

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 02 February 2026 21:08
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/2079

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 02/02/2026 9:08 PM.

Application Summary

Address: Cotlands Paddock Horsham Road Cowfold West Sussex RH13 8AH

Proposal: Use of land for the stationing of 4no. static caravans for (Gypsy and Traveller) residential purposes and associated day rooms.

Case Officer: Shazia Penne

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 5 Fairfield cottages Cowfold

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

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: Reasons for Refusal of the Planning Application
Cotlands Paddock, Horsham Road, Cowfold, RH13 8AH

The proposed development conflicts with multiple adopted Horsham District Council planning policies and would result in unacceptable harm to highway safety, the environment, heritage assets and the character of the surrounding area.



Conflict with HDC Strategic Policy 23

Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Policy 23(1b): Safe and convenient access

The site does not benefit from safe or suitable vehicular or pedestrian access. The proposal would introduce a significant highway risk.

This is a greenfield site accessed directly from the A281 which is subject to a 60mph speed limit. The access point is located on a blind bend and incline where visibility is severely restricted, particularly for vehicles travelling northbound which are unable to see the access until they are almost upon it.

Vehicles exiting the site, including large touring caravans, would have extremely limited visibility to the right. Vehicles approaching from the south would be required to brake suddenly when vehicles attempt to turn into the site due to the blind bend, increasing the risk of collisions.

The access also serves Homelands Nursing Home, five residential properties and agricultural land with regular farm vehicle movements. The nursing home generates frequent traffic including deliveries, staff and visitors, many of whom are elderly with reduced reaction times. A previous planning application relating to Homelands Nursing Home was refused specifically on the grounds of unsafe access.

There is no pavement along this stretch of road and the nearby bus stops are currently under review due to safety concerns. There is a well documented history of serious accidents at this location including three fatalities.

The proposal could generate up to approximately 240 vehicle movements per day, representing a substantial intensification of use of an access that was originally designed only for occasional agricultural traffic. This would create a significant hazard to all road users.

Policy 23(1c): Provision of services

The application fails to adequately demonstrate that the site can be properly serviced. The submitted information refers to a soakaway and drainage field but does not identify its location or confirm that it lies within the applicant's land ownership.

The surrounding land slopes towards a stream that flows into Cowfold via a privately owned pond which is regularly used by local children during the summer months. The absence of clear information regarding foul drainage capacity and treatment raises serious concerns about the potential for pollution.

The application does not specify the number of occupants the waste system is designed to accommodate and therefore does not demonstrate that essential services can be provided safely or sustainably.

Policy 23(1e): Landscape character and amenity

The development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the landscape. It would be clearly visible from the adjoining public footpath and would have a direct and harmful impact on the setting of four nearby heritage assets.

The cumulative impact on heritage significance is unacceptable, particularly in relation to Brook Place which is Grade II* listed. The proposal fails to demonstrate sensitive design or adequate mitigation of visual and heritage impacts.



Conflict with HDC Strategic Policy 24

Environmental Protection

Policy 24(3): Protection of watercourses

The proposal fails to demonstrate how it would protect local watercourses, groundwater and downstream water quality. There is a clear risk of contaminated runoff entering the nearby stream which flows directly towards Cowfold.

Policy 24(7): Cumulative impact

The cumulative impact of development has not been adequately assessed. Planning permission has already been granted for approximately 35 dwellings between this site and the edge of Cowfold. The addition of this development would compound existing pressures on infrastructure, highways and the local environment.



Conflict with HDC Policy 33

Development Principles

Policy 33(1): Efficient use of land

The proposal represents an inefficient use of agricultural land. The application does not justify why alternative existing or allocated sites such as those off Kent Street, Honeybridge Lane, Barns Green or those identified within the HDC framework plan have not been utilised instead.

Policy 33(2): Impact on neighbouring amenity

The development would have a direct and adverse impact on three heritage properties and would undermine the amenity of the surrounding countryside. It would also diminish the experience of walkers using the public footpath network.

Policy 33(4): Local character

The proposal does not reflect or respect the rural character of the surrounding area. It is not locally distinctive and would set an undesirable precedent for further expansion or intensification of development in this sensitive location.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



Ecology and Biodiversity Concerns

The site has not been adequately assessed by an independent council appointed ecologist. Parts of the submitted ecological report have been redacted without explanation.

The ecological data appears to be out of date and was only valid until 19 May 2025. There is credible evidence of Great Crested Newts on and around the site with approximately 13 ponds in the surrounding area which may form part of a wider habitat network. No proper impact assessment has been undertaken for Great Crested Newts, bats including lighting impacts, [REDACTED] or dormice.

The area is also known to support protected bird species such as buzzards and red kites. Despite this, the application incorrectly states that no protected species are present.



Planning Inaccuracies and Procedural Failures

The stable block has been relocated from its originally approved position. This material change has not been disclosed and requires a fresh planning application.

The application does not provide dimensions for the proposed day rooms which is a significant omission.

The applicant incorrectly states that market housing exists on the site. There is no residential housing present, only an old stable building. The application also states that there is no change to non residential floorspace which is inconsistent with the introduction of day rooms and touring caravans. This raises concerns about the potential for up to 60 occupants.

The distinction between a rural hobby stable and a development comprising potentially 12 habitable structures has not been properly acknowledged. There is a clear risk of further intensification if permission were granted.

Fire and Rescue Services have not been consulted. There is no information regarding emergency access, fire safety or hydrant provision.

There is no evidence that the site is connected to mains water and Southern Water mapping does not indicate a mains supply serving the site.

The application understates the heritage impact by identifying only two Grade II listed buildings when in fact three heritage assets are affected. Brook Place which is Grade II* listed has been omitted entirely.

The application refers to the planting of native hedging despite the applicant already having planted a long hedge of non native and potentially invasive species.

The existing access was designed for occasional agricultural use and is wholly unsuitable for the frequency and type of traffic proposed.



Need and Site Suitability

The applicant claims a need for 128 new traveller pitches but provides no robust evidence to support this figure which appears to extend to 2040. Horsham District Council has identified approximately 68 potential sites already.

Given its small size, the site makes a negligible contribution to meeting any unmet need. As such it does not materially advance the wider traveller accommodation strategy. If need is to be addressed, a larger and more suitable site is required in an appropriate location.



Planning Balance

While the existence of a general need for traveller accommodation is acknowledged, this proposal would result in significant and demonstrable harm across multiple planning policy areas. The limited benefits arising from the proposal do not outweigh the substantial conflicts with Horsham District Council policies.

On this basis the application should be refused.

Kind regards

Telephone:
Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



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