

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 October 2025 08:33:05 UTC+00:00
To: "Hamish Evans" <hamish.evans@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/1963

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 22/10/2025 9:33 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land To The East Of Freshfield Lane Danehill West Sussex
Proposal:	Proposed construction of a new stable block on agricultural land comprising of four stables
Case Officer:	Hamish Evans

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: Town Place Ketches Lane HAYWARDS HEATH

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	The recent history of the site ('the site') is relevant. It is part of a field ('the field') that was, for a very long time, grazing land. The field was sold in April 2021 and then re-offered for sale in August 2021 as parcels of land at a price of £54,000 per acre. The sale particulars included the statement that 'The land does not currently have planning permission'. There was concern at the time that the sale was aimed at buyers seeking to profit from a successful future planning application. A 'playbook' for this is to acquire land, engage in some agricultural or horticultural activity, build some minor infrastructure, such as a shed, and after five

years apply for permission to construct a dwelling house from which to continue the afore mentioned activities.

After the sale was completed the new owner of the site created an access from Freshfield Lane without planning permission nor the consent from the owners of the verge, WSCC.

The Applicant, Miss Maria Simpson, who lives in Adingbourne, near Chichester, was in April 2022 successful in getting permission for the building of an Agricultural Barn for the storage of hay and feed for livestock and the secure storage of agricultural plant machinery in connection with land maintenance. The barn was built but no visible agricultural activity has been seen. There has however been a lorry YJ53UXH parked on the land without permission for more than a year.

The current application is for a stable block with four stables and the Planning Statement makes it clear that the intention is to keep and breed horses. The care and maintenance of horses requires daily attendance. But Miss Simpson lives 40 miles away. The question is therefore who is going to look after the horses and where do those people live? Or is it the case that, like the barn, the stable block will be built but not used?

Since the application was made, a number of 0.5 acre plots from the site have been put on the market. The agents are VC Estates of Herstmonceux who have disclosed that six plots will be offered for sale at a guide price of £140,000 per acre. The particulars state that the plots have 'Potential for future planning, subject to permissions - ideal for those looking to invest with a long-term view'.

The current application is defective as the '5-plus acres' referred to in the Planning Statement will be reduced to '2-plus acres' if the plots are sold and the sale particulars are contrary to the applicant's statement of 'preserving and enhancing agricultural land'. The plans accompanying the application are incomplete. Furthermore, guidelines for the keeping of horses suggest that owners should aim for a minimum of one acre of grazing per horse so the reduced acreage of the site would be insufficient to keep three horses as contemplated in the application.

The site lies in the High Weald National Landscape (AONB) and within 7 kilometres of Ashdown Forest which is designated as an SSSI, an SAC and an SPA. I believe that the AONB should be protected from unplanned and scattered housebuilding. One of the objectives of the District Plan (DP12) is to protect the visual properties of the landscape. DP16 of the District Plan states that development within the AONB will only be permitted where it conserves or enhances natural beauty.

It is clear that the field has been repeatedly marketed, and priced, in the expectation that house building will ultimately be allowed. And, after four years the visual properties of the field have declined with the presence of fencing, a storage container, and parked vehicles. This is contrary to the District Plan.

So, while I have sympathy with proposals for the creation of additional rural activities they need to comply with the District Plan and should not lead to housebuilding. The current application is

defective, lacks credibility and gives no assurances that there will not be a future application to build a house or convert the barn into a house.
I therefore object.

Kind regards