

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 02 February 2026 17:51
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 02/02/2026 5:50 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:

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
-----------------	-----------

Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
---------	--

Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
----------------------	---

Comments:

I object to planning application DC/25/2079 and request that planning application is refused. My objection is based on the failure of the application to adequately demonstrate compliance with policy considerations as outlined in the adopted policies of HDPF 2015 and is against the 4 Key Aims of the Cowfold Neighbourhood Plan 2025 , which has been prepared with Neighbourhood Planning Regulation 2012, NPPF and is in general conformity with HDPF

2015.

The application is also at odds with the Government published Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) 2015 which is to be read alongside the National Planning Policy Framework.

Grounds for objections:

HDPF 2015 Policy 2: the application does not protect the rural landscape and character.

HDPF 2015 Policy 4 : states that "the site is allocated in the LP or neighbourhood Plan and does not adjoin existing settlement edge. The level of expansion is appropriate to scale and function".

The application does not conform to the above.

HDPF 2015 Policy 23 : states that the site is served by safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access and should not result in significant hazard to other road users.

The application does not meet this requirement.

Considerations:

There is no safe and convenient pedestrian and vehicular access. The greenfield site borders on the heavily frequented and fast A281 where the national speed limit of 60mph applies, on a location with restricted sight and no forward visibility.

Any traffic in and out of the site would cause significant hazard and dangers to road users. In the 1 mile stretch between Junction A281/Picts Lane and the edge of Cowfold to the South there have been 5 RTAs in the past 5 years, 3 of them serious.

2 RTAs with fatal outcome have been recorded since 2010 (2015,2017) and the one in 2015 has only been a few yards from the site entrance.

The site entrance is located near the crest of a hill and on a blind bend which would make traffic of any sort ,particularly slow moving one (towing caravans), an extreme hazard.

Cowfold is subject to heavy all day long traffic and stationary traffic at peak times and being in an Air Quality Monitoring and Management Area there has been a steady decline in air quality regularly exceeding safe NO2 levels.

HDC has placed Cowfold in an " Emission Reduction Area" in an effort to minimise emissions and guidance has been issued that requires all developments to carry out an Air quality assessment. The applicant has not demonstrated this undertaking.

There is no pedestrian access or pavement nor lighting to or from the site, the site is not accessible except by car and thus does not safely enable non-motorised forms of access.

The site would not be in or near existing settlements nor would it be part of an allocated strategic location. The development would have an unacceptable impact on the unspoilt character and appearance of the rural landscape and visual amenity of neighbouring properties.

The site would cause adverse and irreversible landscape harm and impact on the tranquility and distinctive rural character of the area.

The long access driveway to the stationary caravan pitches and associated hardstanding/utility areas would disrupt the local character and appearance of the landscape and would create an out of character and sprawl feel to the locality.

HDPF 2015 Policy 24 and Policy 38 :

The application would be at odds with statements underpinning this policy.

There will be negative environmental impact in terms of both quality and sustainability on groundwater and watercourses (stream 30m to the north of the site) and drinking water supplies from surface water run off generated by human activity (eg using hosepipes, outdoor water use - washing equipment and cars, using household chemicals).

HDPF 2015 Policy 25 : states that natural environment and landscape character of the district including landscape, landform and development pattern together with protected landscapes and habitats will be protected against inappropriate developments.

This development does not meet any of the development requirements that are outlined warranting support from the Council.

HDPF 2015 Policy 26 :

Countryside Protection

The site would constitute inappropriate and over-development, affecting rural character and the underdeveloped nature and will not protect or conserve the landform of the area and adversely affect tranquillity and the historical and ecological qualities of the locality, especially causing pollution of the field ecosystem.

Importation of building materials to create hardstanding and driveways will cause destruction of grassland and the reduction and dissection of habitats.

HDPF 2015 Policy 27 and Policy 31:

The site would impact negatively on green infrastructure and cause direct and indirect harm to biodiversity by creating an urbanising effect (light and noise, pollution, traffic).

The applicant does not show evidence of BNG bearing in mind irreversible loss of flora and impact on fauna from the consequences of the proposal , namely long driveway dissecting the field, significant areas of hardstanding and impact of human habitation (light, noise, traffic, effluents).

HDPF 2015 Policy 29 :

Equestrian development

The applicant's proposal now shows a different location within the site for the stable block (see DC/25/0054). The applicant has failed to make a new application to account for this change.

HDPF 2015 Policy 32 :

Quality of new development

The application does not complement, enhance or protect the locally distinctive character and heritage of the district.

The application does not contribute to a sense of place both in the buildings and spaces themselves and in the way they integrate with their surroundings and the historic landscape in which they sit.

