

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
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>



Our priorities...

 Improving the wellbeing of Arun	 Delivering the right homes in the right places	 Supporting our environment to support us	 Fulfilling Arun's economic potential	 Our core foundations	 
---	--	--	--	---	--

From: Elaine Walby <Elaine.Walby@arun.gov.uk> **On Behalf Of** Planning
Sent: 25 August 2026 11:29
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Application WA/60/26/PL

Elaine Walby
Technical Support Assistant
Planning Services

T: 01903 737 904
E: elaine.walby@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd

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



Connect with us: [Facebook](#) | [X](#) | [Instagram](#)

From: Mike Tristram [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 August 2026 09:15
To: Kathryn Welch <Kathryn.Welch@arun.gov.uk>; Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Diane Evans [REDACTED]
Subject: Application 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.

Arun District Council (ADC)
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton BN17 5LF

25th August 2026

Dear Sir/Madam

Application WA/60/26/PL - Land south of the Black Horse Pub Binsted BN18 0LP - Siting of 6no. glamping pods with associated structures, access, car parking and landscaping (retrospective)

I would like to object to aspects of this development which are in conflict with several policies of the Arun Local Plan. This objection is against the background that I support the principle of rural business diversification, and that an important part of this is bringing the public into appropriately designed and managed holiday developments in beautiful countryside in their leisure time. My objection relates only to aspects of the development, for which retrospective permissions are being sought, and which are in conflict with Arun Local Plan policies relevant to this location.

My note below sets out the policy grounds on which I believe the retrospective permission for intensification should be refused. However, if and to the extent that the development is allowed to continue on the site with any modification at all to the original planning permission, I submit that strict conditions should, to ensure compliance with Council policies, be applied and enforced in the following respects:

- **Legally binding Operational Management Plan** to assure neighbourliness and rural character of the area; including or additional to these conditions:

- **External lighting control** and luminaire specifications
- **Quiet hours, and external noise control** outside of quiet hours; no external TV/cinema
- **Air pollution control:** only dry, seasoned, compliant (“Ready to Burn” certified) wood or smokeless fuel to be burned in any fire pits; similarly controlled or no indoor log burners with indoor heat to be electric or LPG gas fuelled.
- **Water pollution control:** the specific geographical context of this site which site on the valley-side springline that feeds the Binsted Rife LWS and its chalkstream: potentially an EA permit should in any case be legally required for the drainage fields discharging grey water or treated black water. However to assure this control, a condition is proposed that operation should not be permitted without an EA permit for the drainage fields [after potentially a grace period for the application process]; and a binding maintenance log condition.
- **Site warden/emergency contact:** 24-hour point of contact to be clearly displayed externally so that residents or the council can immediately report noise/light/smoke disturbances for resolution

My policy-based objections to this retrospective application are as follows:

1. Rural Character and Countryside Protection

- **Policy C SP1 (Countryside):** Development in the open countryside is strictly controlled to protect its rural character, beauty, and quiet enjoyment.

While tourist accommodation can sometimes be supported under rural economy policies (Policy TOU DM1), it is conditional on the development being of a scale and design that respects the countryside landscape. The landscape in question is a particularly sensitive one. The area between the pub and the church constitutes the ancient heart of Binsted village, which unusually retains its pre-Norman non-nucleated form; and the site is adjacent to the Binsted Rife Valley Local Wildlife Site and close to the Binsted Woods LWS and the South Downs National Park boundary. The over-intensification of the original permission, for which retrospective permission is being sought, fails this criterion.

- **Policy LAN DM2 (The Setting of the South Downs National Park):** This policy explicitly states that development proposals within the setting of the SDNP must respect its special qualities.

A brightly lit, noisy development introduces "urban encroachment" and visual intrusion, degrading the buffer zone required to protect the National Park's tranquil environment; in addition to its impact on immediate neighbours.

2. Light Pollution and Dark Skies

- **Policy QE DM2 (Light Pollution):** Arun policy dictates that outdoor lighting must be kept to a minimum. It forbids lighting that causes an adverse impact on the visibility of the night sky, countryside character, or local wildlife.

The South Downs National Park is a designated International Dark Sky Reserve. Brightly lit glamping pods directly clash with Policy QE DM2, as artificial light disrupts nocturnal wildlife in the adjacent Binsted Woods LWS and destroys the rural dark sky landscape.

3. Noise and Environmental Nuisance

- **Policy QE DM1 (Noise Pollution):** This policy requires that new developments do not give rise to unacceptable harm from noise.
- **Policy QE DM3 (Air Pollution):** This addresses emissions that impact local air quality.

Neighbours in the vicinity report excessive noise at times from the site. Combined with smoke from many chimneys or fire pits within a small area, this introduces environmental pollution into a quiet, historic village setting, conflicting directly with these policies.

4. Biodiversity and Ecosystem Protection

The location bordering the Binsted Rife Valley Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and sitting near the Binsted Woods LWS places heavy environmental constraints on the site.

- **Policy ENV DM5 (Development and Biodiversity):** This requires developments to achieve a net gain in biodiversity and avoid harming existing habitats.
- **Policy ENV DM4 (Protection of International, National, and Local Sites):** This policy states that development that would have a harmful impact on a Local Wildlife Site will not be permitted unless the benefits significantly outweigh the nature conservation value.

The benefits of the proposed retrospective permission for intensification of the originally permitted development are limited to financial benefit to the Nestled business and its contractors. Harm may be expected in some degree to arise from external noise, lighting and smoke (harming air quality for flora/fauna) to nationally and internationally important wildlife species using the Binsted Rife Valley LWS and Binsted Woods LWS areas, and surrounding landscape, for habitat and movement routes. (Eg bats of which the area has at least 13 out of the UK's 17 species.) Harm may also be expected from liquid discharges in the lateral spring line of the chalk stream valley. Such harms to the LWS's will not outweighed by the benefits of the unpermitted developments for which permission is sought.

5. Conflict with Local Plan Heritage Policies

The site is in proximity to, and impacts the setting of, a group of listed buildings including as nearest Church Farmhouse and Quince Cottage [Beam Ends] and (also within range of some noise smoke and light disturbance) Glebe Cottage, Binsted Church, The Old Rectory and Stable Cottage. Under Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Arun District Council has a strict legal duty to have "special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting." In planning law, preserving a setting is not just about blocking a view; it explicitly includes protecting the tranquillity, historic atmosphere, and sensory environment from intrusive noise, smoke, and light. Consequently, a noisy, smoky, and brightly lit development in this specific location directly violates the historic environment policies in the Arun District Council Local Plan:

- **Policy HER SP1 (The Historic Environment):** This overarching policy states that the council will preserve or enhance Arun's historic assets. It requires new developments to respect the historic character, boundaries, *and contextual settings* of heritage assets.
- **Policy HER DM1 (Listed Buildings):** This policy explicitly states that proposals *affecting the setting of a Listed Building* will only be approved if they do not harm its character, appearance, *or setting*.
- **The Conflict:** Introducing more intensive commercial, transient holiday activity—complete with wood smoke, outdoor late-night noise, and artificial lighting—into a highly sensitive, quiet, and historically intact rural cluster risks permanently compromising the normally peaceful, unaltered setting of these heritage assets.

Michael Tristram

The Old Rectory
Binsted
Arundel
W Sussex BN18 0LL