

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/1453	Case Officer:	Joanne Fisher
Application Type:	Permission in Principle		
Proposal:	Erection of a dwelling and associated development.		
Site:	Birch Trees Farm, Cuckfield Road, Ansty, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5AG, ,		
Validation Date	9 Jun 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	4 Jul 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	11 Jul 2025
Target Date:	14 Jul 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	Joanne Fisher

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	14 Jul 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/1453

**Birch Trees Farm, Cuckfield Road, Ansty, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5AG,
Erection of a dwelling and associated development.
A And R Upton**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS

Highways Authority

In principle, the LHA would not raise any objections to an application at this site, subject to the submission of sufficient information at Technical Details Stage.

MSDC Environmental Protection

Recommendation: approve with condition.

MSDC Contaminated Land Officer

Recommendation: approve with conditions.

MSDC Street Name and Numbering

Informative.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Not received.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks Permission in Principle for the erection of a dwelling and associated development at Birch Trees Farm, Cuckfield Road, Ansty.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

There is no relevant planning history in relation to the red edged site. However in terms of the wider site:

DM/21/1375 - Permission in Principle for the demolition of a steel frame building(s) and erection of single dwelling and associated development. Approved.

DM/22/2315 - Application for technical detail consent in relation to the permission in principle Ref: DM/21/1375. Approved. This has been constructed and is occupied.

DM/23/1251 - Variation of condition 2 of application DM/22/2315 to amend the approved plans in regards of design and location of the proposed dwelling. Approved.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site is an irregular shaped area of land within a larger ownership comprised in Birch Trees Farm. The site includes access to the public highway which is gained via a private single track lane. Most of the site is hardsurfaced and there are trees and vegetation on the boundaries of the site as well as within the site. There is a utilitarian building on the application site.

To the west of the site is a single-storey dwelling, Birch Trees Farm and an agricultural building with Wellingtonia Lodge beyond. To the south is an access and a recently constructed dwelling Meadow View. To the north is an existing access and trees and vegetation on the boundary with the private access. To the east are trees and vegetation and a number of caravan pitches as the wider site is subject to a seasonal touring Caravan Club Certified site.

The application site is situated within the countryside as defined in the District and Neighbourhood Plans.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks Permission in Principle for the erection of one dwelling and associated development at Birch Trees Farm, Cuckfield Road, Ansty.

Due to the type of application limited information has been provided. However, a location and block plan has been provided showing the red line of the application site including access to the east of Birch Trees Farm on an area of hardstanding.

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, Site Allocations Development Plan Document and the Ansty, Staplefield and Brook Street 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 (adopted March 2018)

Relevant policies:

DP6 - Settlement Hierarchy
DP12 - Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside
DP15 - New Homes in the Countryside
DP17 - Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
DP21 - Transport
DP26 - Character and Design
DP27- Dwelling Space Standards
DP29 - Noise, Air and Light Pollution
DP37 - Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
DP38 - Biodiversity
DP39 - Sustainable Design and Construction
DP41 - Flood Risk and Drainage

Site Allocations Development Plan Document (adopted June 2022)

There are no relevant policies.

Neighbourhood Plan

The Ansty, Staplefield and Brook Street Neighbourhood Plan was made on the 2nd February 2017 and forms part of the development plan, carrying full weight.

Relevant policy:

AS1 - New housing development

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 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
DPS4: Flood Risk and Drainage
DPN1: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery
DPN2: Biodiversity Net Gain
DPN4: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
DPN7: Noise Impacts
DPC1: Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside
DPC3: New Homes in the Countryside
DPC6: Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC
DPB1: Character and Design
DPT4: Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure
DPH1: Housing

DPH2: Sustainable Development - Outside the Built-up Area
DPH7: Housing Mix
DPH11: Dwelling Space Standards

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)

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 overarching objectives to sustainable development, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives). The three objectives are economic, social and environmental.

Paragraph 9 of the NPPF states *'these objectives should be delivered through the preparation and implementation of plans and the application of the policies in this Framework; they are not criteria against which every decision can or should be judged. Planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area.'*

Paragraph 11 of the NPPF sets out that for both plan-making and decision-taking, the presumption in favour of sustainable development should apply.

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

Permission in principle.

ASSESSMENT

Issued in support of the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) (Amendment) Order 2017, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government Guidance on Permission in Principle (published 28 July 2017 updated March 2019) sets out matters within the scope of a decision, which are limited to: 'location, land use and amount of development' (NPPG Paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 58-012-20180615).

The application should take into consideration issues relevant to these 'in principle' matters; other matters should be considered at the technical details stage. A decision on whether to grant a permission in principle must be made in accordance with relevant policies in the development plan unless there are material considerations, such as those in the NPPF and National Guidance, which indicate otherwise.

