



HENFIELD PARISH COUNCIL PLANS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Meeting of the Plans Advisory Committee held on
Thursday 3rd July 2025 at 7:00pm in the Henfield Hall.**

Present: Cllrs D Grossmith (Chairman), F Ayres and E Goodyear.

In Attendance: 27 members of public and Mrs B Samrah (Parish Administrator – PA).

MINUTES

1. DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

The Chairman declared a personal interest in DC/25/0987 as it is a neighbouring house.

2. APOLOGIES

Were received from Cllrs R Shaw, M Andrews and J Jones.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 19TH JUNE 2025

These were approved, they were signed and dated by the Chairman.

4. MATTERS ARISING

The Chairman confirmed that there was an additional Plans Advisory Committee meeting next Wednesday at 9.45am to discuss a planning application for Delta, Shoreham Road.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting.

OPEN FORUM

The 27 members of public present were present to discuss DC/25/0815. The Chairman reminded everyone that they would be able to speak but not to repeat what had already been said. He encouraged those present to submit their comments to HDC.

The Comments were:-

- This site lies outside the Built Up Area Boundary
- It was not allocated for traveller accommodation or any development in Neighbourhood Plan (NHP) or Local Plan
- If this was allowed it would undermine the integrity of NHP and risk diminishing the credibility of local planning framework
- If it was allowed it would set a damaging precedent and invite further speculative applications which erode the rural identity.
- This planning application is contrary to 12 planning policies.
- There are badgers on site and there is no impact assessment
- It is contrary to NHP Policy 1 as development is outside BUAB and there is no allocation for traveller use.
- It is contrary to HDPF Policy 25 and 26 as rural character is threatened by urbanising features
- It is contrary to HDPF Policy 33 as it fails to protect residential amenity
- It is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 8 and 105 as it is a remote site , lacks services and is dependent on a car
- It is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 111 as there is poor access and increased traffic risk
- It is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 130(f) as it will cause a loss of privacy, create light pollution and noise
- It is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 180 as it will interfere with an active Badger Set with no impact assessment
- It is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 49 as it undermines emerging Local Plan allocations
- It is contrary to Planning Policy for Traveller Sites paragraph 10 as the development is strictly limited and this site is not justified
- It is contrary to Planning Policy for Traveller Sites Annex 1 as the applicant has not demonstrated status
- It is contrary to the Protection of Badgers Act 1992 giving legal protection of Active Sets
- It is thought that the Planning application is factually incorrect, indicating that there is an animal training centre there when one does not exist, the last use was for horses

The Chairman re-iterated that those against this planning application should submit their comments using the HDC Planning Framework and National Planning Policy Framework.

Cllr Goodyear said that the minutes of this meeting would be published on the website within the week with all the relevant policies quoted. She also said that if there was evidence in photos, videos etc these could be sent to HDC. The Chairman explained that if there were enforcements being considered by HDC these would be held in abeyance until the planning application had been decided. He also said that any adult could submit comments to HDC, it is not limited to one per household. over

It was confirmed that this Planning Application would be heard by committee.

The Chairman reconvened the meeting.

5. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were none.

6. CONSULTATION ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

DC/25/0519

The Slips West End Lane Henfield West Sussex

Change of use of land to the stationing of caravans for 5 gypsy and traveller pitches with 5 associated dayrooms, hard and soft landscaping and parking (revised description)

Ben Kirk

Objection – all agreed. This committee deems that this application is contrary to HDPF policies:-

- **1 as it is not a strategic site in the Local Plan**
- **2 as it is not a nominated site in the Neighbourhood Plan**
- **3 as it is not within an existing built-up area**
- **4 as the site is not allocated in the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan, and does not adjoin and existing settlement edge**
- **19 as it is not a proposal for park homes or caravans to meet a local housing need.**
- **21 as this is not a strategic allocated Gipsy and Traveller site**
- **23 as the site cannot be served by safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access; or cannot be supplied with essential services, such as water, power, sewage and drainage, and waste disposal; or provide adequate vehicle parking; or would have an unacceptable impact on the landscape**
- **25 as does not protect, conserve or enhance the landscape or townscape character of the District; or as does not protect, conserve or enhance the setting of the South Downs National Park**
- **31 as the application does not conserve or enhance the natural environment**
- **33 as there is loss of amenity to the neighbouring property; or the design is not sensitive to surrounding buildings, as the proposal is out of keeping and unsympathetic with the built surroundings and in that it does not respect the character of the surrounding area.**
- **33.2 as there is loss of amenity to the neighbouring property; or the design is not sensitive to surrounding buildings**
- **33.4 in that it does not respect the character of the surrounding area and buildings.**
- **34 as it does not preserve, and ensure clear legibility of, locally distinctive vernacular building forms and their settings, features, fabric and materials;**
- **39 as it does not demonstrate there being sufficient capacity in the existing infrastructure to meet their requirements; or as there is no assessment of the likely infrastructure requirement or its provision**
- **40 as it does not maintain or improve the existing transport system; nor is located in an area where there is a choice of local transport; and there is no sustainable transport to the site.**

This Committee rarely sees so many people attend the meeting for one planning application.

