

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 August 2026 11:22:13 UTC+01:00
To: "Hamish Evans" <hamish.evans@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/1402

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 05/08/2026 11:22 AM.

Application Summary

Address: The Naked Farm Warninglid Lane Warninglid Haywards Heath
West Sussex RH17 5TG

Proposal: Proposed farm abattoir and animal processing facility located
within existing agricultural building. (Additional information and
plan received 04.08.2026)

Case Officer: Hamish Evans

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: Gillhurst The Street Warninglid Haywards Heath

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour or general public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Re: Application DM/26/1402 - Lawful Development Certificate for
an abattoir at Barlands Farm

Dear Mr Evans,
I write to object to the grant of a Lawful Development Certificate
for the reasons set out below. My objection is made on the basis
that, in my respectful submission, the application does not

demonstrate, on the balance of probabilities, that the proposed use is lawful. In particular, the description of the proposed use appears to lack the precision normally required for a certificate under sections 191-192 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the supporting evidence appears internally inconsistent in a number of respects, and it has not, in my view, been demonstrated that the activities described as ancillary are genuinely subordinate to the primary agricultural use.

Summary of my concerns

The description of the proposed use appears to differ from later submissions, supporting documents and publicly available material.

The applicant's Vision Statement and website appear to describe a business involving livestock rearing, slaughter, meat processing, packaging, storage, distribution and direct sales.

The evidence submitted does not appear to demonstrate that these activities are genuinely subordinate or incidental to agriculture, rather than forming integral parts of the overall business.

Information regarding the scale of the holding and the proposed operation has changed during the application process, making it more difficult to identify precisely the use for which certification is sought.

The additional submissions appear to expand upon the original proposal and raise questions as to whether the use now described is the same use originally applied for.

For those reasons, I respectfully submit that the Council may not be able to be satisfied that the statutory test for granting a Lawful Development Certificate has been met.

Requirement for precision

A Lawful Development Certificate is a legal determination rather than an assessment of planning merits. The Council must be satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the use described in the application would be lawful.

In my respectful submission, that requires:

a sufficiently precise and unambiguous description of the proposed use;

supporting evidence that is consistent with that description; and

sufficient evidence to demonstrate that any activities said to be ancillary are properly incidental to the primary use relied upon.

Burden of proof

The burden rests upon the applicant to demonstrate, on the balance of probabilities, that the proposed use would be lawful.

Where the description of the proposed use is unclear, where supporting material appears to describe a broader operation than the application itself, or where important factual matters are not clearly evidenced, the Council may reasonably conclude that the applicant has not discharged that burden.

Applicant's later submissions

The applicant has stated that animals will be bred and reared on the holding and that carcasses will then be transported for butchery elsewhere on the estate.

Those submissions appear to describe activities extending beyond the operation of the proposed slaughter facility itself. In my respectful submission, those activities form an important part of the factual basis upon which the applicant now relies, and the Council may wish to consider whether they merely clarify the original proposal or describe a broader operational model than that originally presented.

Vision Statement

Mr Hall's Vision Statement appears to describe an integrated enterprise involving livestock rearing, slaughter, meat processing, packaging, storage, distribution and sales.

Those activities appear to be presented as central components of the overall business rather than incidental consequences of livestock farming.

The Council will therefore need to consider whether the evidence demonstrates that those activities remain ancillary to agriculture or whether, taken together, they are capable of amounting to a separate planning use.

Website information

The Naked Farm website appears to describe an enterprise involving the production, processing and distribution of finished food products.

To the extent that those activities extend beyond the description contained within the application, they appear capable of raising questions as to whether the operational model being promoted publicly is fully reflected in the description of development for which certification is sought.

Scale of the holding

The acreage relied upon within the application has increased significantly during the course of the application.

As the applicant relies upon the scale of the holding in support of the contention that the proposed slaughtering activities are ancillary to agriculture, I respectfully submit that the Council should be satisfied that the land relied upon forms part of the relevant agricultural holding and that the evidence adequately supports the operational scale now described.

Additional information

The additional submissions provide further explanation of the applicant's intended operation.

However, much of that material appears to relate to anticipated future expansion and projected livestock numbers rather than evidence of the existing agricultural enterprise.

In my respectful submission, the Council will wish to consider whether those additional submissions simply clarify the proposal

or whether they materially extend the factual basis upon which the application is made.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully submit that the evidence before the Council does not demonstrate, on the balance of probabilities, that the proposed use would be lawful. If, having considered all of the evidence, the Council is not satisfied that the applicant has discharged the burden of proof required for the grant of a Lawful Development Certificate, I respectfully submit that the application should be refused.
Yours sincerely

Kind regards