



HENFIELD PARISH COUNCIL **PLANS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Meeting of the Plans Advisory Committee on Thursday 4th June 2026 at 7:00pm in the Henfield Hall.

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

In Attendance: Ten 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 R Shaw, M Andrews and M Chandler.

3. Approval of Minutes of the meeting held on 7th May 2026

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

4. Matter Arising

- 1 Action in Rural Sussex attendance at PAC meeting on 16th July – This was noted.
- 2 HDC - Planning Committee - 19th May – It was confirmed that the Planning Application DC/24/0506 was refused.
- 3 CA/26/0046 – Oak trees in Tanyard it was confirmed that - No objection was submitted to HDC
- 4 Drone Photography – It was confirmed that costs were between £200 and £250 per hour or per visit.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting.

Open Forum

The representative of Beeches Owners Association said that they were objecting to planning application DC/26/0638 for a number of reasons including:-

- Access through Beeches is not suitable as the road is not wide enough for two-way traffic, refuse lorries have to collect up to 27 bins on Shoreham Road, there are no footpaths meaning that residents have to walk on the road.
- Additional houses would erode the rural buffer, is out of keeping with existing development, that the scale of the new houses would alter the character of area and that drainage would be a problem
- Beeches is a private road with five bungalows and not designed for the additional nine houses, it is a gated development and that there was an intention to hand over the access to the management agents, but this had not happened.
- Building work would have a huge impact on the existing properties which would be unacceptable.
- The additional traffic and the use of headlights would shine into a number of the existing homes.
- The additional number of journeys made would be 36,000 per year and the road would not be able to cope.

The Chairman said that he felt that an additional nine houses would create problems especially on access. He stressed the need for submissions to be sent to HDC.

The Planning Consultant for DC/26/0556 said that he had spent time in getting the planning application ready with four building to create 12 units with car parking. He added that they were encouraged to utilise the existing access points. He said that the allocation for employment had been included in Henfield's Neighbourhood Plan. He said that they wanted to keep the trees and to build a 2.5m high fence on northern side to create a barrier between this site and residential properties next door.

The Chairman said he thought it was a well thought out plan and was pleased that attenuation ponds were included. He said it was good that the larger trees would remain.

It was confirmed that solar power would be included.

One resident said that he was against planning application DC/26/0048 and that he had been turned into an industrial site with hard core, road plannings and hardstanding and that many of the old trees dying. He said that deliveries arrive at all hours of the day.

The Chairman said that he was aware of enforcements against this site but was not sure how many were still outstanding. He said that he hoped that the district councillors might be able to find out more information.

The Chairman reconvened the meeting.

5. **Chairman's Announcements**

Registering an Asset of Community Value – Cllr Goodyear said that other councils had already registered buildings in their area that they considered to have Community Value and that she thought that the George and the White Hart should be considered, they provide accommodation, a place for live music and on occasions somewhere for charity organisations to meet. She added that as this was the Year of the Village Centre it would be important to make sure that building like this were preserved as they promote social wellbeing of the village.

The Chairman said that he thought Woods Mill should also be considered.

It was agreed that the PA enquire from HM Land Registry who owned the building.

6. **Consultation on Planning Applications**

DC/26/0048

Birchfield Nursery Kidders Lane Henfield West Sussex BN5 9AB

Demolition of the existing building and offices and erection of a new commercial building (Classes B2, B8, E, F) and associated works which include the demolition/removal of the wooden building, oak building, portacabin to the north of the site and portacabin to the rear of the existing marquee.

Jack Dunckley

Objection – all agreed. This committee deems that there is insufficient information on sewerage, hours of use, environment and lighting to make an informed decision other than objection and notes that this planning application does not contribute to the quality of the landscape HD PFP 24. Additionally the outstanding Enforcement EN/26/0190 is pending consideration.

DC/26/0556

Land West of Shoreham Road Henfield West Sussex

Erection of a complex of 4no. buildings comprising of 12no. light industrial units for employment use (office, industrial, storage and distribution uses (B2, B8 & E(g) use)) with associated car parking, access and landscaping.

c/o Peter Rainier

No Objection – all agreed.

DC/26/0638

New Orchard New Hall Lane Small Dole Henfield West Sussex BN5 9YH

Permission in Principle for demolition of existing polytunnel and removal of hardstanding, and the erection of up to 9no. dwellings.

Desmond and Stephanie Weedon

Objection – all agreed. This Committee deems that this application is contrary to the following HD Planning Framework 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**
- **10 as it does not demonstrate that car parking requirements can be accommodated within the immediate surroundings of the buildings**
- **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**
- **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.**
- **33.4 in that it does not respect the character of the surrounding area and buildings.**
- **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**
- **41 as it does not demonstrate adequate safe and secure parking, and highway safety**

Eight members of public left at 7.36pm.

DC/26/0691

Solva Blackgate Lane Henfield West Sussex BN5 9HA

Erection of an extension to the existing outbuilding to provide a garden room.

Mrs Lynne Ford

No Objection – all agreed as long as this remains ancillary to the house.

DC/26/0734

Downsview Nurseries New Hall Lane Small Dole West Sussex

Permission in Principle for the erection of 1no. dwelling and associated development.

V Novozhilova

Objection – all agreed. This committee deems that there is insufficient information on sewerage, hours of use, environment and lighting to make an informed decision other than objection. This Committee deems that this application is contrary to the following HD Planning Framework 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
- 10 as it does not demonstrate that car parking requirements can be accommodated withing the immediate surroundings of the buildings
- 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
- 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.
- 33.4 in that it does not respect the character of the surrounding area and buildings.
- 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
- 41 as it does not demonstrate adequate safe and secure parking, and highway safety

7. Appeals

Appeal Allowed - DC/24/1932 - APP/Z3825/W/25/3376143 - Land to the east of Charlwood Drive – The Chairman said that it was disappointing that this appeal had been allowed.

8. Neighbourhood Plan

There was nothing to update.

9. Correspondence

- 1 HDC - Horsham Housing Event - 23 June – This was noted.
- 2 SDNPA - Have your say on vital placemaking plan – This was noted.
- 3 HDC - Henfield Development - This was noted.
- 4 HDC - Compliance Complaints Received – 11 - 17/05/2026 – This was noted.
- 5 HDC - Local Plan Briefing - 26 May 2026 – notes circulated 1.6.26 – This was noted.
- 6 Comments x2 on DC/26/0638 from Resident – This was acknowledged in the Open Forum.
- 7 SDNPA - Draft South Downs Open Space Study – This was noted.
- 8 DC/25/1700 (The Slips, West End Lane, Henfield BN5 9RG) email from resident – circulated 27.5.26 and response from Cllr Potts – this was noted.
- 9 Planning Application DC/26/0638 – From Applicant – This was noted.
- 10 HDC - Compliance Complaints Received 25/05 and 31/05/2026 – This was noted.
- 11 Temporary Caravan being used as dwelling at Catsfold Farm – This was noted.

10. Any other Urgent Matters to be raised by Councillors

There were none.

11. Date of Next Meeting

Thursday 18th June 2026.

The meeting closed at 7.52pm.