

Appeal 6013156

Interested party comments

Appeal type	Planning
Appeal procedure	Written
Appeal site	Land South Of The Bowling Green, The Daisycroft, Henfield, BN5 9RN
Agent contact details	ET Planning [REDACTED]
Local planning authority	Horsham District Council
Application number	DC/26/0006

Interested party 1

Comments

All the objections in our original submission still apply.

Our objection as residents of Henfield is that the proposal does not comply with Section 2.4 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan which was supported by the majority of residents.

As residents of the access road Daisycroft, our major objection is that we have seen no evidence that that it is safe and suitable for a large increase in the type and number of vehicle movements.

Daisycroft is a private road which has not been adopted by the Council - the residents are therefore responsible for the maintenance of the road and maintaining Public Liability insurance to cover us against claims from the public using the road. It is brick based and not suitable for a high volume of traffic.

The access road is currently used by 5 residents and members of the bowls club and allotment holders, whose main use is between April and September. Usage is therefore very light.

The original plan for 9 single storey bungalows suitable for older residents would have been a manageable increase in traffic movements. But with 9 2/3/4 bedroom houses suitable for families using their cars (perhaps 2 per house) for getting to work, school runs and evening social activities, Daisycroft is not appropriate as an access road.

We have not been satisfied that the estate access is safe for our residents who are mainly elderly with some using buggies or wheelchairs.

We are concerned that we will have to bear the cost of maintaining the access road with no control over how it is used.

Our insurers would review the risk under our Public Liability insurance cover and we would have to pay any additional premium.

For these reasons we strongly feel that the appeal should be rejected.

Interested party 2

Comments

The attached representation is provided on behalf of the Campaign to Protect Rural Henfield.

Supporting documents

[CPRH Representation to Appeal 6013156.pdf \(/published-document/90ad5519-5bbb-4db8-9540-522b20ca773e\)](#)

Interested party 3

Comments

6013156 - Land South Of the Bowling Green the Daisycroft Henfield West Sussex BN5 9RN

Erection of 9no. detached dwellings with associated parking, landscaping, hardstanding, access and associated works.

Henfield Parish Council deems that this development does not accord with the policies as detailed in Henfield Neighbourhood Plan (NHP) :

Policy 2.4

a The design for the proposal demonstrates an understanding of the elements which contribute to the character of the landscape and these inform the design and layout of the site. Any proposal should be of an appropriate scale and massing in keeping with the character of the surroundings.

b. The proposal preserves or enhances the historic significance of the setting of the Henfield Conservation Area, in particular the proposal must preserve the nearby listed building and its setting. This will include a green buffer zone in the south west part of the site.

c. The proposal comprises single storey dwellings suitable for older and downsizing households to meet local need.

d. The proposal takes account of the amenities of adjoining residential properties.

e. The proposal takes account of visibility and key views, in particular provides mitigation against its visibility from the south

f. The proposal maintains and enhances the site's rural character, retaining existing field boundaries where appropriate and enhancing with native species.

g. A full ecological and biodiversity assessment should be submitted as part of the application. Any reasonable mitigation proposed by the assessments must be implemented in full.

h. Vehicular access into the site is provided from Furners Mead and in a way which does not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the occupiers of adjacent residential properties.

Henfield Parish Council deems that this application is contrary to the following policies in HD planning Framework:-

- 1 as it does not accord with the policies of the NHP
- 10 as it does not demonstrate that car parking requirements can be accommodated within the immediate surroundings of the buildings
- 16 as it does not provide 35% of dwellings to be affordable, which is required of sites providing 15 or more dwellings, or on sites over 0.5 hectares

- 23 as the site cannot be served by safe and convenient vehicular access
- 32 as it does not complement locally distinctive characters and heritage of the district and does not contribute a sense of place both in the buildings and spaces themselves and in the way they integrate with their surroundings
- 33.3 as the scale and massing and appearance of the proposal is out of keeping and unsympathetic with the built surroundings. The proposal consists in reality of 3 x 3 bed properties and 6 x substantial 4 bed properties. Of the 9 properties only 2 are single storey
- 35.5 as it does not include measures which reduce the amount of biodegradable waste sent to landfill. This proposal by design is inaccessible for refuse lorries. Therefore, residents will be moving up to 4 recycling bins over up to 100 metres on a weekly basis. The consequence will be less willingness to recycle

Based on typical municipal guidelines and health and safety standards, residents should not have to push or pull their recycling bin for more than 15 to 25 metres (approximately 50 to 80 feet) to their storage point to the edge of the public highway or designated collection point. The ideal location is that bins should be placed at the edge of the property, right where it meets the public pavement or road.

