permission.

It should also be noted that this approach does not set any form of precedent because the decision of the LPA in this case is based on the unique circumstances that apply in this instance.

The Ecologist supports the submitted Statutory Biodiversity Metric (Arbtech Consulting Ltd., December 2024) and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Arbtech Consulting Ltd., December 2024) subject to a Biodiversity Gain Plan should be submitted prior to commencement.

In regard to the Great Crested Newt, the Nature Space Partnership has raised no objection commenting and are satisfied that while there is a moderate level risk to this application, which could be mitigated through the use of Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMs) without the need for further surveying. This aspect of the proposals is therefore considered acceptable subject to a condition to ensure the recommendations set out in the RAMs are implemented in full.

In view of the above it is considered that subject to condition the proposal complies with Policy DP38 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the aims of the NPPF.

Access and Parking

Policy DP21 the Mid Sussex District Plan requires development to: be sustainably located to minimise the need for travel; promote alternative means of transport to the private car, including provision of suitable facilities for secure and safe cycle parking; not cause a severe cumulative impact in terms of road safety and increased traffic congestion; be designed to adoptable standards, or other standards as agreed by the Local Planning Authority, including road widths and size of garages; and provide adequate car parking in accordance with parking standards as agreed by the Local Planning Authority or in accordance with the relevant Neighbourhood Plan.

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) have reviewed the application and commented:

'Given the site already benefits from a previous planning permission for these proposals, albeit expired, the LHA would not raise any highway safety concerns to the current resubmission. The site is served by an existing established access point on Slaugham Lane that exhibits suitable visibility in both directions. The proposed driveway also exhibits plentiful space for the parking and turning of vehicles associated with the proposed use.

In summary, the LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network,

therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.'

The application therefore is considered to comply with policy DP21 of the District Plan in regard to access, parking and highway safety.

The impact on neighbouring amenities

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan seeks to ensure that development 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.

In terms of the impact on adjoining properties, the site is surrounded by open countryside with no near neighbours. The nearest residential property is Naylands and the proposed house would be some 230m from the boundary with Naylands and the distance between the two houses some 340m therefore it is considered that given these distances there would be no significant impact on this adjoining properties.

The proposal is thereby considered to comply with policy DP26 of the District Plan.

Standard of accommodation

The Government's Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standards document was published in March 2015 and sets out space standards for all new residential dwellings to secure a satisfactory standard of accommodation for future residents. Policy DP27 of the District Plan seeks to ensure that Dwelling space standards comply with The Government's Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standards document, which sets out space standards for all new residential dwellings to secure a satisfactory standard of accommodation for future residents.

In this case the plans show that the house would exceed the required space standards.

The proposals would therefore comply with Policy DP27 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.

Drainage

Policy DP41 of the District Plan requires development proposals to follow a sequential risk-based approach, ensure development is safe across its lifetime and not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. In areas that have experienced flooding in the past, use of Sustainable Drainage Systems should be implemented unless demonstrated to be inappropriate.

The Drainage Engineer has reviewed the drainage details submitted and has raised no objection. However, while the drainage details are detailed, they relate to the 2018 application DM/18/2071. The drainage engineer has therefore commented that due to the change in the development from the previously approved scheme it is considered that this matter should be dealt with by condition, and at the detailed design stage, calculations and drainage layouts should be provided to reflect the updated proposal.

In view of the above it is considered that the proposal would comply with policy DP41.

CONCLUSIONS

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.

It is considered that the proposal would comply with policy DP15 as a need for an owner/manager to live on the site has previously been agreed. The Council's Rural appraisal consultant had previously made comments on the lapsed planning permission on the site regarding the need for an owner/manager to

live on the site in regard to Policy DP15 and it was considered that there was a demonstrated need for such accommodation. It is not considered that this position has changed since the approvals.

In addition the principle of a dwelling on the site has been established by the two previous planning permissions on the site which both included a new dwelling (Reference No: DM/18/2071 and DM/21/0711 which gave permission for re-positioning and minor amendments to the approved dwelling).

The design and visual impact, including the impact on the AONB was considered to be acceptable when both the previous applications for an owner/managers house on the site were assessed. The application remains acceptable in regard to design and visual impact including on the AONB.

There will be a neutral impact in respect of highway safety and parking provision, space standards drainage, ecology and neighbouring amenity.

It is considered that the proposals are compliant with policy DP12, DP15, DP16, DP21, DP26, DP32, DP38 DP41, Policy 1 of the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan and the aims of the NPPF

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Susan Dubberley