

## Delegated Decision

### Sign off Sheet

|                                              |                                                                                          |                                        |             |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------|
| <b>Ref. No:</b>                              | DM/25/2452                                                                               | <b>Case Officer:</b>                   | Steven King |
| <b>Application Type:</b>                     | Removal/Variation of Condition                                                           |                                        |             |
| <b>Proposal:</b>                             | Vary condition 24 relating to planning reference DM/20/4159 to substitute amended plans. |                                        |             |
| <b>Site:</b>                                 | Downlands Park Care Home, Bolnore Farm Lane, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 4BQ, , ,  |                                        |             |
| <b>Validation Date</b>                       | 13 Oct 2025                                                                              | <b>Overall Expiry Date:</b>            | 21 Nov 2025 |
| <b>Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:</b> |                                                                                          | <b>Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:</b> |             |
| <b>Recommendation:</b>                       | Permission                                                                               | <b>Recommendation Date:</b>            | 10 Jul 2026 |
| <b>Target Date:</b>                          | 12 Jan 2026                                                                              | <b>Recommending Officer Signature:</b> | Steven King |

|                                                        |  |                               |   |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)</b> |  | <b>No of Representations:</b> | 2 |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---|

|                              |                    |              |             |
|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|-------------|
| <b>Signed and Agreed By:</b> | Beth Howland-Smith | <b>Date:</b> | 10 Jul 2026 |
| <b>Comments:</b>             |                    |              |             |

## MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

**DM/25/2452**

**Downlands Park Care Home, Bolnore Farm Lane, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 4BQ, ,  
Vary condition 24 relating to planning reference DM/20/4159 to substitute amended plans.  
George Dhillon**

### **SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS**

2 letters received:

- request a reduction in the number of car parking spaces as the unit numbers are reduced and so have the communal facilities available to the public. Reducing the car parking will enable reinstatement of some of the originally required tree planting along the northern boundary
- developer should be required to reinstate the 6ft wall along the northern boundary before further works take place
- request signage be erected to prevent construction vehicles trying to access the site from Kleinwort Close
- the verge along Bolnore Farm Lane should be protected from construction vehicles
- concerned that the developers may continue to prevaricate and never finish developing the site

### **SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES**

#### **County Planning Officer**

Requires the following infrastructure contributions:

Libraries £17,460

Total Access Demand £131,370

#### **Highway Authority**

The proposals seek to change the original 2020 application's proposals to 8 studio apartments proposed originally so we have altered the internal layout to create 4x2 bed apartments. From the Local Highway Authority's perspective no concerns would be raised with these minor changes.

### **TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS**

No comment.

### **INTRODUCTION**

This application seeks planning permission to vary condition 24 attached to planning permission reference DM/20/4159. The purpose of the application is to seek approval for amended plans to make a change to the approved scheme in relation to the apartment block.

### **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

Planning permission was approved under reference DM/20/4159 for the following development: *Erection of part two, part three and part four storey building comprising 70 extra care apartments with community hub, guest suite and staff facilities together with 15 extra care cottages (85 in total), pavilion, parking and access to form a Continuing Care Retirement Community following demolition of existing care home. Additional highways information received 28th January 2021 (Amended plans received 9th March showing a revised design and a reduction in the number of proposed units to 81)*

A previous section 73 application was approved on 6th August 2025 (DM/23/3195). The purpose of that application was to approve a revised development on the site that removed the previously approved basement car parking and amended the surface car parking at the site.

