

[REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 October 2025 13:54

**To:** Planning [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Site reference: DC/25/1364 Staalcot Farm Stall House Lane North Heath West Sussex RH20 2HR

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to object to the application above, which has just reached my attention following a temporary absence on business.

This is an illegal development under current planning laws.

I am aware of the Planning Inspector's report on the appeal, suggesting the matter would be favourably considered were a further application to be submitted for two dwellings. However, this was a prejudicial statement by the Inspector, who reached this opinion in advance of any further consultation with residents. In fact, the Inspector implies that where random, sporadic and unauthorised development occurs, then any retrospective planning application should simply be divided by an arbitrary number and then the relevant authorisation granted retrospectively - a patently ridiculous concept, which encourages similar activities elsewhere. Clearly, applicants need merely double the number of properties they require in order to obtain, say, approximately 50% of their total, thereby neatly obtaining 100% of their objective.

These applications are occurring across the Horsham District as more and more applicants jump aboard the bandwagon, with the pecuniary advantage that then accrues but which is not available to the host community.

There are, of course, numerous reasons that underline the unsuitability of the application, of which the Planning Dept should be well aware:

1 The strain on local infrastructure, including narrow lanes (contrary to the HDC's Policy Framework, per policies 23 and 24) and the absence of sewage systems and drainage.

2 The public footpath which runs through the site.

3 Noise pollution in a rural setting and disruption to local ecosystems.

4 Proximity to the railway and its siren requirements, close to that site.

5 Adverse development which compromises the rural amenity and the rights of local residents and their strong opposition.

6 The absence of local infrastructure, including transport, schools, healthcare.

7 Proximity to grade listed property.

8 The introduction of social division in a community of existing cohesion - why have there been no proposals submitted to address this?

9 The erosion of the visual amenity: caravans are not in keeping with the existing architectural heritage.

10 The failure to accord with the HDC's Planning Framework Policies 25, 32 and 33.

11 This local area has already accommodated vast numbers of these sites in recent years; by contrast, I am unaware of any such sites within the massive developments that abound around the District, accommodating thousands of new houses. How is this possible?

12 What verification has been carried out to ensure that applicants fall within the strict definition of 'travellers' and by whom?

13 Unsustainable development, contrary to the HDC's policies 1, 3, 4 and 26 (incl guidance within the NPPF), and the complete reliance upon vehicular access.

14 The application contradicts the HDC's infrastructure policies 3 and 10, embracing sewage and waste water and the impact on local residents.

15 The impact on the Grade II listed Laurel Cottage, some 40yds distant (policies 15 and 21).

16 Smaller developments in this location have been declined, which by way of rational implication, should set a precedent.

17 Policies 13 and 43 are relevant.

18 The absence of any water quality assessment since 1937. In addition, the proposed borehole is within 50 yds of a septic tank (Laurel Cottage), which I understand is impermissible and within proximity of the proposed caravans.

19 The Application proposes a cess pit for each plot but each needs to be some 50 yds from the borehole. This is not achievable on the site plan as shown in red on the application.

20 Policy 26 Countryside Protection demonstrates the Application is outside the built-up area boundaries and Policy 26 guarantees the rural character of the countryside against inappropriate development.

21 Policy 32 'Quality of New Development' insists development should complement locally distinctive characters and heritage which this Application does not facilitate.

22 Policy 33 'Development Principles' requires development should ensure designs that avoid unacceptable harm to the occupiers/users of nearby property and land. This Application is directly opposite an historic listed building.

23 Policy 34 'Cultural and Heritage Assets' – developments should retain and improve the setting of heritage assets including views, public rights of way, trees and landscape features, including historic public realm features. This Policy is not in keeping with the Application.

24 There has been no traffic assessment. Vehicle movements along this very narrow country lane might rise by 5500 annually, crossing two public footpaths and with no designated areas for walkers, horse riders, cyclists or vehicles. Therefore, the application fails policy 40 of Horsham Planning Policy Framework on points 4, 5 and 6 of the Policy.

25 As of Feb 2024 a development of this nature should provide a biodiversity net gain (BNG) statement demonstrating at least a 10% uplift. There is no BNG statement. Furthermore, the survey for great crested newts was conducted at the wrong time of year, in November and should have been between mid-March and June. There should have been a minimum of four surveys.

26 Ponds within 500m of the site have not been surveyed.

27 Removal of grassland cannot be mitigated by new hedges - different habitats (ref ecology report).

28 Section 6.5 of the Design Access Statement Incorporating the Heritage Statement notes: "The low profile of the caravans together with dense vegetation alongside Stall House Lane will ensure they are not seen from areas within the public realm, preserving the rural sense of the area." This ignores the public footpath through the site, making the caravans clearly visible.

29 There is no fire hydrant for some 260yds, far exceeding the distance required.

30 There is no "Sustainable Transport" contrary to Policy 40, in particular points 2, 5 and 6, requiring an improvement to the existing transport system (road, rail, cycle); a choice in the modes of transport available; minimisation of the distance people need to travel and minimisation of conflicts between traffic, cyclists and pedestrians.

Conclusion: the Application fails on numerous and wide ranging grounds and should be rejected, which is also in line with local democratic opinion, over which remote authority should not be imposed contrary to existing settled policy.



Bramfold RH20 2HA.