

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 24 January 2026 15:04:34 UTC+00:00  
**To:** "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application DC/25/2114  
**Categories:** Comments Received

## Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 24/01/2026 3:04 PM.

### Application Summary

Address:	Land at 519396 111237 Church Farm Walk Upper Beeding West Sussex
Proposal:	Erection of 4 No. detached dwellings with associated amenity space, car parking spaces, detached carports, access road and other associated infrastructure.
Case Officer:	Daniel Holmes

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

Address: The Rectory 73 Church Lane Upper Beeding Steyning West Sussex

### Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Design</li><li>- Highway Access and Parking</li><li>- Loss of General Amenity</li><li>- Other</li><li>- Overdevelopment</li><li>- Privacy Light and Noise</li><li>- Trees and Landscaping</li></ul>
Comments:	My objection is based on material planning considerations and relevant national and local planning policy.

## 1. Principle of Development in the High Weald AONB

The application site lies within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Under NPPF paragraphs 176-177, great weight must be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty, and permission should be refused for major development in an AONB unless exceptional circumstances and public interest can be demonstrated.

In this case, the proposal is for a small number of private dwellings and does not represent a development of strategic importance or overriding public benefit. The applicant has not demonstrated:

- exceptional circumstances
- that the development is in the public interest
- that alternative sites outside the AONB have been properly assessed

As such, the proposal conflicts with national policy protections for designated landscapes and with the objectives of the High Weald AONB Management Plan.

## 2. Landscape and Visual Impact

The submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment significantly understates the harm arising from the development. The proposal would introduce built form and urbanising features into a sensitive rural landscape, resulting in:

- erosion of local landscape character
- adverse effects on key visual receptors
- cumulative harm when considered alongside nearby development pressures

The development would fail to conserve or enhance the character of the AONB, contrary to NPPF paragraph 176 and relevant Horsham District Planning Framework policies.

## 3. Ecology and Biodiversity

There are serious concerns regarding the adequacy and reliability of the ecological information submitted in support of the application.

It is understood that vegetation clearance occurred prior to ecological surveys being undertaken. This raises concern that baseline conditions may have been compromised, potentially affecting the validity of the submitted ecological assessment.

The site has the potential to support protected species including

---

bats, dormice and nesting birds. In the absence of robust and seasonally appropriate survey data, the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that the proposal would not result in harm to protected species or habitats.

This is contrary to NPPF paragraph 180 and the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, which require sufficient information to be available before planning permission is granted.

#### 4. Flood Risk and Drainage

There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proposal would not increase flood risk on or off site. Concerns include:

- the effectiveness of proposed soakaway and surface water drainage solutions in chalk geology
- exceedance flows and downstream impacts
- lack of clear mitigation for extreme rainfall events taking account of climate change allowances

In the absence of a robust drainage strategy, the proposal conflicts with NPPF policy on flood risk and sustainable drainage.

#### 5. Highways and Access

The proposed access arrangements raise serious highway safety concerns, particularly given the narrow rural lane serving the site and its existing use by pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and dog walkers. Since the re-opening of White Bridge, levels of vehicular and pedestrian traffic along this lane have increased significantly. In addition, the church-run café generates regular daily visitors who access the site by car and on foot via the lane.

Weekly community activities, including Rainbows, Brownies, Guides, Scouts and two toddler groups, involve substantial numbers of families and carers using pushchairs. The increased volume of traffic associated with the proposed development would materially worsen conditions for these vulnerable road users and would give rise to highway safety concerns.

The Transport Assessment does not adequately consider:

- pedestrian safety
- visibility constraints
- cumulative impact of additional traffic
- the absence of safe footways

The proposal therefore fails to demonstrate that it would not result in a severe residual cumulative impact on the local highway network, contrary to NPPF paragraph 111.

---

## 6. Impact on Residential Amenity

The application site directly backs onto two existing detached dwellings and a street of residential park homes (trailer housing). The proposed development would introduce new built form and activity into what is currently an open and undeveloped boundary.

This would result in:

- loss of privacy for existing residents
- increased noise and disturbance from additional traffic and domestic activity
- potential loss of light and outlook
- an overbearing and intrusive relationship between new and existing properties

The proposal therefore fails to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to NPPF paragraph 135(f) and relevant local plan policies.

## 7. Heritage and Archaeology

The application site lies in close proximity to Sele Priory, a medieval monastic site founded before 1096, and to the Grade II\* listed Church of St Peter, which incorporates fabric associated with the former priory. Archaeological investigations undertaken in the 20th century have identified remains consistent with monastic structures, including possible cloister foundations, to the north of the church. In addition, a number of Scheduled Monuments relating to medieval salt-working (salters) are located immediately north of the church within the historic Adur valley landscape, land historically associated with Sele Priory and later with the church glebe.

In this context, the application site must be regarded as an area of high archaeological potential. However, no adequate archaeological evaluation has been submitted to establish the presence, extent or significance of any below-ground remains. The proposal therefore fails to comply with NPPF paragraphs 194-196, which require applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including archaeological interest, and to provide sufficient information to allow the Local Planning Authority to make an informed decision.

## 8. Previous Refusal and Planning History

It is noted that a previous application on this site has been refused. The current proposal does not appear to address the fundamental policy objections previously identified, particularly in relation to landscape harm and location within the AONB.

This reinforces the conclusion that the development remains

unacceptable in principle.

For the reasons set out above, the proposal:

- conflicts with national policy protecting Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- fails to demonstrate exceptional circumstances or public benefit
- is supported by inadequate ecological and technical evidence
- would cause harm to landscape character, biodiversity, and local amenity

Accordingly, I respectfully request that Horsham District Council refuses this application.

---

Kind regards

**Telephone:**

**Email:** [planning@horsham.gov.uk](mailto:planning@horsham.gov.uk)



**Horsham  
District  
Council**

---

**Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB**  
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) [www.horsham.gov.uk](http://www.horsham.gov.uk) Chief Executive: Jane E aton