[redacted]
Clovermead, Lyons Road, Slinfold, Horsham, RH13 0QS
[redacted]
[redacted]

6th August 2025

Dear Sir/Madam

Planning Application DC/25/0196 - OBJECTION - Meadowhurst, Lyons Road, Slinfold, West Sussex

We note that the applicant has submitted further documents in respect of their planning application, and we would like to comment as follows. Unfortunately, the applicant has not made any approach at all even before the initial application to seek our views or indeed consult with us.

Location Plan

The proposed barn may have turned by 90 degrees, but we continue to **object** as it is in a domestic setting and has not been designed for the intended domestic/equestrian purposes or is essential to its countryside location. Further the proposal would encroach upon the wider countryside and would introduce a scale of built form and associated paraphernalia that would be overtly commercial in character and appearance, and which would erode the rural character and ambience of this rural setting.

The red line that outlines the site is materially larger than needed for the development of the barn. Further, this reflects a planning application for a standalone plot in the future.

The horses, when on site, as they currently are, graze on fields to the south of the property, which we understand were purchased from a neighbour, and which included planning permission for stables and a sand school and have direct access to the Down Link.

It is clear when viewing the property on google maps that the applicant has already started work on the sand school by installing an access track south from the cottage to the field in the south where groundworks have clearly been taking place. This raises the question why the barn is not co-located with the sand school and sized appropriately.

Whilst it is noted on the location plan that there will be proposed underplanting along the southern boundary, the applicant did a couple years ago plant a single row of hawthorn whips, which have just been left untended, and many have failed, swallowed up in stinging nettles and bindweed. This cannot be considered as underplanting!

Arboricultural Impact Assessment

The HDC Arboricultural Officer has always strongly objected to any pollarding of the protected Lime Trees that border the entire length of the drive, and the plan from Arbtec mentions the pollarding of four trees adjacent to where the applicant wishes to access to the site. This will look totally out of place when all the remaining trees have not been touched. Has the Officer at HDC been approached for comment on these revised plans?

The access into the site between the trees mentions a special roadway to protect the roots of the protected trees, but the narrow access between the trees with heavy vehicles (e.g. concrete lorries etc) entering and leaving the site will potentially damage the trees themselves as there is a lack of turning area.

Water Neutrality Statement

The Water Neutrality statement totally underestimates the amount of water needed to wash down a horse and indeed three. Washing down of horses happens after they have been exercised and will therefore be done more frequently than once a month. Is the size of this tank sufficient for this use? The Statement refers to Polo horses (point 4.10), the three horses on site are not polo ponies, and are ridden all year round!

As a previous owner of an Event Horse, I am aware just how much water is needed for a proper wash down after exercise each day! (Point 4.11 says only once a month!) For a professional set up for "polo" ponies we would have expected to see a dedicated wash bay.

It mentions a mains water top up, for emergency use only, Southern Water do not seem to have been consulted on this as they would need to provide the supply! The approved planning application for the rebuild of the main house has a condition to solely use rainwater harvesting as no mains water connection has been allowed direct to the house. Only emergency top up as per Condition 15 of the permission.

The 6,800-litre rainwater storage tank will be above ground according to the plan provided which will be clearly visible to us and Langley next door, as it is sited on the southwest corner. The tank could easily be installed below ground.

There are no soakaways indicated on the plan and the report does not mention where the wastewater from washing down horses or the effluent run off from a muck heap will go as it cannot drain into any nearby water source.

The Water Neutrality statement refers to polo horses, (not mentioned previously in the original application) which also raises the question of exercise facilities, for stick and ball practice, of which there are none on site.

Reptile Report

In the Reptile Survey on Page 4, 1.3 mentions "*The horse grazing regime would continue to reduce habitat suitability for reptiles prior to works*,"

and at page 10, point 5.4 it says:

"The horse grazing management (which was paused during the survey period) at this location will be continued, which will keep the grassland sward very low."

The field concerned is visible from our property and we have not seen any horses grazing this area, and certainly nothing has been "paused" this is complete fabrication!! The applicant has never fenced this field or used temporary electric fencing for horses. It has just been left fallow since it was ploughed it the year the property was purchased and is waterlogged and unusable in winter and is referred to in the report as "*wet meadow*".

In Summary, the barn is too big and in the wrong location for its intended use and a more appropriate barn should be co-located with the stables and sand school, and this will also protect the Lime Trees along the drive from unnecessary damage.