

[REDACTED]

Sent: 06 February 2026 17:35
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to Planning Application – DC/25/1957

Categories: Comments Received

Objection to Planning Application – DC/25/1957

1. Introduction

I object to the above planning application and respectfully request that Horsham District Council refuse permission. The proposal is fundamentally unacceptable because:

- The application contains material inaccuracies and omissions which render it unreliable and potentially undeliverable.
- The proposal is directly inconsistent with a well-established and extensive planning history of refusals for residential development on this site, including decisions upheld on appeal.
- The development is contrary to adopted local planning policy, national planning policy, and established landscape protection principles, particularly in relation to the High Weald National Landscape.

2. Deficiencies and Inaccuracies within the Application

2.1 Incorrect Representation of Land Ownership and Boundaries

[REDACTED] to

Furthermore, the proposed curtilage conflicts with the established and consistent pattern of development in the locality, which has historically maintained strict separation between residential development and adjoining land.

2.2 Visual Impact and Public Visibility

Contrary to suggestions within the application, the development would be visible from public vantage points. The introduction of residential development, associated domestic paraphernalia, access movements and built form would materially alter the character of the site and its surroundings, resulting in urbanising effects that would erode the rural landscape character.

2.3 Inadequate Drainage Strategy

The application fails to provide a robust or credible surface water drainage solution and does not adequately address foul water drainage at all. This represents a significant omission. Without demonstrable and deliverable drainage solutions, the Local Planning Authority cannot reasonably conclude that the development would avoid environmental harm or comply with policy requirements relating to sustainable infrastructure.

3. Established Planning History and Consistency in Decision-Making

The site has been subject to a clear and consistent pattern of planning refusals relating to residential use, both at local authority level and through appeal decisions issued by the Planning Inspectorate. These include:

- **CG/25/96** – Detached bungalow: Refused
- [REDACTED]
- **DC/22/2126** – Ten-year residential use of caravan: Refused
- **DC/24/0974** – Two gypsy pitches: Refused by HDC; appeal dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate
- **EN/24/0264** – Enforcement action against mobile home: Appeal dismissed
- **DC/25/0462** – Four-bedroom dwelling conversion: Refused
- **DC/25/1428** – Two gypsy pitches: Refused

The Planning Inspectorate has explicitly highlighted that:

- There has been no authorised residential development north of the access lane; and
- The harms associated with residential development on this site clearly outweigh any potential benefits, including contributions to housing supply or traveller accommodation provision.

These are highly material considerations and carry significant weight in the determination of this application.

4. Failure to Address Previous Reasons for Refusal

The current proposal fails to overcome the substantive planning objections previously identified by the Local Planning Authority.

4.1 Conflict with Spatial Strategy and Countryside Protection

As established in refusal decision **DC/25/0462**, residential development at this countryside location is not essential or justified and conflicts with the spatial strategy directing development towards defined settlements. This directly conflicts with Policies 1, 2, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

The absence of a five-year housing land supply does not outweigh these harms. Previous decisions have already confirmed that no material considerations exist that would justify departing from adopted policy in relation to this site.

4.2 Harm to the High Weald National Landscape

Previous decisions have consistently concluded that residential development would introduce domestication, built form, and associated activity that would degrade the rural character of the site and harm the setting of the High Weald National Landscape.

The current application introduces the same harmful characteristics previously identified, including:

- Formalisation of residential use
- Associated domestic structures and paraphernalia
- Increased activity and vehicle movements
- Visual intrusion into a protected landscape

Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with Policies 25, 30, 32 and 33 of the HDPF and national policy requiring the conservation and enhancement of National Landscapes.

4.3 Continued Landscape Harm from Residential Pitches

As confirmed in refusal decision **DC/25/1428**, residential pitches and associated infrastructure would cause unacceptable landscape and visual harm and fail to conserve or enhance natural beauty. The present application does not materially differ in terms of landscape impact and therefore remains contrary to Policies 23, 25, 30 and 33 of the HDPF and the NPPF.

5. Conflict with Planning Policy

The proposal conflicts with several key planning policies, including but not limited to:

- Policies 2, 10, 25, 26, 30 and 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015)
- Shaping Development in Horsham District Planning Advice Note (September 2025)
- The National Planning Policy Framework

Taken collectively, these policies prioritise sustainable development patterns, protection of the countryside, conservation of designated landscapes, and high-quality design that respects local character. The proposal fails against each of these objectives.

6. Conclusion

This application represents a continuation of repeated attempts to introduce residential development onto a site where such use has consistently been found unacceptable by both the Local Planning Authority and the Planning Inspectorate.

The proposal should be refused because:

1. The application contains material inaccuracies, [REDACTED].
2. The proposal conflicts with a clear and consistent planning history of refusals, including multiple appeal decisions.
3. The development would cause demonstrable harm to the rural character of the site and the High Weald National Landscape.
4. The proposal conflicts with key local and national planning policies.

In the interests of sound and consistent planning decision-making, I respectfully request that Horsham District Council refuses this application.

Regards,

[REDACTED]