For these reasons Henfield Parish Council supports Horsham District Council in refusing this application.

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------

Interested party 4

Comments	I am a Trustee of the Henfield Bowling Club and Club Captain, my objections are representative of the club membership of 65 personnel and some 30 allotment holders who are tenants on the Bowling Green land adjacent to the proposed development. Our previous objections raised in our correspondence with Horsham District Council and West Sussex County Council dated 25 February 2026, have not been addressed in the submitted appeal. The appeal appears to be based on circumstantial evidence that support the development as submitted. We have significant safety concerns regarding the proposed development's new access road connecting into the existing narrow spur road from The Daisycroft. Today this spur road is used to access the Bowling Club, the Allotments and is part of a Public Footpath. The existing Bowling Club access road was not intended or designed to be an access route to a larger residential area. Since most of the new proposed development is family accommodation, this will generate a constant flow of family vehicles and large home delivery vehicles servicing the new residents. The spur road and proposed access to the new development is part of The Daisycroft and the road is unadopted, therefore responsibility for any increased maintenance is not currently with the public roads
----------	---

authority reviewing this application. Prior to approval, the application should include a proposal to have the existing road adopted by the local authority.

The Transportation Report submitted with the application, acknowledges that this road has limitations and cannot be used for larger vehicles. The access road is less than 2.9 metres wide and potentially even narrower when the existing parking bay is in use.

The existing road access is not suitable for heavy vehicles and has severe limitations for the requirements of large vehicles turning into and exiting the new development.

The plans show the new development road connection is more than 4.8 metres wide and will join the 2.9 metre wide spur road. The plans do not specify the 'right of way' considerations and how a two-way flow within the development funnels into a single track on the existing road.

With a new road joining the existing access road and increased traffic flow, the planning application does not address the appropriate measures required to provide continued safe access for: -

- Members of the bowling club,
- Allotment holders,
- Pedestrians using the pavement,
- Users of the public footpath,
- Neighbouring properties' driveway entrances.

The Highways assessment in the appeal is non existent and there has been no physical access to the proposed development to evaluate and undertake a comprehensive assessment of the potential safety concerns that will arise if the development is allowed to continue in its existing form. The assessment performed by the developers is inadequate and fails to comprehend the access requirements the Bowling Club and Allotment holders require.

On the basis the developers are submitting plans that endanger our membership and potential ability to continue as a leisure facility to the community the appeal submitted cannot be successful.

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 5

Comments

Added as a document

Supporting documents

[dc260006.pdf \(/published-document/e3a7db35-02e6-4bbc-89e7-3316758b1e4b\)](#)

DOCUMENTS FOR THIRD PARTY REP 2

CPRH Representation to Appeal against refusal of Planning Permission

Land South of the Bowling Green, The Daisycroft, Henfield, West Sussex BN5 9RN

Planning Inspectorate Appeal Reference: 6013156

HDC Application Reference: DC/26/0006

Horsham District Council refused planning permission for this application on two grounds, which we summarise briefly as:

1. The mix, size, and type of dwellings would **fail to reflect local housing need**, contrary to planning policies.
2. The proposal would place the long-term health, retention and public amenity value of **mature trees at unacceptable risk**.

The Campaign to Protect Rural Henfield (CPRH) represents local residents seeking to protect and enhance Henfield and its rural environment. We support housing development which meets local needs and accords with local and district planning strategies.

CPRH does not oppose the principle of housing development on this site. We campaigned for adoption of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan (HNP) which allocated the site for approximately 10 dwellings and brought it within the Built-Up Area Boundary for the specific purpose of providing single-storey homes suitable for older people and households wishing to downsize. The issue in this appeal is not whether houses should be built here, but what form of housing should be provided on a site allocated to meet a particular local need and subject to particular physical constraints.

