

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 06 November 2025 06:59:43 UTC+00:00  
**To:** "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application DC/25/1327  
**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 06/11/2025 6:59 AM.

### Application Summary

Address:	Land East of Mousdell Close Rectory Lane Ashington RH20 3GS
Proposal:	Erection of 74 dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping.
Case Officer:	Sam Whitehouse

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

Address:	15 Mousdell Close Ashington
----------	-----------------------------

### Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Design</li><li>- Highway Access and Parking</li><li>- Overdevelopment</li><li>- Privacy Light and Noise</li><li>- Trees and Landscaping</li></ul>
Comments:	Formal Objection to Proposed Residential Development Ashington Parish - Horsham District Council
I wish to submit a formal objection to the proposed housing development on the following grounds, which I consider to be contrary to the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF), the	

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and relevant local parish policies.

**1. Highway Safety and Road Capacity**

The existing road network is narrow and not designed to accommodate the increased volume of traffic associated with additional dwellings. This raises significant safety concerns for motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians. This conflicts with HDPF Policy 40 (Sustainable Transport) and NPPF Paragraph 111, which states development should only proceed if it does not result in unacceptable impacts on highway safety.

**2. Ecological and Wildlife Impact**

The proposed site forms part of an established habitat corridor supporting local wildlife. There is insufficient ecological evidence demonstrating avoidance, mitigation, or net biodiversity gain as required under HDPF Policy 31 (Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity) and NPPF Paragraph 180.

**3. Increased Traffic and Congestion**

The incremental traffic load will exacerbate congestion, particularly at peak times, and may increase accident risk. This is inconsistent with HDPF Policy 32 (The Quality of New Development), which requires developments to integrate safely into the existing transport network.

**4. Water Supply Infrastructure Capacity**

There is doubt over whether the water mains infrastructure can support additional properties without negatively impacting existing households. HDPF Policy 37 requires developments to demonstrate sufficient utility provision, which has not been satisfactorily evidenced.

**5. Electricity Supply Constraints**

The local electrical network is already limited. No substantiated plan for capacity reinforcement has been provided, contrary to HDPF Policy 38 (Infrastructure Provision).

**6. Protection and Maintenance of Trees and Verges**

The proposed development risks the removal and disturbance of established verges and mature trees that contribute to visual character and biodiversity. This conflicts with HDPF Policy 33 (Development Principles) and NPPF guidance on conserving natural features.

**7. Pedestrian Safety and Pavement Provision**

Current pavements are narrow and do not meet safe access standards. Increased pedestrian movements would heighten safety concerns, breaching the requirements of HDPF Policies 32 and 40, which call for safe and accessible movement networks.

**8. Inadequate Road Lighting**

Street lighting is currently insufficient to ensure safe navigation for both vehicles and pedestrians. Any development should not proceed without secured infrastructure improvements, contrary to HDPF Policy 33.

**9. Lack of Mobile Network Connectivity (4G/5G)**

The site currently suffers from poor mobile reception. This is a significant safety and communications issue and conflicts with HDPF Policy 37, which requires adequate communication

---

infrastructure to support development.

#### 10. Emergency Access Limitations

In the event that the primary access road is blocked, there is no viable alternative route for emergency services. This represents a serious and unacceptable risk to life and safety, conflicting with NPPF requirements for safe and suitable access for all users.

□

#### Conclusion

The proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with multiple key policies in the Horsham District Planning Framework, the National Planning Policy Framework, and considerations within the Ashington parish settlement context. On this basis, I respectfully request that the application be refused.

---

Kind regards

#### Telephone:

Email: [planning@horsham.gov.uk](mailto: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](http://www.horsham.gov.uk) Chief Executive: Jane E aton