A previous non-material amendment application (DM/25/0077) changed the original description to read as follows: *Erection of part two, part three and part four storey building comprising 66 extra care*

*apartments with community hub, guest suite and staff facilities together with 15 extra care cottages (81 in total), pavilion, parking and access to form a Continuing Care Retirement Community following demolition of existing care home.*

Finally, a second non-material amendment application (DM/25/2246) approved a revised description for the development to read as follows: *'Erection of part two, part three and part four storey building of apartments with community hub together with 15 cottages, to provide extra care facilities, following the demolition of existing care home.'*

## **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

The site, which has an area of 2.57 hectares, is located on the eastern side of Bolnore Farm Lane close to its junction with Butlers Green Road (B2272) and is approximately 1km west of Haywards Heath town centre. The site used to have a large two storey 19th Century Victorian manor that was last in use as a care home set in attractive landscaped grounds with mature tree planting around its boundaries. This has been demolished following fire damage. Vehicle access to the site is to the western boundary from Bolnore Farm Lane. There is car parking to the west and northeast of the manor house. There is a substantial fall in levels through the site from north to south of some 8m.

To the northeast of the site is Hurst Place, a retirement village recently developed by Anchor and BUPA comprising 57 Extra Care apartments (C2), a 64 bed Care Home (C2), 10 retirement cottages (C2) and a community building owned by the Lamb Group, the former owner of the subject Downlands Site, and let to Age UK for the provision of services to older people living in the wider community.

To the west on the opposite side of Bolnore Farm Lane there is an area of open space that has several trees within it. To the south Bolnore Farm Lane becomes a single width road that provides access to several residential properties. It is also a bridleway. To the east of the site is Beech Hurst Gardens. To the southeast there is a residential development of 18 dwellings that were under construction when the original planning application on this site was reported to the Planning Committee, permitted under reference DM/19/3619. This residential development to the south of the site is now completed and occupied.

The west, south and eastern boundaries of the site are well screened by trees and hedging. The northern boundary to the care home to the northeast is more open as it is marked by metal railings. To the northwest the boundary with the cottages on Kleinwort Close is marked by hedging.

Immediately to the north of the site is Downlands Cottage, a detached dwelling and to the north of this are two semidetached properties.

In terms of planning policy, the site is within the built-up area of Haywards Heath as defined in the Mid Sussex District Plan (MSDP), with the built-up area boundary running along Bolnore Farm Lane to the west and south.

## **APPLICATION DETAILS**

This application seeks planning permission to vary condition 24 attached to planning permission reference DM/20/4159. The purpose of the application is to approve amended plans to make a change to the approved scheme in relation to the apartment block.

The proposed plans also show the development without the basement car parking and the change to the surface car parking that was approved under application DM/23/3195.

The originally approved scheme provided 33 x 1 bed apartments and 33 x 2 bed apartments, together with 15 x 2 bed cottages. This application would leave the cottages unchanged. The internal layout of the apartment block would be changed to provide 18 x 1 bed apartments and 44 x 2 bed apartments. The exterior of the apartment block would remain unchanged. Therefore, the revised proposal would result in a net reduction of 4 apartments and a change in the mix of apartments.

The applicants have stated that the reason for the change relates to the viability of the project. In response to cost increases, the applicants advise that they have reassessed the mix of apartments,

stating that there is no demand for the 8 studio apartments proposed originally so they have altered the internal layout to create 4 x 2 bed apartments in their place.

## **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, and*
- 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 Mid Sussex District Plan (MSDP), Site Allocations Development Plan Document (SADPD) and the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan (HHNP).

National policy (which is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 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:

DP17 Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC)  
DP20 Securing Infrastructure  
DP21 Transport  
DP26 Character and Design  
DP29 Noise, Air and Light Pollution  
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.

No relevant policies.

## Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan

The Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan (HHNP) was made on 15th December 2016 and so forms part of the development plan. It is therefore a material consideration with full weight.

Relevant policies:

Policy E7 Drainage

Policy E9 Design

## 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 hearings were concluded on the 19th March 2026. The District Plan remains at Examination until the Inspector has published his report, until that time only minimal weight can be given to the Plan and this planning application has been assessed against the policies of the adopted District Plan.