The appeal scheme does not fulfil that purpose. Of the nine proposed dwellings, only three are two-bedroom single-storey bungalows. Six have four bedrooms, including three conventional two-storey houses.

CPRH therefore supports Horsham District Council's decision to refuse permission and asks the Inspector to dismiss the appeal.

1. The planning position has changed since the appeal was submitted

The appellant's Statement of Case was prepared before publication of the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 17 August 2026. The appeal must therefore be considered against a national decision-making framework which differs materially from that relied upon in the appellant's case.

First, the appellant relies heavily on the former paragraph 11(d) presumption and paragraph 14 protection for neighbourhood plans. These have been replaced by the new decision-making policies.

Second, the HNP was made in June 2021 and has now passed its fifth anniversary. CPRH accepts that it therefore no longer benefits from the additional protection provided by NPPF Policy S6 for qualifying neighbourhood plans less than five years old.

That does not mean that the HNP ceased to be part of the development plan on its fifth anniversary, or that its policies automatically became out of date.

Annex A of the new NPPF expressly states that existing development-plan policies, including made neighbourhood plans, should not be given reduced weight merely because they were adopted before the new Framework. Only where an existing policy is materially inconsistent with the new national decision-making policies should it be given very limited weight.

As we show below, the purpose of Policy 2.4 remains relevant, is supported by the evidence and is consistent with the new national policy framework.

2. This is already an allocated housing site within Henfield

The appeal site lies within Henfield's Built-Up Area Boundary. HDC's delegated report confirms this. The relevant national decision-making policy is therefore NPPF Policy S4, which applies to development within settlements.

This appeal is not about releasing an unallocated site to provide additional housing. It concerns an existing allocation for approximately 10 dwellings. Allowing the appeal would not provide additional housing over and above that already envisaged by the HNP allocation. It would instead substitute a different housing mix on a site already allocated for approximately the same number of homes. The district-wide housing shortfall therefore provides no numerical reason why this site should deliver predominantly larger homes rather than the approximately 10 single-storey homes envisaged by the allocation.

The HNP has already established the principle of residential development. Policy 2.4 allocates "approximately 10 single storey dwellings" and requires that:

"The proposal comprises single storey dwellings suitable for older and downsizing households to meet local need."

The policy also addresses the scale and massing of development, neighbouring amenity and views, rural character, field boundaries and other constraints of the site.

The allocation therefore establishes not only the principle and approximate amount of development, but what this particular site was intended to contribute to Henfield's housing needs. **It was allocated specifically to help meet an identified local need for housing suitable for older people and households wishing to downsize, in a sensitive location where the scale and form of development and the site's physical constraints remain important.**

There is an inconsistency in the appellant's case. The appellant relies on the HNP allocation to support the principle of residential development, while relying on the age of the same Plan when seeking to depart from the particular housing purpose for which the site was allocated. The allocation cannot reasonably be treated as current when it supports development but outdated when its requirements constrain the form that development should take.

This approach is consistent with Policy S4, which expressly recognises the relevance of land being allocated for particular uses in the development plan.

3. Policy 2.4 was designed to meet an identified housing need

The requirement in Policy 2.4 was not arbitrary. It arose from the evidence on Henfield's housing needs which informed preparation of the HNP.

The Henfield Housing Needs Assessment identified a housing stock strongly weighted towards larger homes, with relatively few smaller properties. It also identified a high proportion of older residents and widespread under-occupation of existing homes. The assessment concluded that there was a need for smaller dwellings and there was evidence of demand from older households wishing to downsize.

This remains relevant. Nearly three in ten Henfield residents were aged 65 or over at the 2021 Census. There is no evidence before this appeal that the identified need for suitable downsizing accommodation has disappeared.

Providing such homes has a wider benefit. A smaller home which enables an older household to move from a larger property does not simply meet that household's needs; it can also release an existing family-sized home back into the market. Building another four-bedroom house may increase housing supply, but it does not increase the supply of smaller homes into which households occupying larger properties can downsize.

The choice of this particular site was also relevant. In responding to the Examiner during preparation of the HNP, Henfield Parish Council explained both the need for single-storey accommodation for older people and the site's proximity to the High Street, which can be reached on foot. The site therefore offered an unusual opportunity to provide ordinary, independent housing for older and downsizing households close to shops, services and the centre of the village.

Policy 2.4 was the result: approximately 10 single-storey dwellings intended to meet that identified need, on a site where that form of development was also appropriate to the location.

This objective is consistent with the new NPPF. Policy HO7 gives substantial weight to homes which meet the evidenced accommodation needs of the community, while Policy HO1 expressly includes older people among the groups whose housing needs should be assessed. Policy 2.4 is therefore not an outdated restriction standing in the way of national housing policy.

It seeks to deliver the appropriate mix of housing for the local community which national policy itself supports.

4. The appeal scheme fails to meet the identified requirements

The appeal scheme comprises:

- three two-bedroom single-storey bungalows;
- three four-bedroom dwellings with accommodation in the roof; and
- three conventional four-bedroom two-storey houses.

Six of the nine homes would therefore have four bedrooms. Only three would be two-bedroom single-storey bungalows of the kind most clearly responding to the need identified in the HNP.

The appellant argues that older people may want four bedrooms and that six of the proposed homes are “bungalow-style”. We accept that downsizing does not necessarily mean moving to the smallest possible home. An older household may want a spare bedroom for visitors, space for hobbies or accommodation for a carer. But that does not explain why two-thirds of the homes on a site specifically allocated for older and downsizing households should have four bedrooms, or why three should be conventional two-storey houses.

A four-bedroom home may be capable of occupation by an older person, but that is not the same as providing the smaller, manageable housing which broadens the choices available to older households wishing to move from larger homes. The Housing Needs Assessment identified an existing housing stock already weighted towards larger properties. **Providing six more four-bedroom homes on one of the few sites specifically allocated to broaden that housing mix does little to address the identified imbalance.**

There is a further consequence. Policy 2.4 did not specify single-storey development solely because of housing need. The form and scale of development were also important because this is a sensitive site, adjoining the Conservation Area and containing two protected mature oak trees. The policy therefore links the type of housing required with appropriate scale and massing, protection of views and neighbouring amenity, retention of field boundaries and maintenance of the site's rural character.

The housing mix and the physical constraints of the site are therefore connected. Larger dwellings require more space and contribute to the cramped layout identified by HDC's officers. The Council's Landscape Architect remained concerned about the relationship between the development and the protected trees, the positioning of parking, the narrow corridor within the development and the quality and surveillance of the proposed open space. The case officer similarly described the scheme as “somewhat cramped” and considered that reducing dwelling footprints would improve spacing and the relationship with the open space and reduce impacts within the root protection areas.

This is significant. A scheme more closely reflecting the smaller, single-storey housing envisaged by Policy 2.4 would not only better meet the identified housing need; **it would also provide greater scope to design around the physical constraints which helped determine the appropriate form of development on this site in the first place.**

Nor need that mean sacrificing housing numbers. The HNP envisages approximately 10 homes on the site; the appeal proposes nine. The issue is not whether this allocated site should contribute to housing supply, but whether approximately the same number of homes should be provided in the form envisaged by the development plan.

5. Subsequent housing permissions have not removed the identified need

Since the HNP was made, substantial additional housing has been approved in Henfield.

Outline permission has been granted for up to 235 homes at Parsonage Farm, compared with the 205 homes originally allocated there by the HNP. More recently, the appeal at Land East of Charlwood Drive was allowed for up to 191 homes. Together these two permissions provide for up to 426 homes.

The Charlwood Drive decision is particularly relevant because the appellant relies upon it as evidence of the seriousness of Horsham's housing shortfall. CPRH does not dispute that shortfall. But the circumstances are quite different. Charlwood Drive involved permission for 191 homes on land which was not allocated for housing in the HNP. This appeal concerns nine homes on a site already allocated for approximately 10.

