

[REDACTED]

---

**Sent:** 26 November 2025 10:21  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Objection to planning request in Henfield ref: DC/25/1700

**Categories:** Comments Received

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am a resident of West End Lane and drive past this site on a daily basis. I need to object to application DC/25/1700 on the grounds of disproportionate concentration of traveller sites in Henfield, policy conflict, lack of demonstrated need, and harmful cumulative impact on the landscape and community.

### **1. Disproportionate burden placed on Henfield**

Henfield Parish makes up only around 3% of the land area of Horsham District, yet in the past four years has already delivered 9 new traveller pitches, representing 10% of the District's 93 required pitches:

- 2 pitches: Shoreham Road (DC/21/0753)
- 5 pitches: Furners Lane (DC/21/1796)
- 2 pitches: Stonepit Lane (DC/24/0367)

This clearly exceeds a fair share relative to both parish size and population. Adding a further site would unfairly increase this imbalance, contrary to government guidance which seeks broad geographic distribution to maintain community cohesion and traveller way of life — not concentration in one small area.

### **2. Conflict with Horsham District and national planning policies**

The site is:

- Not allocated in the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan
- Outside a built-up area boundary
- In open countryside where new traveller sites should be strictly limited.

The proposal appears contrary to policies 1–4, 23, 25, 31, 33, 34, 39 and 40 owing to: lack of sustainable transport or safe access, harm to landscape character (including the setting of the South Downs National Park), poor integration with surrounding countryside, and likely pressure on local infrastructure.

### **3. Cumulative impact and lack of proven local need**

This site is more visible and landscape-sensitive than existing pitches in the parish, increasing an urbanising effect on a rural environment. No clear evidence has been provided to show a specific local need for extra pitches in Henfield, especially given its existing provision. Without such justification, further concentration is unreasonable and unnecessary.

### **Conclusion**

Henfield has already made a substantial contribution toward traveller accommodation. Granting this application would create a disproportionate burden for one small parish, conflict with planning policy, and cause cumulative harm to landscape and community infrastructure. For these reasons, I respectfully request that planning application DC/25/1700 be refused.

Best regards

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]