

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0735	Case Officer:	Susan Dubberley
Application Type:	Full Application		
Proposal:	New crossover to South-West of site and addition of new acoustic fence to South-East boundary		
Site:	Castle Inn, London Road, Hickstead, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5LZ, ,		
Validation Date	24 Mar 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	25 Apr 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refuse	Recommendation Date:	9 Jul 2025
Target Date:	19 May 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Susan Dubberley</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Steven King</i>	Date:	9 Jul 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0735

**Castle Inn, London Road, Hickstead, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5LZ,
New crossover to South-West of site and addition of new acoustic fence to South-East boundary
Mrs Chloe Breen**

LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION

One letter of objection received:

- o This proposed driveway could impede entrance and exit to our own property during busy times. There is already a very wide access area into the car park on the eastern side of the Castle Inn, so why is another driveway required.
- o Hickstead Lane is already used as a "Rat Run" by heavy lorries and other commercial vehicles as well as domestic traffic.
- o The access to the proposed drive is very close to two driveways on the opposite side of Hickstead lane.
- o This part of Hickstead lane becomes exceedingly congested by horseboxes when the showground is open and traffic queues have been known to form across the bridge over the A23 major trunk road. Therefore, further traffic is not desirable.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Conservation Officer:

Objection - harm to setting of listed building

WSCC - Highways Authority

Objects

Newt Officer: No objection subject to informative.

Twineham Parish Council

Although council are supportive of the proposals to the building which is in urgent need of restoration and sympathetic improvement planning application DM/25/0735 for the new road access on to Hickstead Lane is more complicated.

It is stated that this new access is to allow for a one-way system for leaving the car park, Council can see that this new access would be best as exit only but the existing larger road access is onto the slip road which should also be allowed as an exit for heading north towards London as this would cause the least traffic at the roundabout.

Council has concerns about the proposed access particularly as it is not entirely clear what the benefits are, and that part of the lane is already quite congested with access points and despite the proposed speed limit is the launch point for cars leaving the roundabout at speed. Reviewing the plans it appears the proposed splay will have a serious impact on the nearest neighbours, and this should be reviewed prior to any decision.

The lane already has speeding vehicles which impact both equestrian users and pedestrians and should permission be granted for the new access it will be another obstacle for pedestrians to negotiate if it is used by a lot of vehicles.

On this basis Council cannot support the application.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for a new crossover to South-West of site and addition of new acoustic fence to South-East boundary

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/25/0736 - Erection of new outbuilding, internal and external alterations to Grade II Listed Building. Change of use to allow C1 Use to upper floors. Current application.

DM/25/0737 - Erection of new outbuilding, internal and external alterations to Grade II Listed Building. Change of use to allow C1 Use to upper floors. Current application.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site comprises The Castle Inn, a Grade II listed pub and restaurant with a flat above, together with surrounding outbuildings and parking and garden curtilage. The listed building is part two storey part single storey and is located towards the eastern side of the site. To the north and west of the building is hardstanding providing informal parking, whilst to the south is garden curtilage. The site is served by two vehicular access points situated along the eastern boundary of the site, providing direct access to the A2300.

On inspection of the site works had commenced including the clearance of the garden area with all vegetation including boundary hedges removed and the area laid to dirt.

To the north is a large field, to the east is the A2300 with the A23 beyond, to the south is Hickstead Lane beyond a boundary tree line and to the west is a line of dwellings the first of which is Lanzerac. On the western boundary there is a close boarded timber fence with a trellis on top.

The site is located within the countryside as defined by the development plan.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposal is for a new crossover to South-West of site and addition of new acoustic fence to South-East boundary.

The plans show the creation of a new vehicle access from Hickstead Lane, along the western boundary of the site. A new 3m wide access road and crossover of permeable resin and setts is proposed within the southern garden area, set some 7m from the boundary with the residential property, Lanzerac. The crossover would have a bell mouth of 6.0m wide and would provide a (no entry) one way access from the site onto Hickstead Lane.

