

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 12 January 2026 09:29
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/1954

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 12/01/2026 9:28 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	1 Hilltop Cottages The Mount Ifield West Sussex RH11 0LF
Proposal:	Removal of existing barn building and erection of 5no. detached single storey self-build/custom build dwellings with associated works.
Case Officer:	Hannah Darley

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Hillplace, The Mount, Ifield Crawley
----------	--------------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design- Highway Access and Parking- Loss of General Amenity- Other- Overdevelopment- Privacy Light and Noise- Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	<p>Dear Sir/Madam Re- DC/25/1954</p> <p>As a neighbour and owner of a business in the immediate vicinity of the proposed site I strongly object to this application.</p> <p>I also suggest that the applicant's other recent application for even further residential building DC/25/1963 should have been submitted together as one application as they are on the same site.</p> <p>The applicants supporting statement from MME Planning services completely neglects to</p>

mention the Southern end of the applicants barn and proposed area for residential dwellings is literally less than 20 metres away from a busy Commercial Boarding and Breeding Kennels housing up to 50 dogs, despite them even providing a photograph in the first few lines of the summary showing the ridiculously close proximity to the kennels living/sleeping and recreation areas of resident and visiting dogs, just a few metres away across the dividing farm track. Any future residents could literally and probably would interact with dogs in this area that is only a few meters away, it is so ridiculous a proposition it is no wonder nobody in a supportive role is mentioning it.

The business and occupants would undoubtedly run into conflict with any residents living so close to the kennels, neighbouring amenity and living areas would be blighted by reactive dogs disturbed by residents so close to their living/sleeping and recreation areas, this would in turn cause a statutory noise nuisance to residents and curtail any future development or expansion plans we have for an existing successful business and result in attempts to restrict our business and activities.

At such close proximity to the kennel living/sleeping areas the light pollution from properties and disturbance at night from residents coming home late, leaving for work early around the plot would also disturb resident dogs and make them reactive, again increasing our workload trying to placate reactive and disturbed dogs, this sort of disturbance disturbs the whole of the kennels and is stressful for them, this is not what our customers expect.

It is essential to provide as much light and ventilation to dogs during warmer and busy periods, the dogs need more recreation and enrichment time outside of the kennel buildings, doors, windows and roof velux windows are wide open day and night, it is unreasonable to expect our business activities that centre around the welfare of our clients dogs to be compromised so as not to disturb neighbours that are located so close to a Commercial Boarding Kennels.

It is also totally unacceptable to expect ourselves and staff to have to work with unnecessarily unsettled, agitated and disturbed dogs, this creates extra workload and can be dangerous to ourselves, staff and stressful for resident and visiting dogs in our care. This also affects the breeding side of our business where we do not want dogs disturbed, or stressed, there was a very good reason for locating the kennels in a quiet location away from local residents and neighbourly disturbance. Kennels can be a stressful experience for dogs and for staff working in them and such close proximity to our property from the proposed development would be extremely detrimental to our business, to the welfare and safety of dogs in our care and the staff that must handle them.

The supplied noise survey is misleading in the fact that it was conducted in March when the kennels are at their lowest occupancy and mostly locked down due to the colder, wetter, Winter weather elements, any resident dogs recreation and enrichment time outside is limited for the same reason, If the noise survey was conducted during the warmer months and peak season it would give a more accurate insight into how vocal disturbed dogs can be, of course the survey would not be able to factor in the difference of the currently undisturbed dogs to ones that would be disturbed by building works, demolition and numerous residents within a close audible and visual distance.

The supplied noise survey would also apply to aircraft noise which must be considered in any new residential development in our location, insulation and triple glazing cannot mitigate the disturbance caused by aircraft in amenity and outdoor leisure areas.

Gatwick is running off peak in March, around 150 fewer flights a day compared to peak times, many flights at this time of year that would normally on the prevailing South Easterly winds be taking off over our heads with engines full thrust are now sedately cruising in on barely any engine power to land from the West due to prevailing Winter Northerly winds.

Since this survey was conducted last March all residents of the Mount have recently been advised in letters from Gatwick of the likely adverse impact of aircraft movement in our area with the Northern Runway project under way with an estimated 60,000 extra flights a year. I note on the application the applicant was unable to answer where surface water from the proposed 5 properties plus the one in the separate application DC/25/1963 would be dispersed too, and was unable to answer where the sewerage from them would go either, the property and plot do not benefit from mains sewerage so this would have to be dealt with on site. The small area of land to the Southern end of the plot and the only available area which is not being proposed to be built on is waterlogged heavy clay and it should be noted a direct route between Pond 1 and 2 on the ecology survey for hibernating and breeding amphibians like GCN and smooth newts, these protected species breed in ponds but live and hibernate on land, it would be safe to assume the land between the two ponds proposed for development is a thriving habitat for them as they have been recorded in both ponds, this area should not be

attempted to be turned into a sewerage and surface water soakaway, there are no waterways to discharge to from the site so where does the effluent go?

The proposed site would be accessed off The Mount via a privately owned unlit single lane farm track which is not owned by the applicant, the new owner of the track is not local and possibly unaware of this application, the lanes around The Mount are very narrow with few passing points, there are no pedestrian footpaths and they are unlit, there is no public transport, it is located miles from any local services such as shops and schools, doctor surgeries, this development will be adding more traffic to the narrow Country lanes, the infrastructure for new properties is not there, I would suggest this also makes it a very poor location to build more residential properties.

Regards [REDACTED].

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: 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 Chief Executive: Jane Eaton