

---

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 15 September 2025 13:14  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application DC/25/1364

**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 15/09/2025 1:13 PM.

### Application Summary

Address:	Staalcot Farm Stall House Lane North Heath West Sussex RH20 2HR
Proposal:	Use of land for the stationing of 2no. caravans for residential purposes, together with the formation of hardstanding and associated landscaping. Construction of associated utility buildings.
Case Officer:	Hannah Darley

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

Address:	Beverley Gay Street Lane Pulborough
----------	-------------------------------------

### Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Design</li><li>- Highway Access and Parking</li><li>- Loss of General Amenity</li><li>- Other</li><li>- Overdevelopment</li><li>- Privacy Light and Noise</li><li>- Trees and Landscaping</li></ul>
Comments:	This is just another attempt to establish a traveller site on a non suitable piece of countryside, the planning and appeals have been refused on numerous occasions. They are only submitting now as a 2 static/2 touring application due to the [REDACTED] comments from the appeal planning officer who seemed at all times to be trying to find ways to approve the original also unsuitable application. They have changed to try and show 2 of the 4 caravans but on half of the site, ignoring fact there is an illegal caravan already on the other part.. this is obvious way to try get permission for 2 then they will put in 4 to start before completely filling

the field.

Looking at the appeal it appears different people are now planning to live compared with the declared owners of the land [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. Previously they declared the children were moved to a local school but all schools are over subscribed and so would need transport, now they say that they plan to register them locally, ( conflict of information ), [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Additional comments to previously unchanged planning DC/23/2098.. I believe all objections to the above should be included in this application which is identical [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

I like most assumed that as the previous plan was refused and under appeal no new plans could be submitted , let alone an identical one! Thus would not have appealed against it. I believe they are assuming that most people will do the same and so not be aware they have to appeal again.

My previous objections below still apply. I see now that they are planning rain to supply water, however as the admitted during the appeal there is already mains water connected ( ILLEGALLY as not been done without southern water permission ) but my concern is not supply but with the discharge. As I said this would go into the ditches and flow down to our property which is at the the lowest point and so already floods with excess rain. Allowing an extra 6 properties ( 4 caravans plus the 2 dayrooms )water into the system will increase the risk and cause Damage to my property .

The government wishes to protect the countryside and if you build equestrian stables you are not allowed to build a suitable country cottage with them, something that looks good with in this area.<sup>[1]</sup>So to allow 4 caravans would be extremely detrimental to the area , especially as opposite a listed building. The planning for single properties on the lane have always been refused and so this should be taken into consideration

I notice that they are now using the Traveller requirements planning, I understand the requirements in the area for such however again this is showing contempt for Horsham council and its planning office. Who have found and suggested suitable sites for increased caravans up to 2030 on the local plan.

This site does not meet any of the requirements for such as site, Looking at policy 23:-<sup>[1]</sup>a. It is on ground with poor drainage and liable to flooding and as mentioned to cause flooding in the area.<sup>[1]</sup>b. It's down a narrow single no through lane with high use by dog walkers and horse, thus caravans and excess vehicles will cause a significant hazard.<sup>[1]</sup>c. There are no real essential services in the area and it's off main drains and any gas - far better sites around.<sup>[1]</sup>d. It is not near any real existing settle meets just odd houses along the lane and a large distance from any services such as shops, schools ,health etc. all would require vehicles and so again high risk to above section b.<sup>[1]</sup>e. It defiantly would have an unacceptable impact on the area of countryside and the appearance of local area , which has a listed building opposite and surrounded by fields and farm animals.

Previous objection letter :-

I wish to object especially with the environmental effect and flooding risk. The area is not connected to mains drains and any discharge water/waste should go via a mini sewage plant of which there is no mention. Water from this site discharges into the drainage ditches and flows down hill to the pond. This is already over its max and during heavy rains can back up over the road and flood the ditches. This then also floods our stable yard & storage barn, which is across the road from the pond. The risk of flooding will be greatly increased with the extra waste water from another 8 properties, let alone what effect the waste from 8 caravans will add to the local environment, a live stock area.<sup>[1]</sup>There is the obvious effect to the heritage of the listed building opposite the proposed site and Comments summary and with the noise and light that would be generated.<sup>[1]</sup>I note from the transport consultancy letter that they do not object due to traffic and no accidents reported. This is not relevant as Stall House Lane is a narrow no through lane used by Horses, Dog walkers and the residents that live there. To allow the installation of 8 properties, all that would require vehicles as there are no local amenities walkable from the site, would almost double the traffic along the lane and

exponentially increase the risk of an accident.<sup>[1]</sup> There have been numerous planning applications for single properties on the lane eg DC/20/1600. All have been refused due to the countryside area and over-development and being against various sections of the planning requirements for local and national government. So precedence should be to follow the same guidelines and decline this application, especially as its for multiple dwellings.<sup>[1]</sup> The site in question has already been the subject of numerous enforcement enquiries and previously declined applications.<sup>[1]</sup>

The area is totally unsuitable for a multi caravan site, which should be close to a main road, with full amenities and most importantly mains drainage.

---

Kind regards

**Telephone:**

**Email:** [planning@horsham.gov.uk](mailto:planning@horsham.gov.uk)



**Horsham  
District  
Council**



---

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

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