

**Sent:**  
**To:**  
**Subject:**

21 September 2025 15:38

Planning; Planning

\*Awaiting address\*URGENT - DC/25/1269 - FAO Nicola Pettifer - Outline Planning Application for up to 90 no. residential dwellings (including 40% affordable) all matters to be reserved apart from access.

**Importance:** High

**Categories:** Comments Received

Dear Nicola Pettifer

I object to this proposal in the strongest sense for many reasons - these fall under the following considerations which I will then further deal with individually below:

- 1) Horsham District Planning Framework
- 2) Local Amenities can not cope
- 3) Overdevelopment
- 4) A281 overstretched and dangerous
- 5) Pollution / Trees / Plants / Animals / Landscape
- 6) Noise
- 7) Other

Taking these in turn:

1) Horsham District Planning Framework:

- Clause 6.3 refers to 800 homes per year as a housing target for the whole District. The clause goes on to state the focus will be "centred on Gatwick, plus a small allowance for the Coastal housing market area".
- Rudgwick and Bucks Green are no where near these areas
- A proposal to build 90 homes would be 12% of the annual new build target for the whole District.
- The Rudgwick and Bucks Green area have a population of c3k based on the 2021 census whereas the whole Horsham District is c148k - this means 2% of the Population of Horsham District lives in Rudgwick and Bucks Green
- Proposing to build 12% of the annual new home target in a village area that has a population of just 2% of the District's total is completely illogical
- Policy 15 also refer to the Strategic Policy of Horsham District re Housing Provision which very clearly refers to Horsham, Southwater and Billingshurst - not tiny villages such as Rudgwick & Bucks Green
- Policy 17 also very importantly talks about countryside land only being allowed to be developed in Exceptional Circumstances - these have not been met in the case of Rudgwick and Bucks Green and this proposal should be dismissed on this basis alone

Summary: Proposing to build 12% of the target new houses for the whole district in a village with just 2% of the districts population is illogical. The planning framework is also clear that the focus should be on the Gatwick area which this most certainly is not. Policy 17 is also clear and the Exceptional Circumstances have not been met

2) Local Amenities Cannot Cope

- The village school has not enough space for current children living in the village. It is one class per year and set up to try to educate the size of village that we are - no more houses / population can be added
- The local doctors is also stretched and we have had to stay registered at a doctors in Cranleigh
- There is also only 1 very small local pharmacy and shop that only keeps up with the local population
- The local village does not have fire rescue services / medical emergency facilities are already a long time away and adding more houses and population will put people at risk

Summary - the local school is already full and we cannot attend / other local amenities are at breaking point such as GP - there is no room for more to be added. Emergency services are also stretched and more houses & population present more risk to those already in the village and any new residents

### 3) Overdevelopment:

- Proposed 90 new homes with an average of 4 people per house = 360 people
- This would be adding 12% to the population of the combined Rudgwick and Bucks Green village which is currently c3k - this would be outrageous and is a complete over development

Summary: Adding 12% to the population of a small village with the infrastructure of a small village and the amenities of a small village is completely unsustainable and a complete over development

### 4) A281 overstretched and dangerous / fatalities close to proposed site::

- The A281 is already completely and utterly over stretched and dangerous especially a few hundred yards away where the Downs Link is split in 2 by the A281 and tragically deaths have been caused
- If each household has conservatively 2 cars, adding 180 new cars every single day into this equation is very dangerous indeed
- The A281 turning from Lynwick street is also very dangerous with cars coming at high speed into Buck Green - again having a house estate add more cars to this is dangerous
- Also the A281 is crumbling with road works consistently needed - this is a country road that was not set up to deal with the amount of traffic is having to cope with, another 180 cars conservatively will mean it cannot cope
- Policy SD9 of the Planning Framework also refers to the need for a "comprehensive transport assessment to demonstrate the additional amounts of traffic movement including but not limited to north on the A24 and the A281 that would be generated by all the residential and business development proposed"

Summary - it would be reckless and very dangerous indeed to add more cars to the A281 especially with the very dangerous spot where the Downs Link is cut in 2 by the A281 only a few hundred yards away and more traffic will cause increased risk of more fatal accidents. The necessary in depth assessment required under Policy SD9 has also not been undertaken.

### 5) Pollution / Trees / Plants / Animals / Landscape

- The pollution from c. 180 new cars alone in a small village is terrifying along with the trucks / diggers etc to build the proposed houses
- These are also fields currently full off and surrounded by cattle as well as smaller animals of all shapes and sizes including deer, squirrels etc
- The pollution caused by 1 new car, let alone 180 new cars as well as trucks / diggers into the village will mean air quality degradation and climate change, direct risks to our children and the animals. A typical passenger vehicle emits about 4.6 metric tons of carbon dioxide per year. This can cause respiratory problems, cardiovascular disease, and other health issues.

- All of this added to the fact that trees will be lost as well as countryside destroyed make this a complete non starter from a conservation perspective
- Clause 9.9 in Policy 24 of the Planning Framework also makes clear this risk needs to be mitigated
- Also key at Clause 9.13 that the whole District is an "Emission Reduction Area" where emissions must be minimised where possible

Summary: The pollution risk to children and animals is far too high and this cannot be allowed. The destruction of trees and countryside is also not logical

#### 6) Noise:

- This is the countryside - building 90 new homes along with diggers, excavators, earth removers, installation of utilities, refuse collection, 180 new household cars etc is completely unsustainable in a village of this size
- Clause 9.11 in Policy 24 of the Planning Framework also makes clear this risk needs to be mitigated

Summary: The noise caused will change the whole way of life for people living here currently

#### 7) Other

- Clause 9.14 of Policy 25 makes clear that the "rural qualities of Horsham district are highly valued" and that "the potential for development to result in small changes which cumulatively impact on landscape, settlement, character and the natural environment will be a key consideration, particularly in terms of the impact on smaller scale and local features"
- We are a very small village - the impact of this proposal would devastate the landscape of this village and change the whole character as well as natural environment
- The proposed development does not meet any of the circumstances for exceptions under clause 9.17 of Policy 25

Conclusion:

- The above are just the beginning of the reasons as to why this application must be refused

The information provided above provides more than enough evidence and proof as to why this cannot go ahead under any circumstances and must be rejected

I cannot attend in person on the 22nd September due to previous commitments but if I need to attend a further meeting to discuss do please let me know

With best wishes

[REDACTED]