The Charlwood Drive permission therefore changes the local context in an important way. It makes a substantial additional contribution to general housing supply in Henfield, whereas allowing this appeal would not increase the number of homes envisaged on the appeal site. It would change their type.

The position at Backsettown has also changed since the HNP was made. The HNP allocated that site for approximately 30 dwellings, with single-storey homes particularly supported as suitable for older and downsizing households. Permission has subsequently been granted for 29 homes comprising one-and-a-half and two-storey development rather than the single-storey development originally envisaged.

This matters because Backsettown and the appeal site were two of the opportunities identified through the HNP to broaden Henfield's housing choice for older and downsizing households. The intended contribution from Backsettown has already been diluted. That does not make Policy 2.4 less relevant; it increases the importance of ensuring that the remaining allocation fulfils its intended purpose.

Permission has also been granted at Sandgate Nursery for specialist extra-care and supported-living accommodation. This adds a different form of older-person accommodation to Henfield, serving a different need from the ordinary, independent housing for older and downsizing households sought by Policy 2.4. It does not therefore alter the purpose or continuing relevance of the appeal-site allocation.

Substantial further housing growth is proposed through the emerging Local Plan, while other sites around Henfield continue to be promoted for development. These proposals cannot be treated as committed housing supply, but they reinforce the distinction between opportunities to provide **general housing** and the much more limited opportunities to provide smaller, single-storey homes in a location particularly suitable for older people and households wishing to downsize.

The circumstances since 2021 provide no evidence that the need identified by Policy 2.4 has disappeared. General housing provision in Henfield has increased substantially, while the particular contribution which this allocation was intended to make has not been secured elsewhere.

6. The proposed scheme places greater pressure on a sensitive site

The requirements of Policy 2.4 reflect not only the identified housing need but the characteristics and constraints of the site. The consequences of departing from the form of development envisaged by the HNP can be seen in the proposed layout.

HDC's Landscape Architect remained concerned after amendments to the scheme. Among the issues identified were parking spaces “shoe-horned” into the layout, a narrow corridor between

the existing gardens to the south and the new development, the relationship with the protected trees, and shortcomings in the location, design and surveillance of the proposed open space. The Landscape Architect remained “not supportive on landscape grounds”.

The case officer did not consider these landscape concerns sufficient to justify a separate reason for refusal and CPRH does not seek to introduce one. However, the officer also described the development as “somewhat cramped” and considered that reducing the footprint of the dwellings would improve spacing, the relationship with the open space and impacts within the root protection areas of the protected trees.

The practical consequences of this cramped layout are illustrated by HDC Waste Services. It considered the wheeled-bin distance too far for plots 4–9 and advised that, if residents required the Council's assisted collection service for elderly, disabled or infirm people unable to wheel their own bins, “we would have to reject the applications”. The officer concluded: “I can only see the current plan causing multiple complaints upon completion from residents.”

This is particularly relevant on a site specifically allocated for housing suitable for older people. It also illustrates the importance of NPPF Policy DP3, which requires well-designed places to support communities which will function well over the lifetime of the development and includes accessibility for all ages and abilities among its design principles. A layout intended to meet the needs of older households should work practically for those residents, including those whose mobility may become reduced.

These concerns demonstrate the practical consequences of trying to accommodate the proposed form of development on this particular site. Policy 2.4 envisaged approximately 10 single-storey homes of appropriate scale and massing in a sensitive location. The appeal proposes fewer homes, but six have four bedrooms and three are conventional two-storey houses. Despite the lower number, the resulting layout is still described by the Council's own officer as “somewhat cramped”.

The conflict over housing type and the problems with the layout are therefore not separate issues. A development comprising smaller single-storey homes would better respond to the identified housing need while providing greater scope to accommodate parking, open space, landscaping and the site's physical constraints satisfactorily.

This relationship is particularly important in respect of the two protected oak trees, which form a specific reason for refusal.

7. The appeal scheme has not resolved the conflict with the protected oak trees

The two mature oak trees on the eastern boundary are Category A trees protected by TPO/1468. HDC's Arboricultural Officer considers them to be high-quality specimens of significant public amenity value. Historic mapping from 1874–75 shows a line of five oaks on this boundary, and the officer considers the two surviving trees likely to be the last remnants of that historic line, giving them additional historical and landscape importance.

