

---

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 06 February 2026 11:04  
**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 11:04 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"><li>- Design</li><li>- Highway Access and Parking</li><li>- Other</li><li>- Overdevelopment</li><li>- Privacy Light and Noise</li><li>- Trees and Landscaping</li></ul>
Comments:	<b>OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION DC/25/1957 AT OAKLANDS STUD</b>

I am writing to object to planning application DC/25/1957 for the proposed demolition of the pole barn and conversion of the stable into a new dwelling at Oaklands Stud. As a resident in this household and part of the local community, I am extremely concerned about the impact this development would have on our unique countryside and its protected status.

#### SUMMARY

This site is located in the High Weald National Landscape, a designated area of national significance. Granting permission for this proposal would be contrary to both national and local planning policies, would harm the distinctive rural character, and would ignore the strong reasons for refusal given in recent decisions for similar schemes. This development should not

go ahead.

## 1. STATUTORY AND POLICY PROTECTION

The High Weald National Landscape (formerly known as the AONB) is safeguarded by stringent planning requirements, including the legal obligation under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 Section 85, to protect and enhance its natural beauty.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 180 gives "great weight" to conservation of National Landscapes.

Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) Policies 25, 26, 30, 32, and 33 all require development to respect and conserve the area's character.

The Shaping Development in Horsham District Advice Note (SDPAN Sept 2025) insists on maintaining and enhancing landscape features.

Allowing this application would set aside these vital protections in favour of unjustified residential development.

## 2. RECENT PLANNING HISTORY

This site and others nearby have been the subject of multiple refused planning applications and dismissed appeals (including CG/25/96, DC/24/0974, DC/25/0462, DC/25/1428, and appeals APP/Z3825/W/24/3355610 and APP/Z3825/C/25/3360097). Each time, both Horsham District Council and the Planning Inspectorate have found major harm would be caused by development here, especially to the protected landscape and rural setting. Relocating the footprint of the new dwelling does not address these serious, repeated objections.

## 3. CUMULATIVE AND PRECEDENT-SETTING IMPACT

If this application were to be approved, there is a real risk that it would set a precedent for further building in adjacent fields, leading to creeping and irreversible loss of countryside. Protecting the whole landscape from this kind of incremental development is clearly supported by both local and national policy.

## 4. SITE BOUNDARY AND ACCESS ISSUES

The plans do not accurately show actual land ownership. The proposed dwelling and its associated land would, in reality, be situated on land owned by Forest Grange Private Road Limited, not the applicant.

Necessary access rights for residential or commercial use are not held by the applicant; rights only exist for agriculture or grazing.

Screening is proposed to hide the development, but much of this is suggested over land not controlled by the applicant, and the building is still clearly visible from public footpaths and surrounding land.

## 5. HARM TO THE ENVIRONMENT, AMENITY, AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The development would put ancient, protected trees and well-established wildlife at increased risk. The area supports deer and birdlife, which would be displaced. HDPF Policy 31 and the NPPF highlight the need to protect these habitats.

There are no technical drainage details or evidence provided-inadequate drainage has already been proved at similar locations (DC/20/0980).

Increased noise, loss of tranquillity, and domestic activity would change the character of this peaceful rural area.

## 6. ACCESSIBILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY CONCERNS

The only access is a narrow, winding and unlit private lane, not fit for increased numbers of vehicles and unsafe for children, walkers, or wildlife.

The proposed dwelling would be cut off from amenities, entirely dependent on cars, which goes against HDPF Policy 40.

No houses exist north of this lane in our area. This development would break the established

settlement pattern and set a negative precedent.

#### 7. HOUSING NEED DOES NOT OUTWEIGH LANDSCAPE HARM

While there is a recognised demand for new homes, national planning guidance makes clear that this must not override the irreplaceable value of our protected landscapes. The small gain in housing cannot justify such a large loss to the countryside's character, beauty, and special qualities.

#### 8. STRONG LOCAL OPPOSITION

Our community cares deeply about the local environment. Residents all along the road-22 households-work hard together to maintain the character and ecology of this place. There is a strong and consistent groundswell of objection to further development, and I ask that the Council take into account just how many people care about safeguarding this area for future generations.

#### CONCLUSION

This proposal is flawed and incompatible with national and local planning policy. It repeats past applications and ignores the clear reasons for refusal given by both council planners and inspectors:

It undermines legal and planning protections for the National Landscape.  
It would encourage similar incremental loss of protected countryside.  
The site boundary and delivery details are inaccurate and misleading.  
It would damage local amenity, biodiversity, access, and road safety.  
There is clear and widespread local opposition.

I respectfully urge Horsham District Council to refuse DC/25/1957 to protect the High Weald National Landscape now and for the future.

Thank you for considering my objection.

[Redacted signature]

---

Kind regards

**Telephone:**

**Email:** [planning@horsham.gov.uk](mailto: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](http://www.horsham.gov.uk) Chief Executive: Jane Eaton