



HENFIELD PARISH COUNCIL PLANS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Meeting of the Plans Advisory Committee held on
Thursday 21st August 2025 at 7:00pm in the Henfield Hall.**

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

In Attendance: District Cllrs G Perry and M Croker, 15 members of the public and Mrs B Samrah (Parish Administrator – PA).

MINUTES

1. DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

There were none.

2. APOLOGIES

Were received from Cllrs M Chandler and J Jones.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD 7TH AUGUST 2025

These were approved. They were signed and dated by the Chairman.

4. MATTERS ARISING

There were none.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting.

OPEN FORUM

The Chairman invited members of the public to speak, he requested that they were concise and did not repeat what had already been said.

There were a number of objections to Planning Application DC/25/1019: -

- It conflicts with Henfield's Neighbourhood Plan (NHP)
- It is unsustainable as anyone living in Small Dole had to have access to a car in order to seek medical attention or attend a school or college
- It is close to the South Downs National Park and would spoil the views from the Downs
- Other planning applications for one and two houses in New Hall Lane have been rejected in the last couple of years because of unsustainability and spoiling the South Downs
- The water supply was questioned and it was noted that the two bore holes to secure underground water were very near the previously used waste collection site and may be contaminated
- It would need the removal of a line of well-established trees
- The access on to A2037 was considered to be dangerous because traffic from the north is often driving higher than the speed limit of 40MPH
- The wildlife on the site would be decimated; there are currently deer, owls, nightingales, bats, badgers and hedgehogs as well as insect life and these have attracted red kite, buzzard and kestrel.
- There would be an increased risk of flooding which is already a problem

The Chairman said that anyone wishing to object needed to make representation on the HDC website and they may wish to consider contacting their District Councillors. He did not think that the number of houses being proposed in this development would increase (if outline permission was granted) and confirmed that generally HDC insist on an allocation of two parking spaces per dwelling. The Chairman confirmed that housing demands in whole country have changed and that more housing was needed but added that Henfield's NHP would deliver our contribution to the housing requirements. He said that as HDC could not demonstrate a housing supply going forward, this left parishes vulnerable to speculative development.

Cllr Croker said that he would welcome contact from local residents and then he and other District Councillors could make clear to HDC the strength of feeling of residents and they would be given 5 minutes to speak at the Planning Committee which would decide this application.

The Chairman said that since HDC had proposed this site in their Draft Local Plan he thought it may be difficult for them to reject this planning application. He felt that, if the development were to go ahead, it was important to ensure that the land between the development and New Hall Lane remains as a green space in perpetuity.

The Chairman reconvened the meeting.

5. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were none.

6. CONSULTATION ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CA/25/0080

Report from Tree Warden attached

Chattels Cagefoot Lane Henfield West Sussex BN5 9HD

Surgery to 1x Bay, 1x Honey Locust, 1x Norway Maple, and Fell 1x Conifer, 1x Norway Maple, and 1x Elm (Works to Trees in a Conservation Area)

Mr Christopher Sharpe

No Objection – all agreed.

DC/25/1019

Land To The West of Shoreham Road Small Dole West Sussex

Outline planning application for up to 45 dwellings (including affordable homes) with all matters reserved apart from access.

Ms Grace Edwards

Objection – all agreed.

The Committee felt that this application threatened the integrity of the Neighbourhood Plan made in May 2021 and objects on the following basis:

Policy 2 – it is not a nominated site in the Neighbourhood Plan

Policy 3 – it is not within the existing built-up area

Policy 10 – it does not contribute to diverse and sustainable farming enterprises or promote recreation

Policy 23 – vehicular access could be unsafe to the site
Policy 24.3 as it does not maintain quality of water courses and prevent possible contaminated run-off of surface water

Policy 30 as there will be damage to natural landscapes and views

Policy 40 as it does not improve the existing transport system in an area where there is very limited public transport

16 of the members of public left the meeting at 7.53pm.

DC/25/1094

33 Fawn Rise Henfield West Sussex BN5 9EZ

Conversion of loft with side barn-end roof extension and rear dormer.

Mark Pinder

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

- **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; and**
- **33.2 as 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.**

The Committee felt that this was a poorly designed application.

DC/25/1183

Oaklands Oreham Common Henfield West Sussex

Conversion of loft into habitable living space, installation of three dormer windows to the rear, cladding and window alterations.

Yann Le Bouedec

No Objection – all agreed.

DC/25/1209

Land North of Stonepit Lane Henfield, West Sussex BN5 9QT

Use of land for the stationing of 3 static caravans for residential purposes along with utility building, the formation of hardstanding and associated landscaping.

Mr Oguzhan Denizer

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 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

7. APPEALS

- 1 Appeal Dismissed: DC/24/1225 – APP/Z3825/W/24/3357209 – Jandola, New Hall Lane, Small Dole, West Sussex, BN5 9YH – This was noted.

8. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

The Chairman presented a draft paper to go to the next meeting of HPC. This was discussed and, with minor modifications, it was agreed that this could go forward to be presented at next HPC meeting on 2/9.

9. CORRESPONDENCE

- 1 HALC - Delegation of Planning Applications & loss of call-in rights – This was noted.
- 2 The draft S106 agreement for the Welbeck development – This was noted.
- 3 Comments on DC/25/1094 from resident – This was noted.
- 4 Comments on DC/25/1106 from resident – This was noted.
- 5 Comments on DC/21/2013 from resident – This was noted.
- 6 Comments from CPRH on Neighbourhood Plan – This was noted.
- 7 HDC - Weekly List of Applications Determined 1-7 August 2025 - This was noted.
- 8 HDC - DC/21/2013 Parsonage Farm – Green and Open Spaces – This was noted.

- 9 S106/25/0015 - Henfield Business Park – This was noted. District Cllr Perry said that it was likely that this site would remain as a commercial site.
- 10 Email from Cratus - Land West of Shoreham Road, Small Dole – This was noted.
- 11 CPRH Objection to Sandgate – This was noted.
- 12 Land To The West of Shoreham Road - DC/25/1019 from a resident – This was noted.
- 13 Draft paper for next HPC meeting – from Cllr R Shaw – It was agreed that Cllr A Willard would be asked to assist with Visitor economy, tourism and the High Street.
- 14 HDC Weekly List of planning compliance cases 11-17 Aug 25 – This was noted.

10. ANY OTHER URGENT MATTERS TO BE RAISED BY COUNCILLORS

There were none.

11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 4th September 2025.

The Meeting closed at 8.22pm.