

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 30 July 2026 13:18:30 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0955
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 30/07/2026 1:18 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Calcot Farm Horsham Road Steyning West Sussex BN44 3AA
Proposal:	Change of use of part of a former agricultural building and 10m x 18m of adjacent yard to commercial use; for the storage of soil improver bagging equipment, bagging of soil improver, storage of bagged surplus soil improver and distribution of the same. (Retrospective).
Case Officer:	Daniel Holmes

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: Calcot Farm Bungalow Horsham Road Steyning

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment
Comments:	Horsham District Council - Objection (reasons below) to Planning Application DC/25/0955 - I am a key landowner in this application (I own the access track) - I have given no permission for the application

ACCESS

- DMRB Standard width requirements are 5.5 metres
- The access track on this application is under 3 metres (2.6-2.8mtrs). The applicant has supplied plans which now show the driveway to be too narrow.
- The proposed Fire Access Route to this development breaches Building Regulations 2010. The minimum required UK standards for fire appliance access to non-residential buildings are in Approved Document B, Volume 2, 2019 Edition: B5 Section 15 (Diagram 15.2). Those Regulations lay out at least 3 key minimum access standards that must be achieved;
 - o (a) Minimum width of access road 3.7 metres - The proposed route FAILS this standard.
 - o (b) Minimum width of gateway in access road 3.1 metres - The proposed route FAILS this standard.
 - o (c) Minimum carrying capacity of access road 12.5 tonnes - The proposed route FAILS this standard.

In view of the above the proposed access route in this application fails to achieve any of the three key minimum safety standards for fire appliance access, as specified in Building Regulations 2010. The access track is breaking up (with the current significant increase of traffic movements and weight of vehicles using the access).

- Proof that the access is too narrow was verified when HDC's own refuse truck refused to come onto site. The commercial bins are now collected from a different address.
 - Visibility at the point the access joins the B2135 is poor. With extra traffic movements and size of vehicles Highway safety could be compromised
 - Due to no passing places on the access, more commercial vehicles movements will intensify this issue. There is not room for two vehicles to pass on the junction of the access and B2135 so currently vehicles have to reverse/wait on B2135, resulting in road safety issues
 - Traffic movements in this application are incorrect, as the controlled waste produce is not made on site, how does it arrive to site, these movements have not been mentioned. There is no explanation of the type, size, width, weight of the vehicles to be used.
 - Delivery movements seem unbelievably low, as this is a relocation of a business not a new business, refer to puck-a-muck website.
 - A TRICS Database survey should be carried out, to determine accurate movements.
 - Damage to my property has already happened on numerous occasions by the applicant's vehicles. The access track is not wide enough to deal with the applicants proposed use (leaving us with expensive legal costs to claim for reinstatement) This application will only compact this problem and further compounds our loss and amenity, quiet enjoyment of our property.
 - Hours of operation on past applications are breached regularly - see enforcement. Why would this application's hours of operation
-

be any different? This will lead to a further loss of amenity and enjoyment of ours and other neighbouring property

- The application is sited 20 metres away from a water course, the slope of the land will take run off directly into the water course. It is only 40 metres away from a food establishment and 90 metres from my house.
- Contamination risks:-
 - o Within 25 metres of the proposed site is an artisan borehole, which supplies my property.
 - o The annotated plan attached shows the close proximity of this development to the stream, the borehole, the tea room/bakery and my house.
 - o These are all within 100 metres of the proposed development and the risk of contamination is high.
- Air Bourne smells, odours and spores will directly affect neighbouring properties, prevailing winds and also no wind, the smell will linger in the air.
- This barn itself was granted permission under Permitted Development Rights. Under the above Regulation it cannot be used for housing animals (smell, run off, nuisance of flies/vermin to neighbouring properties), it should only be for storage of hay, straw etc. How can the storage of muck be any different to housing animals?
- Loading and unloading of bagged material would create more activity on site, with the extra noise of vehicles and reversing beepers, which will disturb neighbouring properties. There is no mention of this in the application
- Soil improver - no farmer buys big bags, this is contrived, it is too costly due to 100's of tons being required, rather than a few bags.
- In my opinion this application falls under a Waste application (Town and Country Planning (prescription of County matters) Regulation 2005) and should be dealt with by County and not by District.

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