

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 14 September 2026 10:40:14 UTC+01:00  
**To:** "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application DC/26/1185  
**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 14/09/2026 10:40 AM.

### Application Summary

|               |                                                                                |
|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Address:      | Birchfield Nursery Kidders Lane Henfield West Sussex BN5 9AB                   |
| Proposal:     | Erection of 2no. commercial buildings to be used for storage and distribution. |
| Case Officer: | Nicola Pettifer                                                                |

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

|          |                                        |
|----------|----------------------------------------|
| Address: | Birchfield House Kidders Lane Henfield |
|----------|----------------------------------------|

### Comments Details

|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Commenter Type:      | Neighbour                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| Stance:              | Customer objects to the Planning Application                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Reasons for comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Design</li><li>- Loss of General Amenity</li><li>- Overdevelopment</li><li>- Privacy Light and Noise</li><li>- Trees and Landscaping</li></ul>                                 |
| Comments:            | <p>Hi there,</p> <p>As the neighboring property to Birchfield nursery we are affected the most by the ongoing development at the site.</p> <p>We object to this latest application for commercial buildings on the</p> |

basis that they are not intended for the horticultural use of the site as stated in the design and access statement. This can be proven by the previous application DC/24/1448 whereby a structure has been erected with the permitted use to be for horticultural or Garden Sage nursery use and is now being advertised by an agent as an 'industrial unit' for let - link as follows:

<https://crickmay.co.uk/find-a-property/properties/353771-birchfield-nursery-kidders-lane-henfield>

On this basis we feel the applicant is not adhering to their statement and the intention is to commercialize the site and not use it for horticultural use. This proves there is no justification of 'business requirement' for such a structure at the site as it is being advertised for letting rather than being utilized for the existing use of the property. This will clearly be the same scenario with this latest application as if there were a business justification then the recently erected structure would be full of horticultural stock and being used instead of advertised for industrial letting. It is clear that by allowing this application it would further increase traffic and vehicular movements with negative noise and visual impacts.

We also object on the design of the structure which is unnecessarily high for an intended horticultural use and will; have a negative visual impact on the locality especially given its proximity to the existing structure erected under DC/24/1448. The previous application DC/24/1448 has a unnecessarily high ridge height of 10m and if this application is to follow a similar ridge line it would have a negative overly imposing visual affect on the surrounding area. If the roof angle were to be 15 degrees as per widely accepted in the rural landscape with typical agricultural portal frame structures then the 5m eaves height can be retained with a lower overall ridge height. (in hindsight this should have been recognized in the previous application)

We also object on grounds of operating hours. The previous application was conditioned with the following - The development hereby permitted shall not be open for trade, 'business or deliveries and dispatch except between the hours of 07:30 - 20:00 Monday to Saturday and 10:00 -16:00 hours Sundays and Public/ Bank Holidays.'

As neighbors we feel this has not taken into account reasonable operating hours for such a proposal in terms of noise nuisance especially from plant and vehicular movements. We would prefer - The development hereby permitted shall not be open for trade, business or deliveries and dispatch except between the hours of 08:00 - 18:00 Monday to Saturday and closure on Sunday.

If the intended use is for storage and distribution of horticultural goods then these revised opening hours would be more acceptable so as not to cause nuisance from vehicular movements. Unfortunately we feel that these operating hours would not be kept to by the applicant.

---

We would like to point out the existing structures/yard space on the site of this proposal have continually been used for uses outside of horticultural with storage of good vehicles, general storage, and parking of cherrypickers all not associated with the horticultural use of the site. This can be clearly seen on historic satellite imagery.

Finally we have concerns of more boundary vegetation being removed prior to construction which would have a negative impact on the landscape and screening of the property. Under DC/24/1448 the erection of the structure involved the removal of several mature poplar trees that created a well screened boundary. These trees were felled when construction started and have now exposed the recently erected structure. We feel if this latest application is to go ahead more boundary vegetation would be removed and allow the structures to be seen from further afield thus having a negative impact on the landscape.

On these grounds of lack of business justification, unnecessarily high roof ridge line, unsuitable opening hours, noise nuisance, removal of boundary vegetation and negative visual impact on the landscape we would ask that this application be refused.

---

Kind regards

**Telephone:**

**Email:** [planning@horsham.gov.uk](mailto:planning@horsham.gov.uk)



---

**Horsham District Council, Alberty House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB**  
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) [www.horsham.gov.uk](http://www.horsham.gov.uk) Chief Executive: Jane E aton