
From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 28 November 2025 12:59
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/1700

Categories: Comments Received

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 28/11/2025 12:58 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	The Slips West End Lane Henfield West Sussex BN5 9RG
Proposal:	Change of use of the land for the stationing of 4no. gypsy and traveller static caravans for residential purposes and 5no. associated dayrooms.
Case Officer:	Daniel Holmes

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	2 Lancasters Cottages West End Lane Henfield
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I fully support the Parish council and residents in their objections to this application. Following, is a recent refusal for a Gypsy/Travelers site which I feel is relevant to this application. I also cannot understand, why the owner of the land would require more travelers sites when they already have two in Small dole and are seeking permission for a further five. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] How would these sites operate should they be given permission. Would they be under private or council control? Would the be rented out? What constraints would be imposed? 1) Appeals against refusal to grant planning permission and

enforcement notice dismissed: 21 August 2023.

These appeals related to the refusal of Kettering Borough Council, now North Northamptonshire Council to grant permission for a gypsy and traveller site at 24B Greenfields, Northamptonshire. The two appeals were dismissed because of the impact on valued landscape character and views.

On the main issue Inspector J A Murray LLB(Hons) Dip.Plan.Env DMS Solicitor, an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government held that, should the proposals proceed, they would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. The Appeals should be dismissed even in the face of a lack of a five-year supply of gypsy sites.

In relation to the impact on landscape character, the Inspector considered Stroud DC v SSCLG & Gladman Developments Ltd [2015] EWHC 448 (Admin) and Forest of Dean DC v SSCLG [2016] EWHC 2429 (Admin) finding that a landscape does not have to be nationally or locally designated to be a valued landscape for the purposes of the Framework. He found the landscape valued because it had physical attributes that take it out of the ordinary, in particular the site was in a location where the deeply rural quality of the landscape identified in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment was marked. Although the appellant contended that the Council's Joint Core Strategy Policy 3 was inconsistent with the Framework because it seeks conservation and, where possible, enhancement, whereas the Framework only requires the protection and enhancement of valued landscapes, this argument was misconceived as the policy did not have to precisely replicate the wording of the Framework. (Decision letter [31-39]).

In relation to the other main issues he found:

Joint Core Strategy Policy 31 was not inconsistent with the Framework on the basis that criterion (a) requires sites to be closely linked to an existing settlement with an adequate range of services and facilities. The wording 'closely linked' does not preclude rural sites and is compatible with the Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, which seeks at paragraph 25 to very strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements. The appeal site was not closely linked, either spatially or functionally, to an existing settlement with an adequate range of services and facilities. There was therefore conflict with JCS Policy 31(a) and PPTS paragraph 25;

Given that the appellant's family had not been living on the appeal site for some time and may not be able to do so for some time to come, personal circumstances carried limited weight in favour of the appeal in this case.

The substantial weight afforded to the harm to a valued landscape alongside the harm caused by the unsustainable nature of the development outweighed the lack of a 5 year supply of gypsy and traveller pitches, and the families' personal needs including the best interests of the children when considering whether to grant either a permanent or temporary permission (decision letter [71-5]).

2) The applicant said the scheme would make a "valuable contribution" to the identified need for more Gypsy and traveller pitches in the borough.

On Friday the authority ruled the density of the development would cause harm to the area's "rural locality".

More than 100 objections were recorded against the plan, with concerns raised over the scale of the site and increased traffic. Among those opposing the development was Terry Jermy, the Labour MP for South West Norfolk, and West Dereham Parish

Council.

Some objectors raised that planning permission for a similar scheme had been made in 2024 and was turned down.

Rural location

The King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board opposed the development because of concerns over how waste water generated from the site would be managed.

The agent for the applicant, SJM Planning, said the risk of flooding on the site was "low" and that the land was not located within an environmentally sensitive area.

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council previously identified a need for 100 new pitches for Gypsy and travellers, 76 of those are expected to be needed in the next five years.

SJM Planning said the site was within three miles of a number of schools and that road access to nearby towns was good via the A10 and A134. The council's planners raised concerns about where residents of the site would access schools, doctors and employment opportunities.

The authority said planning permission was refused on the grounds that the area was very rural with a "clear lack of services and infrastructure within the locality".

The scale of the site was also described as "unduly prominent, intense and incongruous" and if approved would be "causing harm to the environment".

3)"In balancing these opposing considerations and their respective weight, however, I consider that the Green Belt harm supplemented by the weight arising from the intentional unauthorised nature of the development is not clearly outweighed by the weight of the other considerations. It follows that the very special circumstances necessary to justify a grant of planning permission for the development in the Green Belt do not exist."

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**



Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB

Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton