
From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 06 February 2026 10:54
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/1957

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 06/02/2026 10:54 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Oaklands Stud Forest Grange Horsham West Sussex RH13 6HX
Proposal:	Demolition of pole barn. Conversion of existing stable building into 1no. detached dwelling with associated works.
Case Officer:	Daniel Holmes

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Tanglewood Forest Grange Horsham
----------	----------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design- Highway Access and Parking- Other- Overdevelopment- Privacy Light and Noise- Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION DC/25/1957 AT OAKLANDS STUD

This application for residential development within the High Weald National Landscape should be refused in line with established planning policy and past decisions, due to its adverse impact on landscape character, conflict with national and local policy, and failure to address the consistent and repeated grounds for refusal identified by both local and national planning authorities.

1. STATUTORY PROTECTION AND NATIONAL LANDSCAPE POLICY
Oaklands Stud lies within the High Weald National Landscape (formerly AONB). The Council is under a statutory duty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 to "have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area" in all

its decisions.

Relevant policies include:

- NPPF Paragraph 180 ("Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in...National Landscapes.")
- HDPF Policies 25, 26, 30, 32 and 33 require maintenance of the character, function and beauty of such areas.
- SDPAN (Sept 2025) requires development to "maintain and enhance" landscape features and remain within defensible boundaries.

Allowing this proposal would undermine the legal and policy safeguards that exist for this nationally significant landscape by introducing unjustifiable development into open countryside.

2. CONSISTENT AND RECENT PLANNING HISTORY

All relevant applications for residential or mixed use on or near this land (CG/25/96, PE/22/0050, DC/22/2126, DC/24/0974, EN/24/0264, DC/25/0462, DC/25/1428) have been refused or dismissed at both Council and Planning Inspectorate (PINS) levels:

- Refusals and dismissed appeals: APP/Z3825/W/24/3355610 (28 April 2025), APP/Z3825/C/25/3360097 (12 June 2025).
- Reasons for refusal: harm to the High Weald National Landscape, urbanising impact, conflict with HDPF and NPPF, undeclared or false site boundaries.

The current relocation of the proposed building on the site does not mitigate these established and fundamental harms.

3. RISK OF CUMULATIVE HARM AND PRECEDENT

Permitting this application would set a harmful precedent for further applications and promote "creeping" or incremental suburbanisation, contrary to national guidance and local plan objectives. This would weaken the strategic integrity of this valued landscape and open the door to further piecemeal development in surrounding fields, as explicitly recognised in previous refusals.

4. INACCURACIES, MISSTATEMENTS, AND UNDELIVERABLE PROPOSAL

- Boundary misrepresentation: The proposal falsely presents ownership that does not reflect Land Registry records; parts or all of the proposed dwelling and curtilage would extend onto land owned by Forest Grange Private Road Limited (FGPRL), not the applicant. This is a material implementation constraint.
- Curtilage and access: Domestic curtilage extends onto non-applicant land; existing legal access authorises only agricultural/grazing use, not residential or commercial.
- Screening and visibility: The site is visible from public footpaths to the north and from the east. Reliance on screening (much on third-party land) is inappropriate and inconsistent with the High Weald Design Guide.

5. ENVIRONMENTAL, AMENITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPACTS

- Protected trees and ecology: Ancient and protected trees adjacent to the proposed site-already encroached upon by previous works-are at further risk, as are habitats for deer and other wildlife (contrary to HDPF Policy 31 and the NPPF).
- Surface and foul drainage: The proposal lacks credible plans or technical documentation, and previous applications (DC/20/0980) within 500m highlighted significant drainage/flooding risk.
- Amenity and tranquillity: Granting permission would increase noise, disturb wildlife, and alter the peaceful character of the area that residents value and actively maintain.

6. UNSUSTAINABLE AND UNSAFE ACCESS

- Access: The lane is narrow, winding, unlit, with blind bends and no footpaths, and was never designed for more than agricultural use. Increased residential traffic would lead to safety concerns for pedestrians, children, and wildlife.
- Location and parking: There are no essential services or community facilities within walking distance; the site is inherently car-dependent, contrary to HDPF Policy 40.
- Pattern of development: There is no residential development to the north of the access lane in this locality, as accentuated in past PINS findings; this proposal would fundamentally disturb that historic settlement pattern.

7. PLANNING HARM NOT OUTWEIGHED BY HOUSING NEED

The National Planning Policy Framework recognises the importance of increasing housing supply but also makes clear that this objective must not override the statutory protection afforded to National Landscapes. Here, the minimal benefit of a single dwelling is vastly outweighed by the significant and lasting harm to landscape character and integrity.

8. WIDESPREAD COMMUNITY OPPOSITION

There are 22 properties on this lane where residents collectively maintain and safeguard their environment. The overwhelming majority of neighbours strongly object, and we ask that this widespread and consistent concern is recognised in your decision.

CONCLUSION

This proposal is fundamentally flawed, undeliverable, and inconsistent with local and national planning policy. It repeats previous applications and addresses none of the serious deficiencies highlighted in recent refusals and appeals:

- Breach of statutory and policy protections for the National Landscape
- Cumulative and precedent-setting risk to protected countryside
- Material inaccuracies and undeliverability
- Negative impacts upon amenity, environment, access, and safety
- Public interest and widespread opposition

I urge Horsham District Council to refuse DC/25/1957 and continue to uphold the integrity of the High Weald National Landscape for present and future generations.

Thank you for considering my objection.

[REDACTED]

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**



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