

[REDACTED]

Sent: 01 February 2026 19:58
To: Planning; [REDACTED]
Subject: DC/25/0450 OBJECTION AND FORMAL COMPLAINT ABOUT THE SITE'S CONTINUED USE AS "SECURE" DOG EXERCISE FIELDS - REQUIRES IMMEDIATE ACTION
Attachments: DC 25 0450 Objection and Complaint.pdf
Categories: Comments Received

For the attention of Halima Chowdhury. Please also forward to HDC Licensing, and HDC Environmental Health for immediate action

Please see the attached letter which serves to make a further objection to DC/25/0450 and make a formal complaint about the site continuing to operate without regard to public safety.

HDC Storrington Ward Councillors,
We would be very grateful if you could monitor HDC officials' progress with this, given the Public Safety concerns we have raised, which need to be addressed by HDC as a matter of urgency.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

To: HDC Planning – FAO Halima Chowdhury – please also forward to HDC Licensing and
HDC Environmental Health for immediate action.
HDC Ward Councillors

1 Feb 2026

**DC/25/0450 OBJECTION AND FORMAL COMPLAINT ABOUT THE SITE'S CONTINUED USE
AS "SECURE" DOG EXERCISE FIELDS**

This letter reiterates **public safety objections about this site**, other important considerations and responds to the 'noise management plan' produced by the applicant.

HDC Licensing and Planning are requested to address the current and future public safety risk. Protection of the public must be HDC's primary responsibility. WSCC Highways should also be consulted about the acceptability of using a verge adjacent to a public right of way as a designated parking space for offloading dogs prior to going into the 'secure' area.

HDC Environmental Health is requested to ensure that a full noise management plan is presented. The plan needs to cover both fields and provide details of how the noise will be managed and monitored.

HDC Ward Councillors are requested to ensure that HDC's statutory Public Safety, Planning and Environmental Health responsibilities are carried out without further delay.

**CONTINUED AND FUTURE OPERATION OF THIS SITE PRESENTS AN UNACCEPTABLE AND
UNINSURED PUBLIC SAFETY RISK**

The eastern field has 80cm stock fencing – with no barbed wire immediately adjacent to the main entrance off Northlands Lane/ Water Lane (see Annex Photo 1). This is next to a public footpath SAS-2448. Large sections of the boundary to the western field - adjacent to footpaths SAS-2442 and SAS-2448 - have no standing fencing at all. (Photos 2 and 3).

The standard farm gates at each entrance are not adequate to prevent small dogs jumping through them or large dogs jumping over them. Over the last few months a padlock and chain has been left draped over the gate / gate post to the main entrance, allowing uncontrolled entry. The gate into the western field is currently secured with a padlock, but the gate can easily be walked around. There is no signage at any of the entrance gates (Photos 1, 4 and 5). Photo 6 shows the entrance to the nearby Little Thakeham Bark Park for comparison purposes. Also note that any Public Liability Insurance for operating on the DC/25/0450 site is likely to be void, since the site is demonstrably insecure.

In summary, the site is currently being run without consideration of the public safety risk. In addition, since first presenting the application 10 months ago, the applicant has not presented any plans to make the site secure and properly managed in line with accepted industry standards (see, for example, [britishdogfields.com](https://www.britishdogfields.com)).

Urgently, HDC Licensing is requested to assess the risk to public safety of continuing to operate this site, and whether its Public Liability Insurance is likely to be void. If the site fails to meet either test, [REDACTED] licence should be explicitly limited to premises that are properly secured. Please also highlight to the planning applicant [REDACTED], the personal financial risks of continuing to operate the site without valid insurance.

HDC Planning is requested to refuse the Planning Application without further delay, given that the applicant has not presented plans for a facility that meets public safety requirements since the application was first made 10 months ago.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The additional designated parking area presented in the 'waste management plan' would increase the public safety risk and is unsuitable for year-round use. The plan suggests car parking along the verge adjacent to Northlands Lane/ Water Lane and the drive into East Wantley House – which forms part of footpath SAS-2448. This presents the prospect of insecure reactive / dangerous dogs being let out of cars adjacent to 2 public highways and footpath, on the opposite side of the drive to the entry gate into the eastern field. Currently, they are than being let out once of cars once they are in the field. **This proposal will make the risks to the public and neighbouring residents substantially worse than they already are.** In addition, the grass verge is totally unsuited to daily, all-year use. WSCC Highways would need to be consulted and plans for the parking area / hard-standing need to be included in the planning application.

No dog management policy is in place or has been presented by the applicant. The eastern field is used on a daily basis. It is insecure, and could potentially be used by any dog, including those falling under the restrictions of sections 1 and 2 of the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991. **This exacerbates the public safety risk.** A dog management policy needs to be presented as part of the application, which demonstrate how dogs will be managed and compliance monitored.

The site continues to be operated without any waste management. Figure 5 shows bagged dog poo lying on the ground inside the fence the entrance to the western field. It has been there for months. Previous complaints have shown this as an ongoing issue next to the main entrance. No waste bins are visible within either field. The statement about provision of a waste bin in the 'Noise Management Plan' provides no information about how dog waste will be managed or monitored, or the collection frequency. It is therefore unacceptable. Further, the applicant/ Doodley Dogs continue to demonstrate that they are not monitoring or clearing the dog waste currently generated within the site.

The site has, is, and can be, used outside the hours stated in the 'noise management plan'. Previous noise complaints to HDC have highlighted its use prior to 8am. The gate to the eastern field is used on a daily basis. It is routinely left insecure, so it can, and is, used at any time. The 'plan' provides no information about how the opening times, and limits to the numbers of dogs and dog owners, will be managed and enforced. It is therefore inadequate and unacceptable. Further, the applicant [REDACTED] continue to demonstrate that they no not manage or monitor the site's current use properly.

The 'noise management plan' only covers one field and does not provide any detail on how it will be operated or monitored. Noise complaints have been made about dogs barking and owners shouting in both fields. Indeed it is when dogs are getting into and out of cars in the eastern field when the dogs appear to bark the loudest and most repetitively. Environmental Health have already been provided with recordings demonstrating the problem. The figure in the applicant's 'noise management plan' shows a small fuzzy area near to the northern boundary of the western field as the noise management zone. This is next to the entry gate. The applicant does not provide any information as to why the fuzzy area is deemed to be adequate. The 'plan' does not provide any detail as to what measures will be taken to reduce the noise in this area, even if it were of adequate size. The 'plan' does not state how the area will be monitored. The 'plan' does not address noise complaints about dogs / owners in the eastern field at all. In summary, the plan is totally inadequate and unfit for purpose.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED] [and on behalf of near neighbours]

East Wantley Barn, Northlands Lane, Storrington. RH20 3EZ

ANNEX

Photo 1 – Eastern main entrance gate (taken 01/02/2026)



Padlock and chain routinely left insecure

80cm stock fencing adjacent to gate - inadequate

No mesh on the gate

Access is next to a public footpath, which is also routinely used nearby residents and HDC waste/recycling personnel

The proposed parking area would be on the opposite side of the access drive / footpath to this gate

Photos 2 and 3 – Western field boundary fencing: lying on its side for long stretches next to 2 public footpaths - barbed wire on the ground presents a risk to footpath users



Photos 4 and 5 Other entrance gates – note dog poo bags and litter within the entrance to the western field



Photo 6 – The entrance to the Little Thakeham Bark Park



Full size, well-maintained, gate and fencing: meets industry standards.

Proper signage

No dog waste or litter