

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 08 February 2026 11:02  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** \*\*REDACT\*\*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 08/02/2026 11:01 AM.

### 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: 3 Countryside Farm Park, Church Lane, Upper Beeding, Steyning, BN44 3HF Steyning

### Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Overdevelopment
Comments:	Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the planning application for the erection of four detached dwellings at Church Farm Walk, Upper Beeding 519396 111237 ref DC/25/2114.

I am a resident of Countryside Farm Park, Church Lane, and a directly affected neighbour. I am also a disabled resident and Motability Scooter user who relies on Church Lane for daily access. This objection is made on the basis of material planning considerations, in particular the unacceptable impacts on highway and pedestrian safety, accessibility for disabled users, landscape character, and ecology.

#### 1. Highway Safety, Pedestrian Safety and Inclusive Access

Church Lane is a narrow, single-track lane with no pavements, no formal passing places, and limited visibility. Crucially, Church Lane is designated by Horsham District Council and signed

on-site as a Public Footpath, with the carriageway itself forming the footpath due to the complete absence of any separate pedestrian provision.

As a result, pedestrians are required to walk within the lane itself. The route is heavily used throughout the day by a wide range of users, including walkers and dog walkers accessing public footpaths via the steps beside St Peter's Church, parents with pushchairs, wheelchair users and mobility scooter users accessing the Churchside Café, parishioners attending St Peter's Church, and school children using the recently refurbished White Bridge Link to Steyning Grammar School. In addition, Church Lane regularly accommodates groups of six or more hikers and ramblers, using the lane as part of a designated walking route.

Due to the restricted width of Church Lane, it is common practice for pedestrians to be forced into private driveways or gateways in order to allow vehicles to pass. For disabled users, including mobility scooter and wheelchair users, this is often difficult or unsafe and, in some cases, not possible at all. The absence of a pavement or segregated pedestrian space means that vulnerable users must directly share the carriageway with vehicles.

The proposed development would result in a material and harmful intensification of vehicle movements along Church Lane. Four large detached dwellings would reasonably be expected to generate a minimum of two private vehicles per household, together with frequent visits from delivery and service vehicles such as Royal Mail, Amazon, and supermarket delivery vehicles including Tesco, Ocado and similar providers. This would significantly increase vehicle-pedestrian conflict on a route that already functions primarily as a public footpath.

Given the lane's designation and existing use, the proposal fails to demonstrate that safe, suitable, and inclusive access can be achieved for all users. The development would materially worsen conditions for pedestrians and disabled users and is contrary to national and local planning policy that seeks to prioritise pedestrian safety, protect public rights of way, and ensure inclusive access.

## 2. Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

The proposed development represents overdevelopment of a sensitive site and is out of keeping with the established semi-rural and historic character of Church Farm Walk and the wider area. The scale, density, and form of development would erode local character and fail to respect the existing pattern of development.

## 3. Overdevelopment and Inappropriate Density

The intensity of development proposed is excessive given the constrained access, greenfield nature of the site, and surrounding context. The resulting form of development would appear cramped and incongruous and would conflict with policies requiring development to respond positively to local character and infrastructure limitations.

## 4. Impact on Residential Amenity

The proposal would result in increased noise, disturbance, activity, and traffic movements, causing ongoing harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents. These impacts would be particularly acute for disabled residents who rely on safe and predictable access.

## 5. Ecology, Wildlife and Greenfield Land

The site proposed for development is an ancient greenfield field that acts as an important habitat for a wide range of wildlife, including badgers, bats, reptiles, butterflies, and a variety of bird species. The loss of this greenfield land would result in significant harm to local biodiversity.

The site is identified within the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) under reference SA629, confirming that it is a recognised site subject to planning scrutiny. Furthermore, the site lies within the Risk Zone of the Beeding Hill to Newtimber Hill Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Development within this zone has the

potential to cause indirect adverse effects on the SSSI through increased human activity, disturbance, lighting, noise, and habitat fragmentation.

Of particular concern is the fact that the field was cleared of vegetation prior to the undertaking of the submitted Ecological Survey. This clearance would have materially altered the ecological value of the site at the time of survey and is likely to have resulted in an inaccurate and understated assessment of existing habitats and species.

This raises serious concerns regarding the validity of the ecological baseline used to assess the development. As all developments are now required to demonstrate a minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain, an artificially reduced baseline undermines the ability of the Local Planning Authority to properly assess whether this requirement can be genuinely met. A compromised baseline risks masking the true ecological value of the site and could lead to inappropriate conclusions regarding biodiversity impacts and mitigation.

In the absence of an accurate, pre-clearance ecological baseline and robust evidence demonstrating genuine biodiversity net gain, the proposal fails to comply with national and local planning policy relating to biodiversity protection and enhancement. The precautionary principle should therefore be applied.

#### 6. Infrastructure and Sustainability Concerns

The application does not adequately demonstrate that local infrastructure, including access arrangements and services, can safely accommodate the scale of development proposed. The cumulative impact of additional dwellings has not been properly addressed.

#### Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the proposed development would result in unacceptable harm to highway and pedestrian safety, inclusive access for disabled residents, local character, and biodiversity. It represents overdevelopment of a sensitive greenfield site within the risk zone of an SSSI and fails to meet the requirements of national and local planning policy. I therefore respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority refuses this application.

Yours faithfully,

██████████

Kind regards

**Telephone:**  
**Email:** [planning@horsham.gov.uk](mailto: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](http://www.horsham.gov.uk) Chief Executive: Jane Eaton