Relevant policies:

DPS4: Flood Risk and Drainage

DPB1: Character and Design

DPI1: Infrastructure Provision

DPI2: Planning Obligations

### 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.

### *National Planning Policy Guidance*

## **ASSESSMENT**

This application is made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to vary or remove conditions associated with a planning permission. The Act states that '*On such an application the local planning authority shall consider only the question of the conditions subject to which planning permission should be granted, and-*

*(a) if they decide that planning permission should be granted subject to conditions differing from those subject to which the previous permission was granted, or that it should be granted unconditionally, they shall grant planning permission accordingly, and*

*(b) if they decide that planning permission should be granted subject to the same conditions as those subject to which the previous permission was granted, they shall refuse the application.'*

Accordingly, it is not necessary to reassess all of the issues from the original planning application; it is only necessary to assess the issues that are relevant in relation to the condition/s that are proposed to be amended.

In light of the fact that this is an application submitted under section 73 of the TCPA, it is considered that the issues to assess with this application are as set out below.

- o Principle
- o Design and Impact on the character and appearance of the area
- o Highways
- o Impact on Residential Amenity
- o Flood Risk and Drainage
- o Ashdown Forest
- o Biodiversity Net Gain
- o Planning Balance and Conclusion

### **Principle**

As noted above, planning permission has been granted for this development under application DM/20/4159. This application is seeking to make amendments to that planning permission that involve internal changes to the apartment block to change the mix of units, resulting in a reduction in the number of the units in the apartment block from 66 to 62. This would be achieved by making internal changes to the building; there would be no external changes to the building compared to the building that was approved under the previous section 73 planning permission DM/23/3195.

Therefore, the principle of the development has been established, and it is not necessary to reassess all the issues that were considered in the original decision to grant planning permission for this development. It is only necessary to consider the matters that arise from the proposed change from the original planning permission. It is also not necessary to reassess the issues that were subsequently assessed under the previous s73 application, DM/23/3195.

### **Design and Impact on the character and appearance of the area**

Policy DP26 in the MSDP seeks a high standard of design in new development. It 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 DP29);*
- *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.'*

Policy E9 in the HHNP states:

*'Developers must demonstrate how their proposal will protect and reinforce the local character within the locality of the site. This will include having regard to the following design elements:*

- height, scale, spacing, layout, orientation, design and materials of buildings,
- the scale, design and materials of the development (highways, footways, open space and landscape), and is sympathetic to the setting of any heritage asset, or respects the natural contours of a site and protects and sensitively incorporates natural features such as trees, hedges and ponds within the site,
- creates safe, accessible and well-connected environments that meet the needs of users, or Will not result in unacceptable levels of light, noise, air or water pollution,
- Makes best use of the site to accommodate development,
- Car parking is designed and located so that it fits in with the character of the proposed development.

*Proposals affecting a listed building, conservation area, building of local interest or public park of historic interest or their setting should preserve or enhance their special interest and/or distinctive character.'*

It is considered that the above design policies accord with the aims of the NPPF and can be afforded full weight.

The NPPF makes it clear in paragraph 135 that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

The scale and external appearance of the buildings within the site would not be changed from this proposal. The change to the mix of apartments and the reduction in the number of apartments would be achieved by internal changes to the building. As such it is considered that the design of the development remains acceptable in accordance with the above policies and guidance.

The plans submitted with this application show the same external parking arrangements as were approved under the previous s73 application DM/23/3195, together with the removal of the basement car parking. This revised parking arrangement was approved in August 2025 under the same development plan that applies now. There have been no changes on the ground since this approval that would warrant a different view being formed on the changes to the car parking to that which was made in 2025. Therefore, it is not necessary revisit this matter now in respect of the design and layout of the car parking.

### **Neighbour amenity**

Policy DP26 in the MSDP seeks to avoid 'significant harm' to the amenities of neighbouring residents, taking into account the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, noise, air and light pollution. Policy DP29 in the MSDP states in part that the quality of people's life will be protected from unacceptable levels of noise, light and air pollution.

To the northeast of the site are the retirement bungalows on Kleinwort Close, which are arranged in a three sided courtyard. There is a distance of some 8.6m at the closest point of the properties on Kleinwort Close to the boundary of the site.

As there will be no change to the external appearance of the apartment block, there will be no change to the impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties from this proposal.