The Council's concern is not simply whether the houses themselves can be constructed outside the Root Protection Areas. HDC expressly recognised that the dwellings on plots 6, 7 and 8 would be outside the RPAs. The problem is the relationship which would be created

between these large, spreading trees and relatively restricted private gardens. The RPAs would lie within those gardens, while the trees would substantially shade them. HDC considered that this would create foreseeable pressure from future occupiers for pruning and other works, as well as risks from changes in ground levels, soil compaction and root damage.

These are not trees which have previously been heavily managed to coexist with development. The Arboricultural Officer records that neither has undergone substantial surgery and that they retain their natural broad-spreading form, with substantial lower limbs extending up to 8 metres westwards into the proposed rear gardens of plots 6–8. The officer considered that future pressure for significant pruning was therefore foreseeable, arising from shading and also from normal consequences of living beneath mature oaks such as leaf and acorn fall. Major or repeated pruning could damage both their visual amenity and their long-term condition.

The appellant has sought to address the tree issue through an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan and by revisions to the layout. Those measures are relevant to protecting the trees during construction. They do not, however, resolve HDC's principal concern about the long-term relationship between the trees, the gardens and their future occupiers. The Arboricultural Officer maintained the holding objection after reconsidering the amended scheme.

This distinction is reflected in HDC's reason for refusal. The Council concluded that it had not been demonstrated that the development could be constructed **and occupied** without direct or indirect harm to the protected trees, including root damage, changes in soil levels and future pressure for pruning or removal arising from their close relationship with the proposed dwellings. It concluded that their long-term health, retention and public amenity value would therefore be placed at unacceptable risk.

Most importantly, the Arboricultural Officer identified a way of addressing this problem without necessarily reducing the number of homes:

“Alternatively, retaining nine units could be achieved by reducing dwelling size and removing larger four-bedroom units to maintain a landscape buffer, protecting the trees while aligning with local housing needs.”

This goes to the heart of this appeal. There is no necessary conflict between protecting the trees and providing housing on the allocated site. HDC's own specialist advice indicates that nine homes could be retained by reducing dwelling sizes and removing the larger four-bedroom units. That would both provide greater protection for the trees and bring the development more closely into line with the local housing need which Policy 2.4 was specifically intended to address.

The appeal therefore does not present a choice between protecting trees and providing much-needed housing. The site is already allocated for approximately 10 homes. The problem arises from the **form of development proposed**, and there is a clear alternative: approximately the same number of smaller homes, better reflecting the HNP allocation and providing the space necessary for a defensible landscape buffer around these important trees.

8. Planning Balance

CPRH recognises that Horsham District has a serious shortage of deliverable housing land and that the provision of new homes must therefore carry substantial weight in planning decisions. But the weight given to this appeal must reflect what the proposal would actually add to housing supply.

This proposal does not create nine additional homes which were not already planned for.

The appeal site is already allocated for approximately 10 homes in the development plan. The principle of housing on the site is not in dispute. If the appeal is dismissed, the allocation remains and the site remains available for residential development.

Indeed, the appeal scheme proposes only nine homes, compared with the approximately 10 envisaged by the HNP. Allowing the appeal could therefore result in one fewer home being provided on the site, while replacing the smaller, single-storey housing envisaged by the allocation with a scheme in which six of the nine homes have four bedrooms.

This is important because the appellant's planning balance gives “substantial weight” both to the delivery of nine dwellings on an allocated site and to their contribution towards the district's housing-land-supply shortfall. That substantially overstates the benefit of this particular proposal. The allocation already provides for approximately the same number of homes. The real choice is not between nine homes and no homes, but between the appeal scheme and development of the allocated site in a form which better meets the identified local need and its physical constraints.

Nor is there any evidence that protecting the trees requires a reduction in housing numbers. As the HDC's Arboricultural Officer noted (see Section 8 above), reducing dwelling size and removing larger four-bedroom units is a practical way of delivering the nine homes claimed by the appellant as a substantial housing benefit, while also addressing both the tree constraint and the local housing need. That advice is particularly important to the planning balance.

