

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 03 February 2026 09:46  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application DC/25/2079  
**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 03/02/2026 9:46 AM.

### Application Summary

|               |                                                                                                                                 |
|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Address:      | Cotlands Paddock Horsham Road Cowfold West Sussex RH13 8AH                                                                      |
| Proposal:     | Use of land for the stationing of 4no. static caravans for (Gypsy and Traveller) residential purposes and associated day rooms. |
| Case Officer: | Shazia Penne                                                                                                                    |

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

|          |                              |
|----------|------------------------------|
| Address: | 33 Holm Oaks Cowfold Horsham |
|----------|------------------------------|

### Comments Details

|                      |                                                                                                                                               |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Commenter Type:      | Member of the Public                                                                                                                          |
| 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>- Trees and Landscaping</li></ul> |
| Comments:            | Objections to the traveller site on the A281                                                                                                  |
|                      | Statement:                                                                                                                                    |
|                      | Reasons for turning down planning application at Cotland Paddock, Horsham Road, Cowfold, RH13 8AH                                             |
|                      | It goes against existing policies.                                                                                                            |

## HDC planning framework policies

### Policy 23

#### Strategic Policy: Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

1b. The site is served by a safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian

access. The proposal should not result in significant hazard to other

road users; This greenfield site is on a main A road with a 60mph speed limit opposite access to a nursing home ( staff vehicles, deliveries and visitors all coming and going) and 5 other properties including farm machinery on a blind corner with incline, where there have been many accidents including three fatalities. There is no pavement and bus stops are under review due to questions about viability due to safety concerns. Homelands Nursing Home had a previous application refused due to unsafe access. Many of the visitors to Homelands are elderly with lower reaction speeds.

Vehicles coming from north cannot see proposed access till almost on it due to rise in road. Vehicles leaving proposed access ( Inc large touring caravans) cannot see to the right. It will greatly increase the number of vehicles using this dangerous bit of road as the number of daily uses from the proposed site could be as many as 240.

When approaching in a car/large touring caravan from the south, anyone turning into the proposed site will cause cars to suddenly brake as this is a blind bend

1c. The site can be properly serviced and is supplied with essential

services, such as water, power, sewerage and drainage, and waste

disposal.

Don't think this has been adequately assessed. They talk about a soakaway into a drainage field, but don't indicate which field, possibly not theirs. The fields here are on a slope down to the Cowfold stream, which then goes into a privately owned pond before heading towards Cowfold, where local children play in it in the summer. They do not state how many people the waste system will be able to deal with .

1e. The development will not have an unacceptable impact on the

character and appearance of the landscape and the amenity of

neighbouring properties, and is sensitively designed to mitigate any

impact on its surroundings. This will have a direct impact on the character and appearance of the landscape, especially when viewed from the adjoining footpath and will directly affect the 4 heritage neighbouring properties. - the cumulative heritage impact is unacceptable. ( Brook Place Grade II\*)

#### Policy 24

#### Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection

3. Maintain or improve the environmental quality of any watercourses,

groundwater and drinking water supplies, and prevents contaminated

run-off to surface water sewers; This could contaminate the local stream which runs down to Cowfold.

7. Ensure that the cumulative impact of all relevant committed developments

is appropriately assessed. There is already planning approved for 35 houses between here and the edge of Cowfold.

#### Policy 33

#### Development Principles

In order to conserve and enhance the natural and built environment

developments shall be required to:

1. Make efficient use of land, and prioritise the use of previously developed

land and buildings whilst respecting any constraints that exist; Not efficient use of agricultural land. Why not use existing static home sites off Kent street, Honeybridge Lane or Barns Green. Or those suggested in HDC framework plan

2. Ensure that it is designed to avoid unacceptable harm to the amenity of

occupiers/users of nearby property and land, for example through

overlooking or noise, whilst having regard to the sensitivities of

surrounding development; Will have a direct impact on 3 heritage neighbouring properties and will damage the rights of walkers to enjoy the countryside.

4. Are locally distinctive in character, respect the character of the surrounding

area (including its overall setting, townscape features, views and green

corridors) and, where available and applicable, take account of the

recommendations/policies of the relevant Design Statements and Character

Assessments; the development does not respect the character of the surrounding area and is not in a locally distinctive character. It sets a precedent which could then be expanded on.

9. Incorporate measures to reduce any actual or perceived opportunities for

crime or antisocial behaviour on the site and in the surrounding area; and

create visually attractive frontages where adjoining streets and public

spaces, including appropriate windows and doors to assist in the informal

surveillance of public areas by occupants of the site; [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED].

Other reasons for planning to be refused....

Ecology Aspect:

Area should be re-assessed by a qualified ecologist for the council re protected and priority species and habitat ...in the accompanying report various bits have been redacted. Why?

Also believe the report is out of date as data only valid till 19/5/25.

We know there are Great Crested Newts at the site and in the surrounding area. There are about 13 ponds in the area which the newts could be using and migrating between. No impact assessment done for GCN, Bats (Inc light pollution affect) [REDACTED], Dormice...Not a very full report as there are also Buzzards and Red Kites in the area. Most of these are Protected Species inc European Protected Species, despite the fact they state on planning application that none exist.

Basis Planning:

The stable block has moved from where planning permission was granted...This is not mentioned in application. It should be re applied for.

There are no dimensions for the Day rooms in the application...this needs to be included.

In the application they state that there is "market housing" on the site....there is no housing on the site, only an old stable. They also state under "non residential floorspace" that there will be no change, but I presume that the dayroom and touring caravans are meant to be non-residential otherwise there is potential for nearly 60 people living here.

They state in the application that there is an existing stable block but there is a huge difference between a stable used for a rural hobby and a residential development with possibly 12 habitable structures....and the concern that if approved this would then increase.

Fire and rescue services need to be consulted...Water hydrant access/vehicle access???

There is no evidence that the site is connected to Mains water.. It doesn't appear to show a mains pipe on Southern waters maps.

The applicant suggests there are 2 grade II heritage sites affected in fact there are 3. ( Brook Place Grade II\* is not mentioned)

They talk about native hedging in the application, but have already planted a long hedge of non-native species that can be invasive.

No safe access or egress into/out of the site. Current access was only designed for infrequent agricultural access... not this frequency.

The applicate suggests there is a need for 128 new sites, but has no evidence to support this and I believe this is looking till 2040. HDC has already suggested 68 possible sites

This site is so small it does not contribute to the 'unmet need' of traveller pitches - therefore by virtue of its own proposal, does not have any significance to the overall strategy - a larger site is required - which will actually deliver to that acknowledged unmet need - THIS IS THE WRONG LOCATION!

Whilst there is a 'need' for traveller sites, this proposal produces significant and demonstrable harm to many Horsham DC policies, and therefore does not outweigh the small amount of benefit created thus the conflict created would suggest a refusal of any associated planning permission at this site and as we know once they move 4 in, that will become 10 and so on and the planning office won't be able to spot it

These site should be on brown site not green fields as they just become dumping grounds like the one on the A23 which was for 4 caravans and now has 10 on it !

---

Kind regards

**Telephone:**

**Email:** [planning@horsham.gov.uk](mailto:planning@horsham.gov.uk)



**Horsham  
District  
Council**