A new 1.1m brick wall is proposed to the southern eastern boundary of the site with hedging planted behind. A new timber acoustic 2.4m timber fence is then proposed set back some 1.0m from the hedge and brick wall. A new pedestrian entrance with gate is also shown to the southern boundary adjacent to the road junction.

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 Twineham 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:

DP12 - Protection and Enhancement of Countryside

DP21 - Transport

DP26 - Character and Design

DP34 - Listed buildings and other Heritage Assets

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.

Twineham Neighbourhood Plan

The Twineham Neighbourhood Plan was made on 24 March 2016.

Relevant policies:

TNP2 (Design)

Other Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

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:

DPN7 - Noise Impacts

DPC1 - Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside

DPB1 - Character and Design

DPB2: Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

DPT3 - Active and Sustainable Travel

Mid Sussex Design Guide 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)

National Planning Policy Guidance

ASSESSMENT

Design and Impact on character of the area and countryside

The site is located in the countryside and 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'.*

While DP26 of the District Plan in part 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;*
- 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'*

Policy TNP2 of the Neighbourhood Plan states:

'All development should be of good design consisting of the best practice standards for well-designed new homes and neighbourhoods in force at the time, contemporary and innovative design is encouraged where appropriate. This means development should:

- Include energy and water efficiency measures*
- Use quality materials, these should be sustainably and locally sourced where feasible.*
- Apply space standards taking into account the user, circulation space and the need for storage*
- Contribute positively to the local character and rural setting*
- Recognise that architectural integrity is of paramount importance and respond in a coherent way*
- Not be dominated by parking and hard surfacing*
- Utilise appropriate landscaping.'*

The low 1m high brick boundary wall along the eastern edge of the site and proposed planting are considered to be acceptable and are of an appropriate design, size and scale that are in-keeping with the building and its countryside setting.

However, the proposed 2.4m high acoustic fence would be appear incongruous and visually unattractive and detract from the visual amenity of the site, street scene and the wider countryside. The site is highly visible on a corner location and the acoustic fence would be clearly visible and will be particularly incongruous due to its location and siting.

The applicant has stated that the acoustic fence is required to mitigate the significant traffic noise from the main roads (A23 and A2300). In this case it is considered that a more natural form of screening would be an alternative solution. It is noted that there was previously a mature hedge and vegetation that provided screening for the garden, before the garden was cleared of any vegetation and a more natural barrier would be more appropriate in the context of the both the listed building and countryside location.

In view of the above it is considered that the proposal would not comply with policies DP12 and DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan or policy TN2 of the neighbourhood plan.

Impact upon The Castle Inn Grade II listed building

Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that:
'In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.'

The following paragraphs of the NPPF are also relevant:

'210. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.*

212. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

213. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- (a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;*
- (b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.*

214. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

215. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'

Policy DP34 of the MSDP states:

'Development will be required to protect listed buildings and their settings. This will be achieved by ensuring that:

- A thorough understanding of the significance of the listed building and its setting has been demonstrated. This will be proportionate to the importance of the building and potential impact of the proposal;*
- Alterations or extensions to a listed building respect its historic form, scale, setting, significance and fabric. Proposals for the conversion or change of use of a listed building retain its significance and character whilst ensuring that the building remains in a viable use;*
- Traditional building materials and construction techniques are normally used. The installation of uPVC windows and doors will not be acceptable;*
- Satellite antennae, solar panels or other renewable energy installations are not sited in a prominent location, and where possible within the curtilage rather than on the building itself;*
- Special regard is given to protecting the setting of a listed building;*
- Where the historic fabric of a building may be affected by alterations or other proposals, the applicant is expected to fund the recording or exploratory opening up of historic fabric.'*

The Council's Conservation Officer has reviewed the application and commented:

'The application site, the Castle Inn, is a Grade II listed building, dating originally from the 18th century, with attached early 19th century parallel ranges, and later additions. The 18th century core of the building faces onto Hickstead Lane, whereas the larger 19th century ranges are set perpendicular to this fronting onto London Road. To the rear is an attached (18th century?) outbuilding which appears to be part of an originally significantly larger range of attached and unattached buildings which formed a courtyard to the rear of the building. Historical map regression suggests that this group of buildings was during the 19th century the farmstead of Hickstead Farm, and only became a hotel during the late 19th or early 20th century. It was renamed the Castle Hotel, taking the name from the previously existing Castle Inn, which was located just to the south of the adjacent road junction (now known as The Old Post Office).

Based on the information in front of us I would consider that the listed building possesses architectural value based on its design, construction and craftsmanship, historical illustrative value particularly relating to the evolution of its use over time from farm to hotel and public house, and aesthetic value, based in part on the use of vernacular materials within the older parts of the building. As a c.1900 public house it will also have some communal value as a longstanding focus of the local community.

The building has a strong relationship with the adjacent road junction, and it appears clear that the later 19th century additions were designed to deliberately reorientate the building to face onto London Road, possibly to provide a higher status façade for the earlier farmhouse reflecting the aspirations of its owners at that time. When it came into use as a hotel, the 19th century range will have provided the main public face of the building, attracting passing custom from this busy highway. As such, the immediate setting of the road junction, and visual relationship between the building and this, will make an important contribution to the special interest of the building and how this is appreciated, in particular its historical illustrative value. The wider rural setting of the building, in particular that to the north and west, will also contribute positively to an appreciation of its earlier role as a farmstead, as well as to its aesthetic value.

The current proposal is for the creation of a new vehicle access from Hickstead Lane, and erection of a new 1.1m brick boundary wall, and set behind this a new 2.4m acoustic fence, along the eastern boundary facing onto London Road. A new pedestrian entrance is also shown to the southern boundary adjacent to the road junction.

In heritage terms, the new access from Hickstead Lane raises some concerns regarding loss of green space within the setting of the building. Although the area to the south has now been, somewhat

regrettably, completely cleared, recent aerial imagery shows that this previously provided a garden setting to this side of the Inn, which complemented the wider rural setting, which, as set out above, contributes positively to the special interest of the listed building. This does appear to reflect the historical nature of this part of the site, and it would be preferable for soft landscaping to be reinstated rather than the space being partly given over to a new hard surfaced access. Subject to the comments of our Tree Officer, there is also the potential concern of impact on the surviving trees along the southern boundary.

Furthermore, although subject to detail there would be unlikely to be an objection to a new c. 1m high brick boundary wall along the eastern edge of the site, the proposed 2.4m high acoustic fence would be an unattractive and visually intrusive introduction which would detract from the visual relationship between the listed building and the old London Road, including views of the building looking from the south east from that road, and the reciprocal outlook from the building and its immediate setting. This would be notwithstanding the slight set back of the fence and the proposed intervening planting to its eastern side. As the relevant Historic England guidance GPA Note 3 'The Setting of Heritage Assets' points out, screening cannot be considered as an alternative to appropriately designed development, and can prove ephemeral. Certainly in this instance the Council would have no longer term control over the retention of screening planting.

For these reasons in my opinion the proposal will be harmful, through impact on setting, to the special interest of the Castle Inn and how this is appreciated. This will be contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. In terms of the NPPF I would place the harm as less than substantial, at the low-mid range of that scale, such that the balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 will apply.

Paragraph 215 of the NPPF provides that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use. The Planning Officer agrees with the advice of the Conservation Officer and in this case, it is not considered that there would be sufficient public benefits associated with the proposal to outweigh the harm to the character of the setting of the listed building.

The proposal is therefore in conflict with Policy DP34.

Residential Amenity

Policy DP26 of the MSDP states in part that, *'All applicants will be required to demonstrate that development:*

o 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);'

In this case the proposed 1.1m brick wall, hedging and the 2.4m acoustic fence are located close to the southern eastern boundary of the site, which face the roundabout and A2300 slip road. It is therefore considered that there would be no significant impact on residential amenity from this element of the application.

The new access and driveway are located along the western boundary and the nearest residential property is Lanzerac a detached dwelling, whose side boundary adjoins the site. The new access and driveway would be sited some 7m from the joint side boundary and given this distance along with the fact that the area is already heavily trafficked, it is not considered that any additional noise and disturbance that might arise from the new access would be significant given the location.

