
From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 17 September 2025 22:12
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/1300

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 17/09/2025 10:11 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	High Chaparral London Road Washington Pulborough West Sussex RH20 3BP
Proposal:	Permission in Principle for the construction of 4no. two storey dwellings.
Case Officer:	Hannah Darley

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	20 Spring Gardens Washington
----------	------------------------------

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- Other- Overdevelopment- Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	<p>The current proposal is a scaled down version of a planning application on the same (0.99 hectare) site that was rejected on appeal in August 2017 (DC/16/1963). It is unapologetic in taking advantage of the new circumstances pertaining to planning applications following the publication of HMG's latest NPPF in December 2024 (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework).</p> <p>Horsham District Council (HDC) has subsequently outlined its own priorities for the District's planning framework contained in the Planning Advice Note entitled 'Shaping Development in the Horsham District' document. I have consulted these planning principles prior to making this comment (c/o the link to the Advice Note via https://www.horsham.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy).</p> <p>From this, it would appear that despite the 'tilted balance' in favour of sustainable development under the revised NPPF, HDC is under no obligation to rush to grant planning permission in principle (PIP) until a full cost/benefit analysis of this particular windfall site is undertaken. In</p>

addition to proven sustainability, water neutrality compliance must be demonstrated by all new proposed developments.

The previous application of 2016 was turned down because it failed to meet the objectives of the Horsham District Planning Framework of 2015 primarily for being outside a built-up area boundary (BUAB). But there were also a number of local concerns aired at the time (see comments and correspondence under DC/16/1963 and the appeal process of 2017) that still apply to the current application.

Firstly, the access route to the proposed site is essentially a paved driveway leading to the two existing residences it serves, of limited width and single-track in nature. It is also a public right of way, much used by local dog-walkers and pedestrians seeking access via the footpath which continues uphill beyond the proposed site to the National Trust Warren Hill woods at Washington Common. Comments recorded at the time of the previous proposals in 2016 (see letters/comments under Harding and Moon, for example, under DC/16/1963) raised concerns about the feasibility of increasing the width of this driveway to allow for traffic/pedestrian passing bays, as well as the risk to 'cross' traffic (and pedestrians) coming in and leaving the junction that adjoins Spring Gardens. Access is via a blind left turn just after traffic from the A24 dual carriageway enters the adjacent lay-by and turns immediately left into Spring Gardens. Commenting on the previous application, a [REDACTED] neighbour, [REDACTED], wrote of near miss accidents [REDACTED] witnessed as speeding traffic left the A24 to make a sharp turn into the (uphill) entry to Spring Gardens.

Under the current application (see: 'Access & Parking' under points 8.1 and following) there is no longer mention of creating passing bays for cars as in the previous application. This is presumably on the assumption that fewer houses (now 4 detached houses, each with double garages, down from 7 mixed dwellings) will place fewer burdens on the driveway in question. Since 2017, however, there have been further developments in the immediate vicinity of this route in the form of a new (bricked) vehicle entrance to the paddock on the immediate right of the access route's entry from Spring Gardens, together with a new stable block constructed on a large area of hardstanding where a number of roofing contractor vehicles are parked overnight. This adds to the local traffic that is likely to be entering and exiting Spring Gardens at this juncture at any given time.

No mention was made by the Highway Authority in 2016-17 of the increased density of lorries parked up in the adjacent lay-by and the through traffic generated by local factory employees, Toovey's auction house, the caravan centre and Spring Gardens Nursery and café, in addition to the mobile café situated in the lay-by off the A24 just past the Spring Gardens entrance. This range of traffic congestion has considerably complicated the safe entry and departure of local traffic via Spring Gardens, and by extension to and from the proposed access route to the development site. Visibility from the exit of the driveway is very poor, and one solution proposed in 2016-17 was to increase the width of the entrance and cut back vegetation/hedging to increase the sight line. The subsequent development of the adjacent paddock makes it even less feasible than previously that the proposed access route could be widened at any point, nor passing bays included in the development plan. On the non-paddock side there remains a small stream/brook and ditch which would need to be filled in and re-routed to avoid flooding.

This links to the second level of concern, already aired in 2016-17, of the increased risk of flooding at the entrance to Spring Gardens at its lowest point, and on the proposed greenfield development site itself (see Para 11 of NPPF on flooding). The map included in the comments submitted by [REDACTED] in 2016 illustrates the flooding problems that persist across the proposed access route and site. Local monitoring and inspections this coming winter will be needed to ascertain whether the deep floods of recent years at the foot of Spring Gardens are a freak occurrence or part of a changing picture related to climate change. There may also have been changes to the routes of waterways (Spring Gardens having been named after the local spring) since the recent paddock infill with hardcore.

As a traffic and pedestrian hazard, the junction of the proposed access route constitutes a point of very high risk if and when incoming/outgoing traffic is forced to stop short when flood waters are present at the foot of Spring Gardens. The latter could also render the footpath/driveway inaccessible for several days at a time.

The proposed site itself, comprised of a hollow in a steeply sloped greenfield site is also subject to flooding: I have seen water-logging in the proposed site from the window of my own house, backed up by the map evidence of [REDACTED], cited above. Again, this may just be a freak occurrence that can be addressed within the 'water neutral' plan or through other site drainage specifications required of a full planning proposal. But it will require close inspection over this coming winter, at very least, to ascertain whether this is a recurrent and ongoing issue.

Also pertinent to HDC's Planning Advice Note cited above, are the following points:

(1) the assertion that the new development would form part of the existing community of Spring Gardens and the semi-industrial sites in the vicinity (eg Bell Leisure) is not entirely accurate. What the application does not make entirely clear is that the proposed development would be contiguous to, but not directly connected to any of these sites, all being accessed by entirely different routes. The far end of Spring Gardens closest to the proposed development is a cul-de-sac, for example, adjacent to, but not directly connected to the footpath which continues beyond the driveway to the proposed site. Access to Bell Leisure is from the A24 exit to the south of Spring Gardens, with a side entrance off the road leading to the garden centre (etc).

(2) The proposed site is situated down the hill from High Chaparral and Hilly Fields and thus is not intended to overlook either. But the first house in the planned development would overlook the houses at the cul-de-sac end of Spring Gardens, to which it would be in very close proximity, but not linked in any way to the existing community (see NPPF advice on overlooking).

(3) This a quiet and compact community, much appreciated by its residents for its rural character, shielded by trees from the A24. The lack of a sufficiently wide and comfortable access route to the proposed development site would constitute a major disruption during construction to the privacy and noise disturbance of this settled community, on both sides of the access driveway. The most negatively affected would be the residents of houses situated parallel to the driveway on the A24 side of the brook/stream, along with those in closest proximity to the construction site itself (eg Hilly Fields Cottage and the cul-de-sac end of Spring Gardens).

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