HDPF 2015 Policy 33:

The application does not prioritise the use of previously developed land nor does it constitute efficient use of agricultural land.

HDC has already proposed 68 traveller sites.

This site would cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of owners/occupiers of nearby properties and land and would not be sensitive (light, noise, pollution) to the surrounding development.

It will have a detrimental and direct impact on the heritage character of neighbouring properties, 3 of which are Grade 2 listed.

The development would not be locally distinctive in character/appearance and would not respect the character of the surrounding area.

There is no mention in the planning application as to how measures to reduce any actual or perceived opportunities for crime or antisocial behaviour on the site and surrounding area would be incorporated (Point 3 of Policy 33).

HDPF 2015 Policy 34

Cultural and Heritage assets.

The application does not meet the requirements.

HDPF 2015 Policy 35

Strategic policy: Climate change

The application does not show how it would meet the requirements: reduced energy in construction, improved energy efficiency, low carbon energy supply, non-motorised travel/access to safe sustainable transport, water management systems (flooding, recycling, runoff), green infrastructure and SuDS concerns.

HDPF 2015 Policy 36 and Policy 38

Sustainable construction and Flooding

The application fails to explain how it would meet the requirements.

HDPF 2015 Policy 40
Sustainable Transport

The application represents a dispersed settlement and as such will result in a group of people highly reliant on a car to go about their daily business (school, work, access to services- shops, health services, other amenities.
Hence the application does not meet the requirements set out in this policy.

HDPF 2015 Policy 42
Inclusive Communities

The needs of a minority group should be balanced against the needs of an already pre existing settled community and not adversely impact on the latter.
Granting planning permission would significantly and demonstratively outweigh the benefits.

Cowfold Neighbourhood Plan 2025:

The development of Cotlands Paddock would be at odds with all 4 Key aims and the Strategic Objectives of Environment and Heritage, sustainability, light pollution, biodiversity protection and enhancement.

The site would be in an Area outside the built up area plan.

Air Quality being a key concern making rural landscapes and surrounding fields of particular ecological value given the high volume of traffic.

CNP emphasises support given to the protection of village feel and atmosphere, conservation of green spaces as well as maintenance of distinctive views and connectivity to the surrounding countryside which includes critically endangered Nightingales as well as other birds of prey (eg. buzzards, sparrow hawks, red kites, barn owls), bats, small mammals and amphibians sensitive to environmental change.

Additionally I wish to highlight the following concerns and inaccuracies arising from the Planning Application (12/12/2025) and Associated Reports:

Subheadings (PP- 14556674):

Residential/Dwelling Units: The applicants answered Yes to the question as to whether the proposal includes gain, loss or change of residential units - however there has never been a residential unit on site just a small stable block.

Foul sewage: There is insufficient detail given as to how effluents from the site would be managed.

Industrial and Commercial Processes and Machinery and Storage of Hazardous Substances: The application indicates that the site would not be used for such activities however there is evidence of recent (several months up to late January 2026) use of the site for building waste of a hazardous nature using accelerants in order to burn it and leading to explosions.

Pedestrian and Vehicle access and Rights of way:

The applicant fails to show due diligence in acknowledging and addressing safety aspects of access between the site and public roads.

Planning Statement (12/12/2025) :

Ecology: contrary to the statements in this section the applicant has already planted several rows of non native laurel hedge - as opposed to mixed native hedgerow species - in addition to using the site as an illegal waste dumping ground for hazardous building materials with several incidences of deliberate burning attempts necessitating emergency services response (for road safety amongst other concerns).

I fail to see how the applicant can indicate a Biodiversity Net Gain attached to the proposal when in fact there has been a Biodiversity net LOSS and habitat loss emanating from the above mentioned activity.

Preliminary Ecological appraisal (12/12/2025):
Based on a desk study and a walkover on site on 19/11/2024 and acknowledges several limitations of its findings.
The report erroneously states that the grassland had been heavily managed, had sustained heavy input of fertilizer and had been subject to regular grazing and cutting.
Despite the installing of stock fencing by the previous owner (known to me and who lived on the South Coast) there has not been any grazing by domestic animals for the past 25 plus years. The field had been cut at most 4-6 times per year and as a nearby resident I have never observed any fertilizer use. The field has never been "heavily managed".
The report fails to mention the significant presence of birds of prey and bats in the surrounding area and expected implication of human noise and light pollution on native species. There are several ponds in the area and evidence suggests that Great crested newts can migrate up to 1000 metres.
There are also several redacted/blacked out sections in the report which is of concern as to why information needs to be hidden ?

Kind regards

Telephone:
Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



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