With regards to the change to the car parking layout, this remains the same as was approved on the previous s73 application DM/23/3195. Therefore, it is not necessary to reassess this issue now, as the revised parking layout was found to be acceptable in relation to neighbouring amenities in August 2025.

### **Transport and Access**

Policy DP21 in the MSDP states:

*'Development will be required to support the objectives of the West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-2026, which are:*

- A high quality transport network that promotes a competitive and prosperous economy;
- A resilient transport network that complements the built and natural environment whilst reducing carbon emissions over time;
- Access to services, employment and housing; and

*- A transport network that feels, and is, safer and healthier to use.*

*To meet these objectives, decisions on development proposals will take account of whether:*

- The scheme is sustainably located to minimise the need for travel noting there might be circumstances where development needs to be located in the countryside, such as rural economic uses (see policy DP14: Sustainable Rural Development and the Rural Economy);*
- Appropriate opportunities to facilitate and promote the increased use of alternative means of transport to the private car, such as the provision of, and access to, safe and convenient routes for walking, cycling and public transport, including suitable facilities for secure and safe cycle parking, have been fully explored and taken up;*
- The scheme is designed to adoptable standards, or other standards as agreed by the Local Planning Authority, including road widths and size of garages;*
- The scheme provides adequate car parking for the proposed development taking into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development and the availability and opportunities for public transport; and with the relevant Neighbourhood Plan where applicable;*
- Development which generates significant amounts of movement is supported by a Transport Assessment/ Statement and a Travel Plan that is effective and demonstrably deliverable including setting out how schemes will be funded;*
- The scheme provides appropriate mitigation to support new development on the local and strategic road network, including the transport network outside of the district, secured where necessary through appropriate legal agreements;*
- The scheme avoids severe additional traffic congestion, individually or cumulatively, taking account of any proposed mitigation;*
- The scheme protects the safety of road users and pedestrians; and*
- The scheme does not harm the special qualities of the South Downs National Park or the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty through its transport impacts.*

*Where practical and viable, developments should be located and designed to incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.*

*Neighbourhood Plans can set local standards for car parking provision provided that it is based upon evidence that provides clear and compelling justification for doing so.'*

The reference to development not causing a severe cumulative impact reflects the advice in paragraph 116 of the NPPF, which 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, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.'*

It is considered that policy DP21 accords with the aims of the NPPF and can be afforded full weight.

The access point into the site remains as previously approved. The total number of car parking spaces (80) remains the same as the consented scheme, with the layout being the same as was approved under the previous s73 application DM/23/3195.

A concern has been raised in one of the representations about the number of car parking spaces, suggesting that this should be reduced because of the reduction in the number of apartments and the previously approved reduction to the publicly available facilities on the site. Whilst this concern is noted, the number of apartments is only reducing by four. As has been set out above, the design and layout of the car parking spaces have been found to be acceptable by virtue of the previously approved section 73 application DM/23/3195.

Given the location of the site, it is your officers view that it would be desirable for all of the car parking generated by the development to be contained within the site, rather than spilling out onto Bolnore Farm Lane. It is not felt that the level of car parking provided results in an over provision of car parking spaces that would result in planning harm. It is also relevant that the Local Highway Authority (LHA) have raised no objections to the proposed changes in this application.

In light of the above it is considered that there would be no adverse impacts from the proposed change in relation to the mix of apartments and the reduction in the number of apartments in relation to transport matters.

## **Flood risk and drainage**

Policy DP41 in the MSDP seeks to ensure development is safe across its lifetime and does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. It is considered that this policy complies with the aims of the NPPF and can be afforded full weight. Paragraph 181 of the NPPF states:

*'When determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment (footnote 63). Development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where, in the light of this assessment (and the sequential and exception tests, as applicable) it can be demonstrated that:*

- a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location;*
- b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment;*
- c) it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate;*
- d) any residual risk can be safely managed; and*
- e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.'*

*Footnote 63: 3 A site-specific flood risk assessment should be provided for all development in Flood Zones 2 and 3. In Flood Zone 1, an assessment should accompany all proposals involving: sites of 1 hectare or more; land which has been identified by the Environment Agency as having critical drainage problems; land identified in a strategic flood risk assessment as being at increased flood risk in future; or land that may be subject to other sources of flooding, where its development would introduce a more vulnerable use.*

The site is within flood zone 1 and is at low fluvial flood risk (risk of flooding from Main Rivers). The site is not within an area identified as having possible surface water (pluvial) flood risk.

