

---

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 29 January 2026 16:32  
**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 29/01/2026 4:31 PM.

### 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:	SouthCottage, Brook Farm Horsham Road Cowfold
----------	---

### Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Other
Comments:	

Planning proposal suggests that it will 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. Not true, as it will have a direct impact on 3 heritage neighbouring properties and will damage the rights of walkers to enjoy the countryside.

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.

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].

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.

Also believe the report is out of date as data only valid till 19/5/25.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 and there has already been accidents on the corner.

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.

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 time.

---

Kind regards

**Telephone:**

**Email:** [planning@horsham.gov.uk](mailto: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](http://www.horsham.gov.uk) Chief Executive: Jane Eaton