This means that matters such as siting, design, scale, accessibility, impact on neighbouring occupiers or impact on trees and biodiversity cannot be considered at this stage. They would however be considered at the technical details stage instead.

The application as submitted contains a location plan denoting the extent of the application site along with an application form and planning statement. This sets out that the proposal is for one dwelling and that it *'is envisaged that the proposed dwelling would be built on the surfaced area of the site marked A on the location plan, which is currently used occasionally as an additional visitor parking area for the adjoining caravan site.'*

Taking each of the matters for consideration in order:

Location

The application site is designated as being within the countryside. Policy DP12 of the District Plan refers to the protection of the countryside and states, in part, that development will be permitted in the countryside provided it maintains or where possible enhances the quality of the rural and landscape character of the District, and is necessary for the purposes of agriculture or 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.'*

The red line of the application site is contiguous with the development boundary and is considered to be in a sustainable location close to a bus stop and the garage at Ansty which provides a small shop.

Policy DP15 of the District Plan refers to new homes in the countryside and sets out the special justifications where new homes would be permitted. Special justification would include;

- Essential agricultural or forestry workers accommodation
- Exceptional design quality for isolated new homes
- Rural exception sites
- DP6 requirements being met

The proposed residential development meets point 4 of these special justifications.

Policy AS1 of the Neighbourhood Plan relates to New Housing Development. It states:

'The Ansty, Staplefield and Brook Street Neighbourhood Plan area is subject to significant environmental constraints and as a result new housing should be focused within the Development Boundary of Ansty as identified in the proposal map. Other proposals for small scale housing development of up to 10 units, to meet identified local need will only be permitted subject to the criteria below and compliance with other policies within the plan, in particular AS2 and AS3:

- a) The proposed development contributes to sustainable development;*

- b) Any application is supported by assessment of the environmental and visual impact of the proposal and include as necessary appropriate mitigation measures.*
- c) An application is supported by a robust assessment of the impact of the proposal upon the local highway network.*
- d) The proposal provides a mix of tenure types including private, social rented and shared equity (intermediate) to meet local housing need.*

All other development proposals outside the Ansty Development Boundary will not be permitted unless:
o They comply with the countryside policies of the Mid Sussex Local Plan 2004 or the Mid Sussex District Plan once it is adopted; Or
o They relate to necessary utilities infrastructure where no reasonable alternative location is available.'

There are no other relevant policies in the District Plan, any other development plan documents such as the Site Allocations document, or the Neighbourhood Plan that would explicitly support the residential development of this site. The principle of the application complies with the development plan, in terms of what type of development is allowable under Policies DP6 and DP15.

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 delivery 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.

Policy DP15 (New Homes in the Countryside) identifies the types of new homes that will be permitted in the countryside, where special justification exists. While this policy relates to the provision of housing, the aims are consistent with paragraphs 82 - 84 of the NPPF and as such this policy can be given full weight.

Policy AS1 of the Neighbourhood Plan relates to new housing development and seeks to focus new housing within the development boundary of Ansty. It does however allow for small scale housing developments of less than 10 to meet identified local need subject to a number of criteria including that it contributes to sustainable development and provides a mix of tenure. While this policy relates to the provision of housing, the aims are consistent with paragraphs 82 - 84 of the NPPF and as such this policy can be given full weight.

Therefore, the key test that must be undertaken when assessing this application is as set out within paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF.

It is considered that whilst the proposal falls outside of the development boundary of Ansty, the red line of the application site is contiguous with the development boundary. The proposal is for 1 dwelling set close to the development boundary and surrounded by three other dwellings. The design and scale of the dwelling would be considered at the technical consent stage, however, it is considered that in this instance due to the location of the site that the proposal would maintain the character of the countryside in this part of Ansty.

The site falls within Flood Zone 1. Details concerning how the site would be drained if it were to be developed is a matter which would be considered at the technical matters stage.

The sustainability of a site is a consideration. The NPPF recognises that opportunities to maximise sustainable travel solutions will vary between urban and rural area, however it also encourages development to be focused on locations that limits the need for travel as set out with paragraph 115 of the NPPF. This aligns with the aims of Policy DP21 of the District Plan. As policy DP21 accords with the aims of the NPPF, it can be afforded full weight. The site is located close to a bus stop and the garage at Ansty which provides a small shop. As such any future occupiers would not be highly reliant on the use of motor vehicles to access local services and that these could be accessed through sustainable means.

The principle of development is therefore deemed acceptable in relation to location. Matters relating to the above criteria will in part form consideration of 'amount of development' below. However more detailed assessment of matters such as materials and neighbouring amenity would be considered at the 'technical details consent' stage should permission in principle be approved.

Land use

As noted above the application site is located within the countryside just outside the built up area boundary of Ansty. The proposal would result in the removal of an agricultural building on the site to allow for vehicular access to serve the dwelling.