The proposed change will not alter the built form of development on the site (buildings and hardstanding for car parking) compared to the previously approved s73 application DM/23/3195. The previously approved s73 application was found to be acceptable in relation to drainage matters and there are no reasons to come to a different conclusion on this matter now. The same condition regarding drainage matters attached to the planning permission granted under DM/23/3195 will be carried forward onto this consent.

## **Infrastructure provision**

Policy DP20 of the MSDP seeks to ensure that development is accompanied by the necessary infrastructure. This includes securing affordable housing which is dealt with under Policy DP31 of the District Plan. Policy DP20 sets out that infrastructure will be secured through the use of planning obligations.

The approval of this application will result in the creation of a new planning permission that sits alongside the original planning permission. As the proposal changes the number of units in the scheme, a deed of variation (DOV) has been completed to secure the revised contributions towards county council infrastructure (libraries and Total Access Demand) that are generated by this revised application.

## **Ashdown Forest**

A Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) was carried out for the previous extant planning permission, DM/20/4159. This new planning application does not propose any changes that would make a material

difference in relation to this HRA. The quantum of development has been reduced by four units. As the original planning permission remains extant, and a section 73 application could not be used to extend the lifetime of a previous planning permission, it could be argued that it is not necessary to carry out a new HRA for this application. However, for completeness, a new HRA has been carried out, and the conclusion remains the same as on the HRA for the originally approved scheme.

#### Biodiversity net gain

Biodiversity net gain is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This planning permission is being granted on an application made under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the application for the original planning permission to which the Section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12th February 2024. This application is therefore exempt from the requirement to provide biodiversity net gain.

#### **PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION**

Planning legislation requires the application to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is therefore necessary for the planning application to be assessed against the policies in the Development Plan and then to take account of other material planning considerations including the NPPF. The Development Plan in this instance consists of the MSDP, the SADPD and the HHNP.

As this is an application submitted under section 73 of the TCPA 1990, whilst the approval of the application would result in a new standalone planning permission, it is only necessary to consider the changes that are proposed from the previously approved scheme rather than reassess all the issues that were associated with the original planning application. The legal effect of approving this application would be a new standalone planning permission that sits alongside the previously approved scheme DM/20/4159 and the amended planning permission granted under reference DM/23/3195. It would then be open to the applicant to decide which of the three planning permissions they choose to implement.

The principle of development has been established by virtue of the planning permission that has been granted for a similar type of development under DM/20/4159, which has commenced implementation and is extant.

It is considered that the internal changes to the apartment block and the consequent change to the mix and reduction in the number of units within the block are acceptable. It is considered that the level of car parking remains appropriate for this revised development and would not result in an over provision of car parking that would result in planning harm. The layout of the car parking would be as previously approved under application DM/23/3195, which has been found to be acceptable by the Local Planning Authority. The vehicular access point into the site would remain the same as the previously approved scheme. As such there would be no adverse transport impacts from the proposed changes.

It is considered that the applicants have demonstrated that the site can be satisfactorily drained. The internal changes to the apartment block will not alter the drainage arrangements for the development, which the LPA has previously found to be acceptable.

Having regard to all the identified issues, it is considered that the proposal complies with the development plan when read as whole, which is the proper basis for decision making.

For the reasons set out within the assessment section, it is considered that the application complies with Mid Sussex District Plan policies DP17, DP20, DP21, DP26 and DP41 and Neighbourhood Plan policies E7 and E9 and the application can therefore be approved.

Decision:        Permission

Case Officer: Steven King