

[REDACTED]

---

**Sent:** 27 November 2025 12:50  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** [REDACTED] Re: Application No. DC/25/1700 - The Slips, West End Lane, Henfield, West Sussex

**Categories:** Comments Received

Sent from my iPad

Dear Sir,

>>

>> Application No. DC/25/1700 - The Slips West End Lane Henfield West Sussex.

>> Change of use of the land for the stationing of 4no. gypsy and traveller static caravans for residential purposes and 5no. associated dayrooms.

>>

>> I strongly object to the proposed development for the same reasons that I outlined in my objection to the previous application which was withdrawn in August, 2025.

>>

>> My objections on Local Plan policy grounds remain unchanged and I have attached a copy of the said objections hereto for ease of reference. As regards the current application I would comment as follows:

>>

>> \* Inaccurate information.

>> The description of the proposed development in the notification letter refers to 5no. dayrooms whereas the Application Form describes the proposal as 4no. static caravans for residential purposes and associated dayrooms. The submitted Block Plan shows 4no. static units and 4no. dayrooms but in the Planning Statement, Proposal, the reference is to 4no. Static caravans and 5no. associated dayrooms.

>>

>> \* On the Application Form, under the heading Vehicle Parking, it states that the existing parking is 0 with proposed parking 8. The Block Plan shows two parking spaces per pitch with four additional spaces at the entrance to the site making a total of 12.

>>

>> \* The Location Plan still shows the adjoining land to the east annotated 'Animal Training Centre'. There is no planning permission for any such use and none currently exists.

>>

>> Planning Statement.

>>

>> Under the heading Relevant Policies, in addition to the Local Plan policies and the advice in the NPPF, the Agent has now added the Government's advice on Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2015). In this regard I would particularly draw attention to Paragraphs 22,24 and 25 and the cogent advice to LPA's in the determination of applications for new gypsy and traveller sites.

>>

>> Need.

>>

>> The section opens with the statement that ; " At this time, the district is subject to a substantial unmet need for gypsy and traveller pitches which has subsisted for a number of years..."

>> This unsubstantiated statement is based solely upon a theoretical assessment of need with no regard for the provision in the Local Plan Review for additional gypsy and traveller sites. The perceived 'need' is across the district and is not manifest locally in Henfield where two previous gypsy sites in Lawyers Lane and in Furners Lane have been lost and the sites redeveloped for permanent housing. Additionally, the planning permission allowed on appeal for three pitches in Stonepit Lane many months ago has yet to be implemented contrary to the speed with which private gypsy sites are normally developed. These facts alone demonstrate a lack of any pressing need for the proposed

development. Accordingly, the proposals fail to represent 'material considerations' which would disturb the application being determined in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan ( Paragraph 22 PPTS, 2015).

>>

>> Furthermore, Paragraph 24 of the PPTS contains relevant advice to LPA's regarding issues which they must consider in determining applications for traveller sites. Apart from the local level of provision and any identified need for sites there are the personal circumstances of the applicant. No such circumstances have been advanced in support of the proposed development and there has been no Pre Application Advice sought from the Local Authority. This absence of essential information to support the proposed development and the lack of engagement with the LA raises serious questions as to the validity and the justification for the proposals.

>>

>> I do not propose to reiterate my comments on a number of the others matters in the Planning Statement which I addressed in my previous objections except to reinforce my concerns regarding the mature trees on the site, which are of 'heritage' status and should remain undisturbed by any form of development. On a practical point, the two detached dayrooms for Plots 1&2 would be unworkable from any gypsies lifestyle standpoint. Dayrooms are to provide additional accommodation not available in a single unit mobile home, such as shower and toilet facilities together with laundry and cooking and living space. As such they need to be within the pitch and readily available. Additionally, the replacement of the 1.8m close- boarded fencing around each pitch with a 1.2m post and rail fence would deprive the occupiers of the pitches of all personal privacy. This proposed change recognises that the proposed development would, in either of the forms proposed, seriously 'urbanise' the character and appearance of the locality.

>>

>> I should be grateful if you would take into account all the objections I have raised in respect of the two proposals in determining this application.

Yours faithfully



>>

>>

>>

>> Sent from my iPad