

**Dear Ms Welch**

## **Objection to planning of WA/60/26/PL**

**Georgie Smith**

**Oakwood cottage**

**Shellbridge road**

**Slindon**

**BN18 0LT**

## **Objection to Retrospective Planning Application – Binsted Glamping Site**

I strongly object to this retrospective planning application.

The original planning permission was for six small, low-impact glamping units that would fit into the rural surroundings of Binsted. The development that has actually been built is very different.

### **The Development Is Much Bigger**

The original application was approved because it was described as a small and simple glamping site that would remain mostly green and open.

What has now been built includes:

- Larger two-bedroom units
- Enclosed bases underneath the units
- Large areas of decking
- Hot tubs
- Separate sauna buildings
- Outdoor cinema areas
- High wooden fencing around the units
- Gravel tracks instead of grass paths
- A shipping container
- An above-ground LPG tank and fencing
- Additional lighting
- Different landscaping and planting

When all these additions are put together, the site looks and feels much more like a holiday park than the small rural glamping site that was originally approved.

## Effect on Binsted

Binsted is a small and peaceful rural village.

The extra buildings, fencing, gravel, lighting and outdoor facilities have changed the appearance and character of this countryside location.

The original planning officer said that the approved site would remain "**almost entirely verdant.**"

That description does not fit the development that is now on the site.

## Noise, Smoke and Lighting

The original application was considered unlikely to create significant noise.

However, the addition of hot tubs, outdoor saunas and outdoor cinemas encourages people to spend much more time outside, particularly during the evening.

This creates more potential for noise and disturbance.

There have also already been problems with smoke from the wood-fired facilities. On occasions, smoke has resulted in windows having to be closed and people leaving nearby outdoor areas.

There is also much more external lighting than would be expected in this quiet countryside location.

This can affect neighbours as well as bats and other wildlife.

## Landscaping and Wildlife

The original scheme included native hedging and trees to help the site blend into the countryside and improve biodiversity.

Instead, a number of non-native and suburban-looking plants have been used, including laurel, pittosporum, magnolia and Photinia 'Red Robin'.

These plants do not suit the rural character of Binsted in the same way as traditional native hedging.

There are also concerns about the loss of previous hedging and historic earthworks.

The Council should also consider the effect of the development on wildlife, including bats and other nocturnal animals.

## **Binsted Rife**

There are concerns about drainage and possible pollution affecting Binsted Rife below the site.

The Council should make sure that wastewater and drainage from the development cannot harm this sensitive water environment or groundwater.

## **Changes to the Layout**

The position of some of the glamping units also appears to have changed from the approved plans.

Unit 1 has moved closer to the neighbouring boundary and Unit 6 appears to have moved closer to the southern boundary.

The Council should compare the development as built with the plans that were originally approved.

## **This Is Not an Objection to Glamping**

It is important to make clear that this objection is **not against the six glamping units that already have planning permission.**

The objection is about the much larger and more intensive development that has actually been built.

The Council originally approved a simple and low-impact development.

What is now on the site is very different.

## **Retrospective Permission**

The fact that these changes have already been made should not mean that they are automatically acceptable.

The Council should consider whether it would have approved all these additional features if they had been included in the original application.

If the answer is no, they should not be allowed simply because they have already been built.

## **Conclusion**

The development that has been built is significantly different from the development originally approved.

The larger units, fencing, decking, saunas, hot tubs, outdoor cinemas, gravel tracks, storage container, LPG tank, lighting and landscaping have all increased the impact of the site.

Together, these changes have made the development much more noticeable and intensive in this quiet rural location.

I therefore ask Arun District Council to **refuse the retrospective application** and require the site to comply with the original planning permission.

I also strongly ask the Planning Committee to **visit the site before making a decision.**

Seeing the development in person would allow members to understand how different it is from the simple, low-impact glamping site that was originally approved.

Yours Sincerely

Georgie smith

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Nicola Spencer on behalf of Planning.Responses  
**Sent:** 04 September 2026 11:58  
**To:** Planning Scanning  
**Subject:** FW: Objection to WA/60/26/PL  
**Attachments:** objection planning done.docx

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF [www.arun.gov.uk](http://www.arun.gov.uk)

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to  
<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>

-----Original Message-----

From: Kathryn Welch <Kathryn.Welch@arun.gov.uk>  
Sent: 04 September 2026 10:02  
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>  
Subject: FW: Objection to WA/60/26/PL

Objection letter.

Kathryn Welch  
Senior Planning Officer, Planning Department

Please note: My working hours are currently split between Development Management and ADC Engineers, which may result in extended response times. Development Management: Tuesdays and Thursdays ADC Engineers: Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays  
T: 01903 737789  
E: [kathryn.welch@arun.gov.uk](mailto:kathryn.welch@arun.gov.uk)

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF [www.arun.gov.uk](http://www.arun.gov.uk)

-----Original Message-----

From: Georgina Smith [REDACTED]

Sent: 02 September 2026 13:28  
To: Kathryn Welch <Kathryn.Welch@arun.gov.uk>  
Subject: Objection to WA/60/26/PL

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Good afternoon

My objection letter to planning WA/60/20/PL is attached down below.