

Dear Ms Hannah Darley,

Planning Reference: DC/25/1899

Further to the above planning reference. I writing as a local resident with significant concerns about the proposed development. These concerns range from the quality of the application information provided, water resources, privacy, green space, parking and most significantly the safety of residents and the general public.

The Health and Safety at Work, Act 1974 requires safe access and egress to every workplace. Entrances to construction sites are particularly hazardous due the concentration of movement there — of people, materials, vehicles and plant. Due to the unique nature of the sites location, as stated by the applicant themselves, PLANNING STATEMENT: P-073 paragraph 2.2, *“The site is served by pedestrian walkways to the south, east and west with no vehicular access present”*.

The sole vehicular & plant access would require driving over the playing field owned by North Horsham Parish Council from Rowlands Road. This location is <20m from the Amberley Close Children’s Playground and over the field with football goal posts. This land is widely used by children, dog walkers, residents and the general public. Footpath access to the site from the highway for people, materials, vehicles, plant and waste is the sole access for residents. [REDACTED]

As stated under The Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015 section 17, *“There must, so far as is reasonably practicable, be suitable and sufficient safe access to and egress”*. The first control in the hierarchy of risk management is always to **eliminate risk**. Therefore, the only logical decision is to reject this planning application on safety grounds.

Due to the foreseeable safety risk from the site access and egress, I feel its essential to involve the HSE at this preliminary stage. A copy of this letter and supporting documentation has been provided to them due to the severity of the risk.

Additionally, Paragraph 6.35 states, *“Any additional parking demand could be comfortably accommodated on surrounding streets, where there is no evidence to suggest any that any existing parking issues would be exacerbated.”* This statement is evident that a minimal desktop effort has been made to satisfy the application requirements. On any given day during usual home occupation hours there is insufficient parking. All spaces are occupied resulting in residents needing to park on footpaths to accommodate their vehicles. Supporting photos attached (images ‘Parking 1’, ‘Parking 2’ and ‘Parking 3’).

Furthermore, due to restricted site access from the highway the Developer must provide detail and guarantees of material storage locations, during construction and for supplier deliveries. Due to existing parking issues, spaces cannot be utilised for materials or deliveries to further reduce parking opportunities.

As the South of England is classified a Water Stressed Area, declared by the Environment Agency, every effort must be made to deliver water efficient developments. Infill does not support the economy of scale for sustainable drainage and water efficiency. The removal of a Water Neutrality requirement should not be the reckless 'hand break release' by the Planning Authority to approve infill development, driving private greed over water resource scarcity.

Additionally, I note no per capita calculation required under Part 7 of The Building Regulations 2010 has been provided by the applicant. Therefore, any proposed PCC cannot be measured against the Part G technical standard.

In reference to the Southern Waters formal consultation response dated the 28th November 2025. It was identified on the asset drawing provided there is an existing 4" potable water main positioned directly below the proposed new build position. This potable main feeds all existing residents of Rowlands Road. As detailed in the response the property must be 6m clear of the mains position either side. This makes the applicants proposal wholly untenable. Alternatively, under section 185 of The Water Industry Act 1991, it is the Developers sole responsibility and liability to full fund the diversion and associated legal costs to reposition the water main feeding Rowlands Road residents.

The desktop application documents BLOCK PLAN: PBP, REV A marks the existing position of Open Reaches telephone pole. It fails to identify the chamber in proximity of the pole which, as per the plans provided by the applicant, would be incorporated within the site boundary. No evidence or comment has been provided as part of this application to detail engagement with Open Reaches Asset Protection team. Existing residents have communication lines run from the pole to their properties. No detail has been provided regarding seeking wayleaves or easements from the asset owner to guarantee the residents security of supply.

Within the document titled APPLICATION FORM, the Existing Use section marks all contaminated land sections as 'No'. However the land had a legacy use as a pig farm prior to development in the 1960's. It is anticipated that applicant reassess the requirement for a contamination assessment with your application due to the risk of microbiological contamination levels.

There is a serious concern with a loss of privacy. The proposed buildings windows will be looking directly into each adjacent property as shown on applicants plan PROPOSED ELEVATION PLAN: PEV, REV A. This will become an overbearing presence in direct line of sight from each surrounding property resulting in a complete loss of outlook. Additionally, it is unachievable to maintain the Design Code Separation Distances based on the current proposal. The application states a 'boundary hedge' will be installed – This minor proposal is insufficient to maintain the privacy of local residents. Any amended proposal to incorporate a larger visual obstruction would not be in keeping with the visual aesthetic or character of the neighbourhood.

The above concerns should also be considered for the detrimental impact on neighbourhood amenity. Specifically for properties numbered 9-20, Rowlands Road. This development will have a direct impact on their living standards. Not limited to privacy but including development noise, dust, parking conditions, vibration and lastly the previously mentioned **safety risk** to residents and the general public.

Finally, on a personal note, I strongly oppose any schemes involving any potential harm to the ecology of the Green Belt. The space is a haven for English wildlife, I have witnessed hedgehogs, bats and deer (images 'Deer 1' and 'Deer 2'). It is saddening to lose more green space and English wildlife for the sake of greed.

To maximise engagement and ensure we land on a common sense outcome on this matter a copy of this response and tailored covering letter has been provided to the following parties:

- John Milne (MP for Horsham) [REDACTED]
- Councillor Tony Bevis – [REDACTED]
- Councillor Belinda Walters – [REDACTED]
- North Horsham Parish Council – [REDACTED]
- The Health and Safety Executive - [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- The Argus - [REDACTED]
- West Sussex County Times - [REDACTED]
- All About Horsham – [REDACTED]

Lastly, I'd like to draw attention to the number of significant omissions identified within this letter, either through negligence, poor stakeholder engagement or an intentional lack of transparency. This fills myself with no confidence that any development would be delivered to a professional, compliant or safe standard. On this basis and for all reasons provided within this letter I strongly urge you to reject this planning application.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

18 Rowlands Road.



Site boundary location

Residents sole footpath access

Playground and access path