The application site adjoins three dwellings and is on the edge of the settlement boundary of Ansty. Due to the relationship with surrounding residential properties, there currently being storage buildings on the site and the relationship with the settlement boundary, it is considered that based on the land use, the principle of the use of the site for residential purposes is acceptable.

Amount of development

In relation to amount of development and in the absence of specific national guidance that would undermine this approach, consideration will be given to matters which could render the proposal for one dwelling on the site unacceptable in principle.

In the absence of supporting information, the Local Planning Authority and relevant consultees have drawn on the resources available at the time of the application in order to inform their consideration of these matters.

In relation to the size and shape of the plot and its possibility to accommodate a single dwelling, Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design. In part it requires developments to be well designed, be of a high quality design and layout with appropriate landscaping and greenspace; contribute positively to and clearly define public and private realms as well as creating a sense of place whilst addressing the character and scale of surrounding buildings and landscape. In addition, it requires development to incorporate well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment.

Whilst details of the scale and design are reserved for the technical details consent stage, it is considered that the size and shape of the plot is suitable to accommodate one dwelling on the site whilst retaining adequate distances from the neighbouring residential properties and providing adequate parking and access to the site. The size and shape of the plot and the potential to accommodate one dwelling on the site will not cause harm to the character of the area.

In relation to access, the site is accessed by a single access track off the Cuckfield Road which serves a number of dwellings and the adjoining caravan site use. It is considered that the additional traffic resulting from one dwelling would not result in material harm to the highway network and the use of this access.

It is therefore considered that the amount of development of one dwelling proposed on the site is acceptable.

Ashdown Forest

Under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the 'Habitats Regulations'), the competent authority - in this case, Mid Sussex District Council - has a duty to ensure that any plans or projects that they regulate (including plan making and determining planning applications) will have no adverse effect on the integrity of a European site of nature conservation importance. The European site of focus is the Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

The potential effects of development on Ashdown Forest were assessed during the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) process for the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031. This process identified likely

significant effects on the Ashdown Forest SPA from recreational disturbance and on the Ashdown Forest SAC from atmospheric pollution.

A Habitats Regulations Assessment has been undertaken for the proposed development.

Recreational disturbance

Increased recreational activity arising from new residential development and related population growth is likely to disturb the protected near-ground and ground nesting birds on Ashdown Forest.

In accordance with advice from Natural England, the HRA for the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031, and as detailed in District Plan Policy DP17, mitigation measures are necessary to counteract the effects of a potential increase in recreational pressure and are required for developments resulting in a net increase in dwellings within a 7km zone of influence around the Ashdown Forest SPA. A Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) mitigation approach has been developed. This mitigation approach has been agreed with Natural England.

The proposed development is outside the 7km zone of influence and as such, mitigation is not required.

Atmospheric pollution

Increased traffic emissions as a consequence of new development may result in atmospheric pollution on Ashdown Forest. The main pollutant effects of interest are acid deposition and eutrophication by nitrogen deposition. High levels of nitrogen may detrimentally affect the composition of an ecosystem and lead to loss of species.

The proposed development was modelled in the Mid Sussex Transport Study as a windfall development such that its potential effects are incorporated into the overall results of the transport model, which indicates there would not be an overall impact on Ashdown Forest. This means that there is not considered to be a significant in combination effect on the Ashdown Forest SAC by this development proposal.

Conclusion of the Habitats Regulations Assessment

The Habitats Regulations Assessment concludes that there would be no likely significant effects, alone or in combination, on the Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC from the proposed development.

No mitigation is required in relation to the Ashdown Forest SPA or SAC.

A full HRA (that is, the appropriate assessment stage that ascertains the effect on integrity of the European site) of the proposed development is not required.

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 Ansty, Staplefield and Brook Street Neighbourhood Plan.

For the reasons set out within the assessment section, it is considered that the application complies with Mid Sussex District Plan policies DP6, DP12, DP15 and DP21 and Neighbourhood Plan policy AS1.

Although the application must be assessed against the policies of the development plan taken as a whole, this assessment has identified conflict with the development plan. There is partial conflict with policy DP12 but the proposal does maintain the quality of the landscape character.

As a result, it is considered that the application conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole. 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.

When undertaking the balancing exercise the following benefits, harms and neutral impacts are as follows:

In terms of the scheme's benefits, the proposal would form 1 dwelling. Socially, the provision of the new dwelling will bring about positive impacts to the local community. The construction of the development will provide local jobs and employment opportunities which is a positive impact. From an environmental view, the proposed development is sustainably located within close proximity to facilities, services and public transport. This is all positive in the planning balance.

While the proposal conflicts with some policies in the development plan, it is not considered that it would lead to any adverse effects that would outweigh the benefits of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Notwithstanding that, while this is only one new dwelling, it would still contribute to the Council's much needed housing supply and make effective use of the land.

The neutral impacts relate to the impact on Ashdown Forest.

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: Joanne Fisher