In view of the above it is considered that the application would comply with policy DP26 of the District Plan in regard to residential amenity.

Highways matters

Policy DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states (in part):

'... 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 proposal includes a new secondary access which would provide a one-way access from the site onto Hickstead Lane. It is noted that an objection has been received from the nearest neighbour to the access, Lanzerac and also from the Parish council who question the need for the access and safety of pedestrian. The occupants of Lanzerac are also concerned that the proposed driveway could impede entrance and exit to their property during busy times.

WSCC Highways have reviewed the application, and in this case, they have also consulted their Highway Area Office regarding the suitability of the proposed access arrangement. The comments of WSCC Highways are:

'From a planning perspective, I would have requested visibility splays of 2.4m x 215m to be demonstrated, as Hickstead Lane is subject to a speed restriction of 60 mph. The demonstrated visibility the applicant has provided of 2.4m x 43m would be suitable for 30 mph speeds, and no supporting speed survey data has been submitted to suggest that actual speeds are lower.

However, our Area Office (who grant licences for works within the highway) have confirmed that they are unlikely to grant a licence for the proposals, due to their policy on not permitting second accesses. The site is already accessed from the A2300, so they would not permit the use of a second access from Hickstead Lane.

Therefore, whilst visibility may be able to demonstrated, even if planning permission were to be granted, the proposed access works are essentially unimplementable. As such, I would advise that the proposed access be omitted from the plans.'

The applicant has responded to the comments stating that there is a current consultation process being carried out by WSCC which proposes to reduce the speed limit of the lane to 30mph. However, the WSCC Highways engineer has responded confirming that given that the proposed 30mph limit is only at

an early consultation stage and there are no guarantees that the lower speed limit will be introduced, then the application must be assessed on the current situation. The application has therefore failed to demonstrate the required visibility splays of 2.4m x 215m for the 60mph speed limit. In addition, WSCC Area Office (who grant licences for works within the highway) have confirmed that they are unlikely to grant a licence for the proposals, due to their policy on not permitting second accesses, thus even if the application were acceptable in regard to other highway planning matters, it is unlikely to be implementable.

In view of the above it is considered that the application would fail to comply with policy DP21.

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 is a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. As a householder application this development is exempt from the requirement to provide biodiversity net gain.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the application has failed to demonstrate the required visibility splays of 2.4m x 215m for the 60mph speed limit. In addition, WSCC Area Office (who grant licences for works within the highway) have confirmed that they are unlikely to grant a licence for the proposals, due to their policy on not permitting second accesses, thus even if the application were acceptable in regard to other highway planning matters, it is unlikely to be implementable.

The site is located in the countryside and it is considered that the proposed 2.4m high acoustic fence would appear incongruous and visually unattractive and detract from the visual amenity of the site, street scene and the wider countryside. The site is highly visible on a corner location and the acoustic fence would be clearly visible and will be particularly incongruous due to its location and siting.

The area to the south prior to being completely cleared, provided a garden setting to this side of the Inn, which complemented the wider rural setting and contributed positively to the special interest of the listed building. It would be preferable for soft landscaping to be reinstated rather than the space being partly given over to a new hard surfaced access. It is further considered that the proposed acoustic fencing acoustic fence would be an unattractive and visually intrusive introduction which would detract from the visual relationship between the listed building and the old London Road, including views of the building looking from the south east from that road, and the reciprocal outlook from the building and its immediate setting. Thus the proposal will be harmful, to the setting of listed building through impact on setting, to the special interest of the Castle Inn and how this is appreciated. It is not considered that there would be sufficient public benefits associated with the proposal to outweigh the harm to the character of the setting of the listed building.

Overall, the planning balance is considered to fall significantly in favour of refusing planning permission. The proposal is not considered to comply with policies DP12, DP21, DP26 and DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and policy TN2 of the neighbourhood plan.

Decision: Refuse

Case Officer: Susan Dubberley