

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 25 November 2025 16:37
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 4:36 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:	Chestnut House 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:	<p>I request the above planning application be refused on the basis of the following key objections:</p> <p>Short references as follows:</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan (NHP) Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS)</p>

- (HDPF) Henfield parish represents approximately 3% of the geographical area of Horsham District council and already has 9 of the 93 (c.10%) stated pitches for the Horsham District. Whilst the need for such sites is not in question, Henfield appears to already be materially overweighted in its representation.
- (NHP 1) The site is located outside of the established BUAB for Henfield and has not been allocated as traveller accommodation on any current or legacy Neighbourhood Plan or Local Plan. Allowing this site would materially undermine the credibility of all the hard work that has gone into developing such plans.
- (NHP 25, 26) The site threatens the established rural character of its immediate surroundings with many of its features being more akin to urban developments
- The application is contrary to no less than 14 established planning policies - namely NHP policies 1, 25, 26, 33/HDPF policies 25, 26, 33/NPPF policies 8, 105, 111, 130(f), 180, 49/Traveller site planning policy 10 (details below)
- (NPPF 130f) the site will create a material loss of privacy, light and noise pollution (precedents of which already exist from the current pop-up camp site use) for the residents in the immediate vicinity of the site, who have previously enjoyed the unencumbered peace and tranquillity of rural living.



- (NPPF 111) the site currently has no approved access and will result in increased traffic risk on a narrow single carriage lane
- (NPPF 49) as stated above the application undermines the emerging Local Plan allocations for Henfield
- No water neutrality assessment has been undertaken which is a mandatory requirement of all such applications
- The environment impact assessment on local wildlife was carried out outside of the summer months, when animal activity would have been materially subdued by cold weather. In my view, there is therefore very little credence that can be placed on that assessment.
- (PPTS 10) The Planning Policies for Traveller sites (PPTS) strictly limit the scope of such developments that must respect the scale and character of the local setting. The application includes significant elements of hard stand and access roads that make it more akin to a housing development than a traveller site for caravans. This is totally out of character with the site's rural setting.
- (PPTS 1) There is no statement of traveller residential need in the application which must be evidenced. Granting approval in the absence of such an evidence-based need is contrary to the PPTS. Given the current overweighting of such sites in the Henfield vicinity, it is questionable as to whether practical, supportable evidence of this nature could ever be produced.
- (PPTS 1) I understand that such applications require a statutory declaration of the relevant travellers' status. I cannot see evidence of this having been submitted.
- A number of TPOs exist on the site - it is uncertain as to the impact that the extensive hardstand will have on these trees ability to access water, should surface water run-off be material changed.
- Although not explicit to the application, the diagrammatic representation of site is factually wrong. It includes reference to an 'Animal Training Centre' which currently does not exist. There is a genuine concern that this may be an attempt 'via the back door' to get this neighbouring site approved for a use it does not currently hold. 'Security canines' were temporarily housed on this site during a 3-month period over the summer of 2024, which created a significant noise disturbance for the local residents, as well as animal welfare concerns, which ultimately resulted in enforcement notices being issued to help enforce having the dogs removed from the site.

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