

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 February 2026 16:27:59 UTC+00:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0010
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 09/02/2026 4:27 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land North of Girder Bridge, Gay Street Lane, North Heath RH20 2HW
Proposal:	Use of land for the stationing of 6 static caravans for residential purposes (to be occupied by Gypsies and Travellers) and associated landscape works.
Case Officer:	Shazia Penne

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Lower Stile Barn Gay Street Pulborough
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design- Highway Access and Parking- Overdevelopment- Privacy Light and Noise- Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	<p>I am writing to object to this application.</p> <p>I have read the Planning Statement submitted with the application (dated 23 December 2025) and I am concerned that it presents an</p>

overly optimistic and, in places, misleading picture of the site and its constraints .

My objection is not based on opposition in principle, but on the fact that the evidence relied upon by the applicant does not stand up to scrutiny.

Access is described as "safe" without addressing whether it is lawful

The Planning Statement repeatedly refers to an "established" and "safe" access from Gay Street Lane. What it does not explain at any point is whether the applicant actually has the legal right to use that access.

The track lies outside the application site and no evidence has been provided to show ownership, an easement, or any formal agreement. This is not a technical detail, without lawful access the development simply cannot be delivered.

The Planning Statement treats access purely as a highway safety issue and ignores the more basic question of whether the applicant is entitled to use the track at all.

The scale of intensification is played down.

The Statement accepts that the proposal would intensify use of the access track but describes this as "modest". That is difficult to accept.

Six permanent residential pitches mean multiple households, daily vehicle movements, visitors, deliveries, refuse collection and emergency access. That is a very different level of activity from occasional or low-key use.

No comparison is made with how the track has historically been used, and no explanation is given as to why this level of change should be considered modest. It is simply asserted.

The presence of the railway is barely acknowledged.

The access runs alongside a live railway line and appears to be used by railway staff for maintenance access. This is not properly addressed in the Planning Statement.

There is no reference to any agreement with the railway operator, nor any assessment of how regular residential traffic would interact with operational railway use. This feels like a significant omission, particularly given the obvious safety and operational sensitivities.

Claims about sustainability rely on assumption rather than

evidence.

The Planning Statement describes the site as being in a suitable and sustainable location, largely by comparing it to other applications. This is not the same as demonstrating that the site itself is sustainable.

The site is in a rural location, accessed by unlit lanes, with no footpaths and limited public transport. Future occupiers would be heavily reliant on cars for everyday needs, which in turn increases pressure on the access route.

These practical realities are not grappled with in any meaningful way.

Landscape and amenity impacts are understated.

The Statement focuses heavily on screening and visibility, but this misses the wider point. Six residential pitches introduce a permanent level of activity, noise, lighting and movement that is not characteristic of this rural area.

The impact on neighbouring land and the character of the area is more than just what can be seen from a footpath. That wider impact is not convincingly assessed.

Policy is treated as a reason to approve, not a test to be met.

Throughout the Planning Statement, unmet need and five-year supply arguments are relied upon as if they outweigh all other considerations.

However, policy does not require permission to be granted on unsuitable or undeliverable sites. Need does not remove the requirement to demonstrate lawful access, safety, or compatibility with surroundings.

The Planning Statement reads as though these matters are secondary, when in reality they are fundamental.

Taken as a whole, the Planning Statement relies heavily on assertion and selective interpretation. Key constraints - particularly lawful access, third-party land control and railway use, are either glossed over or ignored entirely.

This makes it very difficult to have confidence in the conclusions it reaches.

Because the Planning Statement fails to provide a balanced or complete assessment of the site, the application does not demonstrate that the proposal is deliverable, safe or appropriate in this location.

For all of the above the application should be refused.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



Horsham District Council, Alberty House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton