

[REDACTED]

Sent: 06 February 2026 14:06
To: Planning
Subject: OBJECTION to DC/25/1957

Categories: Comments Received

Re: DC/25/1957 – “Demolition of pole barn. Conversion of existing stable building into 1 no. detached dwelling with associated works”

Site: Oaklands Stud (formerly Tanglewood Equestrian), Forest Grange, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 6HX

Dear Sir/Madam,

Objection

I object to planning application **DC/25/1957**.

The proposal introduces (or intensifies) a **permanent residential use** in a highly sensitive countryside location within the **High Weald National Landscape**, with associated domestic activity, parking, lighting, private amenity space and paraphernalia. The application should be refused for the reasons below.

1) Unacceptable harm to the High Weald National Landscape (highest policy weight)

The site lies within the **High Weald National Landscape**, where decision-makers must give **great weight** to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty and must apply the statutory protected landscape duty.

Recent Planning Inspectorate decisions on this **same equestrian facility/site context** are directly relevant. In **APP/Z3825/W/24/3355610 (decision 28 April 2025; DC/24/0974)** the Inspector found that introducing residential use and associated domestic activity/paraphernalia would have an **urbanising effect**, erode characteristic landscape features (including field pattern), and fail to conserve/enhance natural beauty, conflicting with relevant Horsham District Planning Framework landscape policies. The appeal was dismissed.

A permanent dwelling created from the stable block would typically generate exactly the same kinds of effects (domestic use, garden/curtilage, vehicles, lighting and ancillary domestic features), and the application does not robustly demonstrate how those impacts would be avoided or neutralised in this protected landscape.

Given the very high policy protection for National Landscapes, and the Inspector’s recent findings of landscape harm from residential/domestic encroachment at this location, the Council should refuse permission.

2) Conflict with the development plan approach to protecting landscape character and public enjoyment

Even where development is physically small, its *effect* can be significant in a National Landscape. A dwelling and domestic curtilage typically results in incremental domestication and cumulative change over time.

The Council should assess the proposal against the relevant Horsham District Planning Framework policies that protect:

- the **natural beauty/landscape character** of the High Weald National Landscape;
- the **public's enjoyment** of the landscape; and
- the retention of important **natural and landscape features**.

On the evidence available, the proposal is not demonstrated to conserve/enhance those qualities and is therefore contrary to the development plan.

3) Inaccurate/uncertain “red line” land control and deliverability (material because it undermines assessment)

There are serious concerns that the submitted red line boundary/curtilage does not match land genuinely within the applicant's control, and that some screening/works relied upon are outside the applicant's ownership or control.

While private land ownership disputes are not the Council's role to determine, **the planning system requires accurate plans and correct ownership certification**. If the Council cannot be confident the red line is correct and the applicant controls all land required for access, parking/turning, drainage infrastructure, landscaping/screening and residential curtilage, then the proposal is not properly assessable and should not be approved.

At minimum, the Council should require:

- confirmation that the ownership certificate is correct; and
- corrected/verified plans showing all land necessary to implement the development (including any visibility splays, parking/turning, drainage and landscaping).

4) Unsustainable and potentially unsafe access / parking impacts

A dwelling in this location is likely to be highly car-dependent. The application should demonstrate, with proper evidence, that safe access, turning and parking can be achieved without causing harm to the rural character of the lane and without unacceptable highway or pedestrian safety impacts.

If the proposal relies on additional parking areas, widening, engineered visibility improvements, lighting or other domestication along the access, those impacts must be assessed and weighed—particularly given the protected landscape designation.

5) Drainage and foul water disposal not evidenced to an appropriate standard

The application must provide a clear, technically supported strategy for:

- **surface water drainage** (including whether infiltration is feasible, exceedance routing, and downstream impacts); and
- **foul drainage** (method, location, capacity, and any environmental constraints).

If this information is absent, vague, or unsupported by site-specific investigation, the Council cannot lawfully conclude the development is acceptable. The application should be refused or (at minimum) not determined until the drainage position is properly evidenced.

6) Biodiversity, trees and lighting impacts (including cumulative effects)

The site sits within a landscape containing woodland/tree belts and habitat features typical of the High Weald. The proposal should be supported by proportionate ecological and arboricultural evidence, including:

- tree constraints/protection and any veteran/important trees potentially affected;
- biodiversity impacts and **measurable net gain** (where applicable);
- lighting design that avoids harm to wildlife and rural dark skies character.

In a National Landscape, these matters carry additional weight and should not be left to post-permission condition if fundamental acceptability is uncertain.

Request

For the reasons above, I request that Horsham District Council **refuse** planning application **DC/25/1957**.

Yours faithfully,

4 The Courtyard, Forest Grange, Forest Road, Horsham, RH12 4TG