

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 12 August 2025 20:55:28 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/1120
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 12/08/2025 8:55 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Adjacent To Pucks Croft Cottage Horsham Road Rusper West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline application for the erection of 4no. dwellings, extension to existing cottage, alterations to access and provision of landscaping.
Case Officer:	Tamara Dale

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	4 Steeres Hill Rusper
----------	-----------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Highway Access and Parking- Loss of General Amenity- Overdevelopment- Privacy Light and Noise- Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	<p>I would like to express my opposition to the planning application proposed.</p> <p>Previous applications have been declined on this land, many matters pertaining to the appeal decision are valid concerns and</p>

still remain.

As such I cannot see how this can be legitimately approved.

Overdevelopment & Environment.

Since previous planning applications the wildlife in this plot and the surrounding areas has thrived, with deer seen resting and rearing young in this space daily Year on year.

Birds of prey, Barn owls and little owls are often seen flying in this vicinity, using many of the surround trees and wildflower areas to rest & roost. This is a well established greenfield , the woodland and grassland hosts bats, amphibians and slow worms. To build on this land in excess, 4 houses road and parking would be extremely detrimental to this space and damage the environment and habitat in the area.

Policy

I understand that the land was previously specifically rejected for development, as 'not suitable for development' by Horsham Planning, in the Housing Planning Report Feb 2021. It is not clear in any of the attached how this has changed and according to District Policy, this land does not comply or fit with those policies. Coupled with the development approved less than 400m away, 4 additional houses adds nothing to the housing plan that this aforementioned development does not already deliver.

In fact, it is more of a drain on the small resources of the village and nearby amenities.

I also note that each planning application appears to be considered in isolation rather than understanding the wider affect with all of the said development as a whole. That in itself will add pressures on the water table, amenities (lack thereof), noise and light pollution. Increase in foot and vehicle traffic in the village and parking pressures affecting local residents.

Road safety issues continue to exist, I note the documents state there have been no collisions, it doesn't live here and take into account the near misses. Not everyone reports collisions as they are not required by law to do so , in fact quite the opposite for a damage only collision. I myself have seen damage only collisions on the very area you are looking to have the entry , exit and approach . Clearing up various wing mirrors and car parts where they have collided due to one or both being on the wrong side of the road and appear to be speeding. Not to mention the near misses crossing over on foot due to people speeding and there being a blind spot for oncoming traffic. It's not clear how the plan is looking to prevent any collisions rather evidences there's no need to due to lack of reporting? They'd only need to interview local residents to see how dangerous this particular corner is.

Amenities

Since the previous application was rejected, nothing has changed or improved as to the availability of access to this area. Horsham and Crawley are not walkable, to rely on a twice weekly bus is not

tenable.

There is no commuter access nor is their doctor/ dentist access. Any secondary school access is a drive away. This has not changed and still stands as a valid reason for denying this application. There is no infrastructure for the increase in residents and they will have to rely on squeezing in to an already pressured NHS, dental practices.

The increase in noise and light pollution for the nearby houses on the edge of the village is still large, as is the potential disruption of providing additional 'on street' parking, with Horsham Road and Steeres Hill likely to bear the brunt of this.

The document does make sense re parking it states 9 spaces will be provided , one is a visitors space and one is additional 2 garage parking spaces. This will undoubtedly not be enough in modern society and the rural location. People generally have more cars nowadays and due to the location and lack of infrastructure residents will need to drive or be picked up and driven home, increasing traffic noise and pollution locally.

Due to the lack of infrastructure visitors will also have to drive , or be picked up. With only one visitor parking space for 4 houses I cannot see how this won't impact on local residents and potential road safety when people start to park on/off the kerbs, congest local residential streets making them unpassable increasing driver frustration, likely increasing potential for collisions, Anti social driving and traffic congestion.

We already see this when schools are in season with drop off and pick ups, people using Rusper as a cut through to get to and from work.

Also Parking on Horsham Road would block the highway and make an already dangerous junction, worse.

Highways.

I note the plan makes mention of widening the access and implementing a pathway at the entrance to the site. This does not mitigate the dangerous junction from traffic travelling from the South of the site. This is a blind bend when pulling out of the site onto Horsham Road. As I have said it's already dangerous when crossing on foot due to the blind bend.

Currently when crossing from the copse, towards Steeres Hill, there is no visibility of the road to the south and cars regularly cut the corner and have to break and swerve to avoid collision on this tight corner. This is not addressed or accounted for.

I note in the plans, there are many lovely photographs of the site and indeed the roadway to the north - but the angle that would show the dangerous access to the south has been avoided/ excluded, potentially as the applicant knows this angle would not be favourable.

The pathway for pedestrians does little to mitigate the need to cross at this dangerous point, as there is no other footpath on the east side of Horsham Road all pedestrians would have to cross at this dangerous point.

Water neutrality

I note in the attached documents was completed in June 24 , summer months, would it not be more realistic to have done this in high rainfall?

It also states Southern Water do not cover this area and Thames Water are to be contacted as it is their coverage but there is nothing from Thames Water within the documents produced.

Whilst this application is for 4 properties, less than the original planned. It still does not meet the requirements for water drain on the supply nor on maintaining neutrality. Nor does it take into account other already recently approved developments and how they ALL impact the area, they are all taken in isolation.

Coupled with the fact this area of land has a high water table, building on it and disrupting the natural drainage will make it significantly worse. In October to March, water runs off this land to nearby public rights of way and adjoining fields, building and paving this space will only make this worse and no provision has been made for this.

The trees and fauna removed to make way for this site are currently keeping water run off and table in balance, to remove these to build would adversely affect the water courses and put pressure on drainage across the area.

Lastly, I am not satisfied that the building of this excessive development would preserve the heavily wooded borders of this land, the application does not commit to not cutting down the trees, the mere digging of so many foundations at the periphery of the land would impact the tree root systems and cause tree damage and loss by default, affecting the conservation of established trees and biodiversity and important variety of wildlife here. With the announcement of the Climate Crisis and the drive to restore nature and the balance of impact of the climate. This site breaches this government commitment.

None of these houses can be classed as affordable housing, they appear to be more for those on higher disposable income with access to vehicles for commuting etc.

Thus I don't see how this contributes to addressing the housing situation in the UK as anyone who can't access the housing they need are highly unlikely to be able to afford these houses.

Surely councils should be looking to address the rise in vacant properties and how these can be made suitable for those with housing needs. Which has increased in England by 30% since 2021. (Source : empty homes network for habitat for humanity Great Britain).

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton