

[REDACTED]

Sent: 28 January 2026 15:50
To: Planning
Subject: Case reference DC/25/2079 - objection.

Categories: Comments Received

Dear sirs

I wish to object anonymously to this application - see the basis of objection below.

The proposed traveller caravan site would constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt, contrary to Policy 34 (Green Belt) of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and national Green Belt policy. Traveller sites are defined as inappropriate development in the Green Belt and planning permission may only be granted where very special circumstances are demonstrated; in this case, no such circumstances exist to clearly outweigh the substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt and its purposes. The proposal would introduce a visually intrusive and urbanising form of development into the countryside, including caravans, hardstanding, fencing, lighting and domestic paraphernalia, resulting in unacceptable harm to landscape character and rural amenity, contrary to Policy 25 (Countryside Protection) and Policy 33 (Landscape). Furthermore, the site lies within Flood Zone 3, where traveller sites are classified as highly vulnerable development. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy 40 (Flooding), as the submitted Flood Risk Assessment fails to demonstrate that the site would be safe for long-term residential occupation or that occupants would not be exposed to unacceptable flood risk. In addition, the development would give rise to significant highway safety concerns, contrary to Policy 23 (Highways and Transport), due to the proposed access onto a main road, inadequate visibility splays, increased traffic movements along narrow and unsuitable rural lanes, and the lack of adequate turning space for caravans and associated vehicles. Finally, the proposal conflicts with Policy 38 (Gypsies and Travellers), which requires sites to be located in sustainable locations with reasonable access to schools, healthcare, shops and public transport. The siting of a permanent traveller site in an isolated rural location remote from towns and key services would be inherently unsustainable, increase reliance on private vehicles, and undermine the spatial strategy of directing development to sustainable settlements, contrary to Policy 3 (Development Hierarchy) of the HDPPF.

The land in question has been subject to prolonged and highly inappropriate use since its purchase. Rather than being managed responsibly or maintained in a condition suitable for development, it has been used as a dumping ground for vast quantities of waste, creating a significant visual blight on the surrounding countryside and causing serious concern among local residents.

Most alarmingly, this waste has recently been burned on site. The burning of large volumes of mixed waste released thick, noxious fumes that spread across the village, causing distress, forcing residents indoors, and raising serious concerns about public health and environmental safety. The emission of potentially toxic smoke represents a clear disregard for the wellbeing of neighbouring households, including children, the elderly, and those with respiratory conditions.

This behaviour demonstrates a complete failure to manage the land in a safe, lawful, or environmentally responsible manner. It raises profound doubts about whether the site could be properly controlled or regulated if planning permission were to be granted. Planning policy places significant emphasis on sustainable development, protection of residential amenity, and the prevention of environmental harm. This site has already shown the opposite in practice.

Furthermore, the site lies within a rural setting where visual impact, environmental stewardship, and respect for neighbouring communities are of paramount importance. The accumulation and burning of waste has caused lasting damage to the character of the area and undermines any claim that the proposed development would integrate acceptably into its surroundings.

The planning system must consider not only what is proposed on paper, but the real-world conduct associated with the land. The history of misuse, pollution, and disruption at this site is directly relevant and cannot be ignored. Granting permission in these circumstances would set a deeply troubling precedent and reward behaviour that has already caused harm to the local community.

For these reasons—environmental damage, serious public health concerns, visual harm, and demonstrated inability to manage the site responsibly—I urge Horsham District Council to refuse this application in its entirety.