

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 25 November 2025 14:48
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/1700
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 25/11/2025 2:48 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	The Slips West End Lane Henfield West Sussex BN5 9RG
Proposal:	Change of use of the land for the stationing of 4no. gypsy and traveller static caravans for residential purposes and 5no. associated dayrooms.
Case Officer:	Daniel Holmes

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Layspring Lawyers Lane Henfield
----------	---------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design- Highway Access and Parking- Loss of General Amenity- Other- Overdevelopment- Privacy Light and Noise- Trees and Landscaping

Comments:

****Formal Objection to Planning Application - The Slips, West End Lane, Henfield****

I would like to lodge my formal objection to the above planning application for the reasons outlined below.
Each point highlights a clear conflict with policies adopted by Horsham District Council, the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Points Contrary to Horsham District Council Policy Framework

Point 1. Not a Strategic Site:

This location is not identified as a strategic allocation within the Horsham District Local Plan. Existing approved traveller sites were designated through the proper strategic process, and no additional need has been recognised that would warrant development in this area.

Point 2. Not in the Neighbourhood Plan:

The Henfield Neighbourhood Plan-shaped through extensive community engagement and endorsed via two referendums-does not identify this site for traveller accommodation. The location was deemed neither appropriate nor required during its preparation.

Point 3. Outside the Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB):

The proposed development lies outside the defined BUAB, as clearly marked in both the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan. It sits at the end of a narrow rural lane with only sporadic development and is surrounded by agricultural land and open countryside.

Point 4. Not Adjacent to a Settlement Edge:

The site is not positioned next to any recognised settlement boundary, and no evidence has been put forward to demonstrate a justified need for a traveller site here.

Point 19:

The application is not for park homes or caravans meeting any established local housing requirement.

Point 21:

The site has not been designated by Horsham District Council, nor by any planning authority, as a strategic gypsy and traveller location.

Point 23: Highway Safety and Accessibility Concerns

Inadequate Road Access: West End Lane is a narrow rural road without pavements or lighting, bounded by drainage ditches that prevent any widening. It cannot safely accommodate additional traffic, especially from larger towed caravans.

No Safe Pedestrian Access: There is no safe walking route to Henfield. The road is hazardous for pedestrians, particularly in poor weather or reduced visibility.

Lack of Public Transport:The closest bus services operate over a mile away at the High Street. With no public transport access on West End Lane, the site would be entirely dependent on private vehicles.

Congestion Issues: Church Street, the main approach from the High Street, is routinely congested during peak times such as school runs, church events, and funerals. Its narrow entry point already struggles with existing traffic volumes. The alternative route via Nep Town Road also suffers from tight bends, on-street parking, and multiple pinch points.

Lack of Essential Infrastructure

The site has no mains water, sewage connection, or drainage. The temporary campsite currently relies on portable toilets. Nearby properties rely on septic tanks due to the lack of services, and the proposal includes no workable or sustainable solutions to address this deficit.

Point 25 and Point 31: Harm to Landscape and Natural Environment

The land is a long, narrow field containing mature trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). Installing access tracks and parking areas would cause notable landscape harm.

* The proposal does not protect, conserve, or enhance the natural or built environment, contrary to Local Plan policy and NPPF paragraphs 130 and 180.

* The development would introduce urbanising features into a sensitive rural gap, eroding the separation between the built-up area and open countryside. Increased lighting and vehicle movements would significantly affect rural character.

* Biodiversity is also at risk. [REDACTED] and deer routinely cross Lawyers

Lane. The ecological assessment was undertaken in winter, meaning it does not reflect the full biodiversity present on the site.

Point 33

* The proposal would adversely affect the outlook, privacy, and general amenity of neighbouring properties within this small rural community.

* The overall scale and layout are inconsistent with the character of the surrounding housing and the countryside setting.

* It does not maintain or enhance the rural nature of the area, which is contrary to the Local Plan and NPPF guidance.

Point 40:

There is no access to an established public transport network. The only available bus service is over a mile away, reachable only via a narrow, unlit road with no pavements. Realistically, all access to and from the site would require the use of vehicles, providing no sustainable travel alternative.

Disproportionate Burden on Henfield Parish

* Although Henfield Parish makes up just 3% of Horsham District by land area, it already accommodates 9 traveller pitches-over 10% of the district-wide requirement of 93.

* Adding further pitches here would disproportionately increase the burden on a relatively small community compared with the wider district.

9. Non-Compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The proposal conflicts with several key NPPF paragraphs:

Paragraphs 8 & 105: The site is remote, reliant on cars, and lacks basic services.

Paragraph 111: Significant concerns about highway safety and accessibility.

Paragraph 130: Expected harm from noise, light pollution, and reduced privacy for nearby residents.

Paragraph 180: Insufficient biodiversity evidence and potential impacts on protected species.

Conclusion

In summary, the proposal is incompatible with local and national planning policies, lacks essential infrastructure, poses significant highway and safety concerns, and would cause lasting harm to both the environment and rural character of the area. Henfield has already exceeded its proportionate share of traveller site provision, and this application represents an unjustified and inappropriate extension.

I respectfully request that Horsham District Council refuse this application.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**



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