

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 26 August 2026 18:00
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/1234
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 26/08/2026 5:59 PM from [REDACTED].

Application Summary

Address:	Winstons Farm Muttons Lane Ashington West Sussex RH20 3AL
Proposal:	Prior Notification for the erection of 2no. agricultural buildings.
Case Officer:	Sam Nye

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	2 Oak Cottages Rock Road Storrington

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Dear Sir/Madam, Re: DC/26/1234 - Winstons Farm, Muttons Lane, Ashington I am writing to strongly object to the above application for two agricultural buildings at Winstons Farm. Having reviewed the application and supporting documents, I have serious concerns about the claimed size of the agricultural holding, the lack of evidence demonstrating agricultural need, the substantial agricultural building already on the site, and the scale and impact of the proposed development on Wood Cottage and the surrounding rural area. 1. The claimed 16.2-hectare agricultural holding needs to be verified

The applicants state that Winstons Farm comprises an agricultural holding of approximately 16.2 hectares/40 acres.

It is not clear from the submitted information which land actually comprises this claimed 40-acre agricultural unit. From available mapping, the land associated with the property appears considerably smaller.

This is particularly important because the application relies upon Part 6 Class A agricultural permitted development rights, where the size and nature of the agricultural unit are relevant.

I therefore ask the Council to independently verify the claimed 16.2 hectares and require a plan clearly identifying every parcel of land relied upon as forming the agricultural unit, its acreage and its agricultural use.

The claimed 40-acre figure should not simply be accepted without evidence.

2. A substantial agricultural building already exists

The applicants' supporting statement says that the holding has "no suitable buildings".

However, a substantial agricultural building already exists at Winstons Farm. This was approved under DC/20/1382 specifically for the storage of agricultural equipment, tractor and digger.

I have attached recent photographs showing this building as it currently stands. It is a substantial purpose-built structure with a large roller-shutter entrance and concrete access/apron.

As a neighbouring resident familiar with the site, I have never observed this building being used for the storage of hay or forage, nor have I observed regular agricultural machinery movements or activity suggesting that its storage capacity has been outgrown.

I appreciate that my observations cannot establish how the building is used internally.

However, they raise an obvious question:

Why does a holding with an existing purpose-built agricultural machinery building now reasonably require a further 864 sqm building for machinery and equipment?

The application provides no machinery inventory, no assessment of the capacity of the existing building and no clear explanation of why it is unsuitable.

I am also concerned that this existing agricultural building does not appear to be clearly identified on the plan submitted with the current application.

Before determining the application, the Council should establish the existing building's dimensions and current use and ensure that it has an accurate plan showing all existing and proposed buildings on the agricultural unit.

3. No convincing evidence for 1,728 sqm of additional buildings

The proposal is for two buildings, each 48m x 18m and almost 7m high - approximately 1,728 sqm combined.

This is an exceptionally substantial amount of new development.

The applicants describe the buildings as "essential" to an "established agricultural enterprise", with one 864 sqm building for machinery and another 864 sqm for hay/straw.

However, the supporting documents provide:

no machinery inventory;

no livestock numbers;

no current hay/forage production figures;

no projected tonnage or number of bales;

no indication of how much of the holding will actually be cut for hay;

no calculation of the storage capacity required; and

no convincing explanation for why 1,728 sqm of additional buildings is reasonably necessary.

The additional forage document provides generic information about forage production and costs, but does not demonstrate the actual requirements of Winstons Farm.

From my own observations, these fields are predominantly used by a local farmer for grazing sheep. I have not observed hay being produced or stored on a scale that would appear to justify an 864 sqm hay and straw building.

If the applicants intend a significant expansion or change in agricultural activity, I believe this should be supported by proper, site-specific evidence demonstrating the agricultural requirement for buildings of this scale.

4. Impact on Wood Cottage, protected tree and neighbouring amenity

The proposed buildings would be very substantial structures in close proximity to Wood Cottage, immediately adjoining the site.

Each building would measure 48 metres long, 18 metres wide and almost 7 metres high. Given their scale and proximity, I am concerned about their impact on Wood Cottage,

including loss of outlook, daylight/overshadowing and an overbearing sense of enclosure. The submitted information should clearly demonstrate the distance between the proposed buildings and Wood Cottage so that the impact upon neighbouring residential amenity can be properly assessed.

There is also a protected tree/TPO on or close to the boundary of the proposed development.

I ask that the Council's Tree Officer establishes the exact relationship between the proposed buildings, foundations and construction activity and the protected tree, including its Root Protection Area, and requires appropriate arboricultural evidence where necessary.

The cumulative impact should also be considered. There is already a substantial agricultural building on the site, and this proposal would introduce a further 1,728 sqm of built development, with structures almost 7 metres high.

Given the scale of the development, its proximity to Wood Cottage and the protected tree, I strongly request that the Case Officer and Tree Officer visit the site before the application is determined.

5. Recent residential planning history

Finally, I believe the recent planning history of Winstons Farm makes it particularly important that the agricultural justification for these buildings is properly scrutinised.

DC/25/0003 sought residential development on the site and was refused, with the subsequent appeal dismissed.

DC/25/2104 again sought permission for a dwelling and was also refused.

I fully appreciate that this application cannot be determined on speculation about what might happen to these buildings in the future.

However, given this recent history, I believe it is particularly important that the Council independently establishes that two further substantial buildings are genuinely and proportionately required for an existing agricultural enterprise before allowing them through agricultural permitted development rights.

Conclusion

I am not opposed to genuine agricultural development. Working farms clearly require appropriate buildings.

My concern is that the information submitted does not adequately demonstrate why two enormous new buildings totalling approximately 1,728 sqm are reasonably necessary at Winstons Farm.

Before any approval is granted, I respectfully ask the Council to establish:

whether the claimed 16.2-hectare/40-acre agricultural unit is accurate and qualifies under the relevant Part 6 provisions;

exactly which parcels of land comprise that agricultural unit and how they are used;

the nature and scale of the existing agricultural enterprise;

why the existing purpose-built agricultural storage building is considered unsuitable;

what machinery requires a further 864 sqm machinery store;

what quantity of hay/straw requires a separate 864 sqm store;

why the existing agricultural building does not appear to be clearly shown on the submitted plan;

the relationship between the proposed development and the protected tree/TPO and its Root Protection Area; and

the impact of buildings of this scale on Wood Cottage, neighbouring residential amenity and the surrounding rural landscape.

Unless these matters can be satisfactorily demonstrated, I respectfully request that the Council does not grant prior approval.

I also strongly request that the Case Officer visits the site before reaching a decision, so that the existing agricultural use, existing building, relationship with Wood Cottage, protected tree and overall scale of the proposed development can be properly understood.

Where did you
hear about this
application?

Word of Mouth

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**



Horsham District Council, Alberty House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB

Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton