

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 August 2025 14:57  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** DC/25/0883

**Categories:** Comments Received

For attention of Kate Turner - following a conversation with a colleague of yours [REDACTED] I have been advised to email you with my objection to the above application. I have tried 3 times to send this document to you today and each time the system has said that I have been timed out for inactivity.

In brief:

Despite neighbouring Limekiln property we were not informed by HDC of this Application and have only become aware of it in the last few days. There are no planning signs up at the property.

I am dismayed at this application. Within 12 months of a previous application which allowed substantial development of buildings on agricultural land, including a staff room, this application now seeks further accommodation. If I may remind HDC this is land that was part of Gyll Farm estate. It is floodplain and has been a permanent pasture for over 300 years. It had, until recently, never had a building on it. HDC vowed, when Gyll Farm was sold and split into units, to protect it from a 'proliferation of unsightly pony paddocks', to protect it from 'off-grid-development' and unsocial activities. Indeed one planning enforcement officer said that no-body would be able to put a stick in the ground. Sadly, this land has not been protected and this application is just the start of further requests to develop agricultural land units adjoining into accommodation.

Previously the applicant had asked for overnight accommodation for occasional use. This time they are ambiguously asking for a temporary worker's dwelling. What is this? A temporary building? Or for temporary staff? It is neither it is stage one of a building that in time will be further developed into permanent accommodation. Works granted permission in the previous application have been started but not finished, but already an application is being made for additional accommodation.

The applicant's business of horse rehabilitation now seems to be in the process of becoming a stud farm and an alpaca breeding centre. Breeding of alpacas - if one consults small holder journals, is a key strategy for individuals to achieve change of land use on agricultural land and accommodation in order that 'animals may be cared for'. One only has to take a quick drive around the countryside to see that most farmers have animals pastured on land that is not contiguous to their farmyards or in sight of their farmhouses. There is no requirement necessary for on-site living. Currently, the applicant's animals are living in fields without the applicant on-site. Maybe, when one is giving birth the applicant wishes to be there, and fortunately the staff facilities, which have already been granted permission, will provide adequate 'occasional' accommodation. However, just because the Applicant has 'developed an interest in breeding horses and keeping Alpacas' does not mean it is a requirement for her to facilitate her hobbies by building accommodation that inevitably will become a permanent dwelling on-site. And once we have one, all those paddocks will be developed.

The applicant has not demonstrated that their business is viable and expanding to the extent that it requires them to be on site temporarily or indeed in five years time, permanently, falls under the National Planning Policy Framework's Paragraph 79a which provides HDC with guidance on when to

consider 'the degree in which there is confidence that the enterprise will remain viable for the foreseeable future'. This enterprise does not appear to be running in line with their previous business plan and the keeping of a few horses and alpacas on low quality land does not inspire any would-be potential customer that this is the right location for their equine to be rehabilitated from injury. I know of no horse owner that would consider that set up to be professional and where their animal will get the highest quality of care. Messy, poached fields full of ragwort do not inspire one to consider that it is a professional establishment.

note that the plan references temporary planning for 5 years - previously they had asked for accommodation for 'occasional' overnight use.

The size of the accommodation for 'temporary workers' is staggering.

This is quite obviously not for 'bunking down when a horse is about to give birth. This is for a 90 sqm building with an additional 26 sqm veranda. For comparison the average size house in the UK is 94 sqm and the average sized flat 56 sq m (Housing survey 2018). This is not for occasional overnight use but a standard sized house for living in. Paragraph 84 of the NDDF reminds us that 'planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside' except under certain circumstances. There is no essential need for a rural worker in this situation and should there be for the small number of overnight birthing occasions, then the current development already has staff facilities. The application does not demonstrate that it meets the exceptional circumstances that Paragraph 84 describes and gives no concrete reasons why accommodation should be required over and above what they already have got permission for.

I urge HDC to demonstrate that they have considered the opinion of local people and considered that their permissions to date allow a business to be conducted and that further development is not required.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]  
Lower Sedgwick Farm

Sedgwick Park

Horsham

.