This Committee would like to bring Council's attention to:-

Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government - Planning policy for traveller sites

(Updated 12 December 2024)

Clearly states

The government's overarching aim is to ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates the traditional and nomadic way of life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community.

Policy B

Local planning authorities should,

- d) relate the number of pitches or plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population's size and density**
- e) protect local amenity and environment**

Henfield Parish approximate size of 1,700 hectares makes up broadly 3% of the geographic area of Horsham District (at approximately 53,000 hectares)

In the last 4 years Henfield Parish has encompassed 9 new gypsy & traveller pitches namely - 2 pitches in Shoreham Road (DC/21/0753), 5 pitches in Furners Lane (DC21/1796) and most recently 3 pitches in Stonepit Lane (DC/24/0367)

These 9 pitches together represent 10% of the stated 93 pitches required by the HDC Local Plan Henfield is therefore

- Exceeding the target and reasonable allocation (at 10%) of HDC requirements
- Taken a significant overload of pitches comparably to the size of the Parish
- Obviously is exceeding the local need for pitches

Henfield population is also a fraction of the overall population of the whole of Horsham District. The overriding need to provide gypsy and traveller pitches is not in question but the need to site them all in the Parish of Henfield is strongly challenged.

The government expectation is that these pitches to be in a broad geography number of locations to facilitate the traditional and nomadic way of life - not crammed into one small Parish

18 members of public left the meeting at 7.35pm

DC/25/0781

Swains Farm Brighton Road Henfield West Sussex BN5 9RP

Removal of modern agricultural building and replacement with 4 new-build residential dwellings with associated landscape works.

Mr S Tingey

Objection – all agreed. This committee holds with previous comments on this site namely that this planning application is contrary to HD Planning Framework Policy Numbers: -

- **1 as it is not a strategic site in the Local Plan**
- **2 as it is not a nominated site in the Neighbourhood Plan**
- **3 as it is not within an existing built-up area**
- **10 as it does not maintain the quality and character of the area; does not contribute to diverse and sustainable farming enterprises; or promote recreation.**
- **23 as the site cannot be served by safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access; or cannot be supplied with essential services, such as water, power, sewage and drainage, and waste disposal; or provide adequate vehicle parking; or would have an unacceptable impact on the landscape**
- **26 as the site lies outside built-up area boundaries and does not support the needs of agriculture or forestry; does not enable the extraction of minerals or disposal of waste; or provide for quiet informal recreational use or enable the sustainable development of a rural area**
- **27 as the site will generate urbanising effects within the settlement gap, including artificial lighting, and traffic movements**
- **33.2 as there is loss of amenity to the neighbouring property; or the design is not sensitive to surrounding buildings**
- **33.3 as the scale and massing and appearance of the proposal is out of keeping and unsympathetic with the built surroundings.**

This Committee does not feel that the Water Neutrality Statement is sustainable with the additional landscaping being added to the site. If HDC were minded to allow this planning application this committee requests that the conservation officer's statement is adhered to, as well and the pre and post planning conditions.

This committee notes that this application as DC/24/ 0806 was withdrawn previously

DC/25/0813

Truffles High Street Henfield West Sussex BN5 9DA

Conversion of the rear cafe (Class E) to form 1no. residential dwelling (Class C3).

Daisy Tompsett

No Objection – all agreed.

DC/25/0897

Whitchurch Shoreham Road Small Dole West Sussex BN5 9SD

Conversion of bungalow into chalet bungalow with erection of side extensions.

Jimmy Wallis

No Objection – 2 agreed and 1 abstained.

Six members of public left the meeting at 7.45pm

DC/25/0907

Downsview New Hall Lane Small Dole West Sussex BN5 9YJ

Removal of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey side infill extension.

Dan Barrett

No Objection – all agreed.

The remaining three members of public left the meeting at 7.48pm

DC/25/0965

Ashley London Road Henfield West Sussex BN5 9JH

Erection of a single storey rear extension and outbuilding.

Habib Amir

No Objection - all agreed. As long as the building remains ancillary to the main dwelling and that the trees are protected.

7. APPEALS

APP/Z3825/D/24/3354659 Green Oaks Barn, Henfield BN5 9AX (DC/24/0173)

The appeal is made by Mr Vlad Mihovilovic against the decision of HDC

The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for new access to the highway- This was noted.

8. CORRESPONDENCE

1 HDC Neighbourhood Planning Workshop – Slides from presentation – This was noted.

9. ANY OTHER URGENT MATTERS TO BE RAISED BY COUNCILLORS

There were none.

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Wednesday 9th July 2025 and Thursday 17th July 2025.

The Meeting closed at 7.53pm.