

Sent:

12 November 2025 22:32

To:

Planning

Subject:

Objection to Planning Application DC/25/0894 – Proposed Development of 92 Dwellings

Categories:

Comments Received

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to planning application DC/25/0894, which proposes the construction of 92 new residential dwellings to be connected by road to the existing housing development.

The existing development already suffers from extremely narrow roads with very limited passing spaces. Vehicles regularly struggle to pass safely, and large emergency vehicles such as fire engines and ambulances already face serious difficulty navigating the current layout. Adding a further 92 dwellings sharing the same access routes will only make this situation more dangerous and place both residents and emergency responders at unacceptable risk.

It is my honestly held belief that increasing vehicular traffic through these constrained roads will, at some point, lead to serious injury or worse. Many of the existing roads do not have continuous pavements, forcing pedestrians—including children, parents with pushchairs, and elderly residents—to walk in the road itself. The proposed development would significantly increase traffic flow and therefore the danger to pedestrians.

The current road layout also fails to provide adequate parking for visitors to existing homes. Vehicles are frequently parked partially on pavements and in turning areas, obstructing access and further narrowing already tight carriageways. The new development offers even less provision for visitor parking, meaning additional residents will inevitably park on surrounding streets, worsening congestion and safety risks.

Furthermore, the plans for the new development indicate that roads/shared driveways and grass areas within the existing estate—which are privately maintained by a management company (see attached)—will be used to serve the new dwellings. As a

resident, I pay annual service charges for the upkeep of these areas, and it is wholly unreasonable that a separate development should make use of this private infrastructure without the consent or compensation of those who fund its maintenance.

I am also concerned that the proposal to utilise a through road via Carter Drive appears to have arisen as a result of plans to close a section of road elsewhere (Sergeant Way) due to traffic issues. This approach does not resolve the problem—it simply moves the traffic burden and associated safety risks from one area to another. It is unacceptable for existing residents to bear the consequences of a design that diverts established traffic pressures into an already constrained residential area.

It is particularly troubling to note that, according to the developer's own planning documents, "the inclusion of Carter Drive, which is now included within the site boundary, has been made specifically at the request of Horsham District Council to enable an increase in density across the Site."

If accurate, this raises serious concerns about the impartiality and transparency of the planning process. The Local Planning Authority should be assessing development proposals objectively, not requesting amendments that intensify development or disadvantage existing residents. I respectfully ask that this issue be fully examined to ensure the application has been handled with proper procedural fairness and that all affected residents have been appropriately reconsulted following this significant amendment.

The intensity of the proposed development is wholly inappropriate for this location. Introducing 92 additional dwellings accessed through narrow private roads represents overdevelopment and will have a materially harmful impact on the safety, amenity, and character of the existing community.

In addition, local public services and infrastructure are already under significant pressure. Schools, healthcare providers, and local roads are operating at or beyond capacity. The proposed development will worsen this situation, yet no clear mitigation measures or infrastructure improvements are identified.

These issues directly conflict with several key policies in the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), including:

- Policy 33 (Development Principles): requiring safe and adequate access, protection of amenity, and avoidance of overdevelopment.

- Policy 39 (Infrastructure Provision): requiring new developments to provide or contribute towards the infrastructure needed to support them, including transport, schools, and healthcare.
- Policy 40 (Sustainable Transport): requiring safe and suitable access for all users without causing severe cumulative impacts on the transport network.
- Policy 41 (Parking): requiring adequate parking provision to prevent highway safety issues.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge Horsham District Council to refuse planning application DC/25/0894 on the following grounds:

- Highway safety and inadequate access for residents, visitors, and emergency vehicles.
- Increased risk to pedestrian safety due to narrow roads and lack of continuous pavements.
- Severe shortfall in parking provision, leading to dangerous on-street parking and congestion.
- Unfair and inappropriate use of privately maintained roads, imposing additional burdens on existing residents.
- Through-road via Carter Drive merely relocates traffic issues from Sergeant Way, rather than resolving them.
- HDC's own request to include Carter Drive to increase density raises questions about procedural fairness and impartiality.
- Overdevelopment and loss of local character, contrary to HDPF Policy 33.
- Unsustainable pressure on already overstretched local public services, contrary to HDPF Policy 39.
- Conflict with HDPF Policies 33, 39, 40, and 41, requiring safe, sustainable, and well-supported development.

Thank you for considering my objection. I trust the Council will take these serious concerns into account when determining this application.

Yours faithfully,

44 Carter Drive
Broadbridge Heath
Horsham
West Sussex
RH12 3GZ

BROADBRIDGE HEATH WICKHURST GREEN, WEST HORSHAM		
TRANSFEE TITLE TRANSFER PLAN PLOTS 282-305		
DRAWN BY TM	DATE July 2012	DRAWING NO. BROW-500/2
SCALE 1/100000	CHECKED/DATE	