The appellant also relies on the economic and social benefits associated with additional housing. Such benefits are real, but again they largely arise from developing the allocated site rather than from the particular scheme before the Inspector. A development of approximately 10 homes in accordance with the allocation would also generate construction expenditure, additional residents and spending within Henfield.

Against those benefits must be weighed the actual consequences of the appeal scheme. It conflicts with the particular housing purpose of Policy 2.4; provides predominantly four-bedroom homes despite the identified need to broaden Henfield's housing choice; produces a layout which HDC's officers have described as “somewhat cramped”, with parking “shoe-horned” into it; creates practical difficulties identified by Waste Services which are particularly relevant to older residents; and has not demonstrated that the long-term health and amenity of the two protected oak trees can be safeguarded.

The appellant places considerable reliance on the Charlwood Drive appeal and Horsham's housing-land-supply position. But the comparison is misleading. Charlwood Drive provided up to 191 homes on land which had not been allocated for housing in the HNP. The Inspector

therefore had to weigh the benefit of a substantial addition to housing supply against conflict with the development plan. This appeal is fundamentally different. The Bowling Club site is already allocated for approximately 10 homes. Dismissing this appeal does not remove those homes from the development plan.

The appellant's Statement of Case was also written under a national policy framework which has since been replaced. Its planning balance relies repeatedly on former NPPF paragraph 11(d), including the test of whether adverse impacts would “significantly and demonstrably outweigh” the benefits, and on the expiry of the additional neighbourhood-plan protection formerly provided by paragraph 14. As explained in Section 1, those are no longer the national decision-making policies against which this appeal must be determined.

The housing shortage deserves substantial weight. It does not, however, justify treating every form of housing as equally beneficial on every allocated site. Henfield needs a range of housing, and this particular site was allocated to make a particular contribution to that range. There is no numerical housing-supply reason why it cannot still do so.

The planning balance therefore favours dismissal of the appeal and development of the site broadly as envisaged by the HNP: approximately 10 single-storey homes suitable for older and downsizing households, with a size and mix which responds to the identified local housing need, appropriate to this sensitive location and designed around the site's constraints with adequate space to protect its important mature trees.

For these reasons, CPRH supports Horsham District Council's refusal of DC/26/0006 and respectfully asks the Inspector to **dismiss the appeal**.

DC-26-0006: Proposed development of 9 houses on a plot adjacent to the Henfield Bowls Club

Objection

We understand that the govt inspector will opine on the developer's appeal against HDC's decision to reject; there is no public meeting for questions to be raised, one hopes the Inspector will however visit the site to assess at first hand all circumstances relating to the development.

Initially West Sussex Highways (WSH) requested a statement from the developers for a transport statement. This was received on 31 March 26. – quote "a realistic, and robust worst case". It is questionable that the consulting engineers have actually visited to site – a number of assertions are made which are incorrect, the sight lines don't follow guidance as defined in the 2006 "Manual for Streets", further fail to mention that a number of existing houses entrances intersect with the proposes routing. A major omission is a lack of a pedestrian pathway/pavement at the access into the development, compounding safety issues at this junction.

Horsham DC rejected the existing plans before WSH opined on the consulting engineer's response. Whatever is finally decided whether it is 10 retirement homes, or the plans as proposed, access to the site needs proper assessment. However, as I understand that it is existing proposed plans that will be decided by the Government Inspector, access should be part of the decision.

In the absence of Highways response, and the consulting engineer's updated responses re questions raised re the access to the site, there are some serious concerns in regard to risk & safety issues. Perhaps WSH should be asked to respond to the Transport statement dated 31/3/26; in addition, the documented response by a resident, dated 21/4/26.

In the event the inspector is unable to visit the site, we have submitted additional documented evidence to substantiate our concerns

1. Public Right of Way (Footpath 2547)

- a. Figure 1 – shows the narrow width pavement in north side leading the proposed access, contrary to developer's statement; it is rarely, if used by pedestrians.



Figure 1 riacht of wav

of
upto
the
ever

- b. Figure 2 – demonstrates actual poor visibility vehicles leaving via the proposed access re pedestrians walking from west to east once existing footpath has been removed.



Figure 2 Pedestrian Access visibility

for
the

2. Layby or defined passing place (adjacent to 16/17 The Daisycroft)?

- a. There is no documentation which stipulates that it is a passing place, as suggested by the developers. In fact, it is regularly used as a layby by various nearby owners and their

guests. It is a gross exaggeration to state that it is a defined passing place, as suggested by the developer.

- b. Statement confirmed by resident [REDACTED] who use the area as a layby (see below).
- c. Statement by resident [REDACTED] who use the area as a layby. (see below).
- d. Statement by resident [REDACTED] who use the area as a layby - (see below).
- e. These photographs show area in use as a layby over a number of days.



3. Sightlines relating to new access into existing infrastructure

- a. We would contend that the developer's Access Visibility & Intervisibility displays are not in accordance with what is defined in the 2006 Manual for Streets.
- b. If the sightlines were redrawn for vehicles leaving the access to the proposed development in accordance with the "manual" we estimate this key sightline is under 12m; stopping distance at 20 mph is 12m.
- c. Furthermore, the sightlines for vehicles leaving "Little Meadow" house, will be compromised with virtually little or any pre-sight of vehicles entering the new development from Daisycroft. Secondly, vehicles exiting #16, also has little, if any, pre-sight of vehicles leaving the new development.
- d. Figure 3 – shows an example of existing traffic ignoring existing white lines at the turning into the Bowls club. We would contend that the risk of drivers cutting the corner into the entrance of the new development, where there is effectively a "double" bend, would be common. This substantially increases the risk of collision should the event occur when a vehicle is exiting "Little Meadow".



Figure 3 Typical vehicle usage of narrow access

4. Traffic Management - In terms of the actual access to new development, at the junction to the new site, there is in effect a 6-way traffic movement (including access to Little Meadow & #16 The Daisycroft)– the developers make no suggestion in how this should be managed. Should the viability of the access to Little Meadow being directly on the junction be questioned?

the



Figure 4- Proximity of access to Little Meadow & No 16 The Daisycroft

5. Pedestrian Access to/from new development - Further, there is a worrying omission in that there is no allowance for pedestrian access within the new development – the plans show no pavements for those wishing to access the village on foot. The latter was one of the key considerations in the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan. Hence, we suggest that it would mandatory to include a pavement for pedestrian access (the Manual for Streets suggests 2m), this actually reduces the space for vehicular traffic to 2.8m at the narrowest point, i.e. single track only, not the 4.8m suggested/planned.



Figure 5- access to development - no pavement into new estate?

Summary: We would contend that the developer's contention of "A cumulative worst realistic scenario" is inaccurate, makes incorrect assumptions, and is a complete understatement of the inherent risks associated with the proposed access to this development.

At the very least some consideration to traffic management at the new entrance should be mandatory before any approval can be given to this development. It would be sensible if all three parties, the developers, the Bowls Club, & the Daisycroft Residents Association worked together to find a workable, acceptable compromise.

We would recommend rejection of the plans on the basis of access and the associated risks and safety concerns

References:

Highways 5/3/26

Amended transport statement 31.3.26

Daisycroft resident response 21/4/26

Statements regarding use of the layby.

A.

6th September 2026

To whom it may concern

We wish it to be know that we have always used the layby outside nos 17/18 The Daisycroft as parking for ourselves, guests/relatives and contractors' vehicles



B. From [REDACTED], 15 The Daisycroft, Henfield, Sussex, BN5 9LH – 7th Sept 2026

The lay by outside 16/17 The Daisycroft has always been used for parking. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Our side gate faces the lay by and has always been used for
parking visitors cars. Looking at the area it is not in any way suitable as a passing space.

[REDACTED]

C. From [REDACTED], 17 The Daisycroft, Henfield, BN5 9LH – 4th September 2026

To whom it may concern We can confirm that we, our guests and trades people who work for us very frequently use the lay by outside our house. It is not possible to park anywhere else adjacent to our property [REDACTED] 17 The Daisycroft