From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 April 2026 10:05:32 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/0925
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 08/04/2026 10:05 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Tisserand Farm Stane Street Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 9AE
Proposal:	Change of use to rear parcel of land and existing house. Erection of rear extension to existing commercial building and rear store extensions. (Retrospective).
Case Officer:	Steve Astles

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	Pelennor Fields Stane Street

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	To whom it may concern, in light of the recent highways and ecology rooted submitted regarding this retrospective planning application, I write to formally object, in the strongest possible terms. My objection rests on three principal grounds: significant

planning harm, material inaccuracies within the application, and the applicant's failure to provide sufficient information to allow the Local Planning Authority to properly assess the development's impacts.

2. Misleading Description of Development

The application describes a "partial change of use to office space," yet the supporting documentation reveals a very different picture: storage yards, heavy plant machinery, commercial vehicle activity, and material handling operations. The office use is clearly ancillary. The primary use is industrial in nature - properly classified as B2/B8 - and the application's description is therefore misleading and likely understates the true impacts of the proposal. This is further obvious upon the new highways supporting statement where large 'Storage Buildings' are now proposed, with no elevation or size guide, which will border directly onto our property, and presumably to be used in conjunction with the HGV usage on the site.

3. Unacceptable Intensification of Use

Even where some prior activity may have been lawful, the scale now proposed goes well beyond what this constrained site can reasonably accommodate. The intensification includes increased HGV and large vehicle movements, greater staff numbers, expanded commercial storage, and a significant growth in built form and operational area. Lawful uses can become unacceptable when intensified to this degree, particularly on a site immediately adjacent to a residential property.

4. Severe Harm to Residential Amenity

The development will cause material harm to residential amenity - not merely inconvenience. Specific impacts include overlooking and loss of privacy from offices and operational zones; continuous disturbance from staff activity, deliveries, and engine idling; noise from plant machinery, HGVs, and loading operations; and the loss of quiet enjoyment of the home and garden. The business is understood to operate on a 24-hour basis, yet the application proposes no restriction whatsoever on operating hours. This level of activity is wholly incompatible with residential living.

5. Absence of Noise Impact Assessment

No acoustic assessment has been submitted - a serious and unjustifiable omission given the nature of the operations. There are no decibel predictions, no assessment of cumulative noise impacts, and no proposed mitigation measures. In the context of HGV movements, heavy plant machinery, and potential 24-hour operation, the applicant has entirely failed to demonstrate that noise impacts would be acceptable. This omission alone is sufficient grounds for refusal.

6. No Operating Hours or Operational Controls

The application fails to define opening hours, delivery hours, HGV movement restrictions, or external working practices. Without such controls, the site could operate unrestricted industrial activity at all hours to the severe detriment of neighbouring residents. This is a fundamental deficiency.

7. Light Pollution
The application makes no reference to lighting. Security lighting, floodlighting, and night-time vehicle movements are all foreseeable consequences of the proposed use, each of which would cause significant light pollution, further harming both residential amenity and the rural environment. There are already floodlights installed on the extended building which shine into our property at all hours of the night.

8. Harm to Rural Character
The site lies in a rural setting on the outskirts of Billingshurst, where countryside protection policies apply. The proposal represents industrial creep into the countryside, evidenced by the loss of open land to hardstanding and storage, the visual intrusion of machinery and materials, and the expansion of built structures. The harm to the character and appearance of the rural area is substantial. Historically the farm house has been that, a farm house, however now the entire site seems to be turning into one giant industrial site.

9. Visual Impact and Absence of Screening
There is no landscaping plan, no screening provision - whether trees, bunds, or fencing - and direct visibility of machinery, commercial activity, and lighting from the surrounding area. Planners rightly expect mitigation of this nature. Its complete absence compounds the visual and amenity harm.

11. Inadequate Boundary Treatment
No adequate or secure boundary fencing has been installed. Given the presence of heavy machinery and industrial activity, this raises legitimate concerns regarding public safety, site security, and unrestricted access. It is wholly inappropriate.

12. Removal of Trees Without Consent
Many trees have been felled on our border, exposing our once green and quiet driveway to the site's industrial usage, the damage to other trees too is considerable, where land excavation has already taken place, many trees are now dangerously leaning onto our property, and several have already fallen in storms that were completely solid and fine for 30+ years.

13. Drainage and Pollution Risk
The increase in hardstanding will generate greater surface water runoff, creating risks of both flooding and pollution from oils, fuels, and other contaminants. No drainage strategy or SuDS measures

have been provided. This is a serious and unacceptable omission.

14. No Construction Management Plan
No Construction Management Plan has been submitted. There has been no assessment of construction traffic, dust, vibration, or ongoing disturbance to neighbouring residents. This remains unacceptable even in the context of a retrospective application.

15. Retrospective Nature of the Application
The retrospective character of this application indicates that development has been carried out without prior consent. This undermines the integrity of the planning system and should weigh heavily against approval.

16. Precedent
Granting permission would set a damaging precedent for incremental industrialisation of rural and residential sites, and for "develop first, seek permission later" behaviour that erodes public confidence in planning controls.

Conclusion
The applicant has failed to demonstrate that this proposal is acceptable in planning terms. The development causes material harm to residential amenity, represents an unacceptable intensification of use, industrialises a rural setting, and is undermined by fundamental omissions in the supporting information - including the absence of any noise assessment, operating hours, drainage strategy, or construction management plan.
For all of these reasons, I strongly urge the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk

Horsham District Council