

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 09 February 2026 20:39  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application DC/25/2114

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**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 09/02/2026 8:39 PM.

### 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:	78 Church Lane Upper Beeding
----------	------------------------------

### Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Highway Access and Parking</li><li>- Overdevelopment</li><li>- Privacy Light and Noise</li><li>- Trees and Landscaping</li></ul>
Comments:	<p>Objection to Planning Application DC/25/2114 - Land at Church Farm Walk, Upper Beeding</p> <p>I wish to formally object to the above planning application.</p> <p>Highway safety and access The proposed development would be accessed via Church Farm Walk, Church Lane, Deacons Way and Pepperscombe, all of which are narrow, single-width residential roads. Church Farm Walk and Church Lane have no footpaths and are used daily by pedestrians</p>

including school children, parents with buggies, elderly residents, mobility scooter users, dog walkers and visitors to the church and river.

It is important to clarify that the so-called "grass verges" on Church Lane are private front gardens, not public highway, and cannot reasonably or safely be used by pedestrians to avoid traffic. There is therefore no safe pedestrian refuge.

Construction traffic, including HGVs, would use these roads for a prolonged period, potentially up to two years, creating significant safety risks, noise, vibration, air pollution and road damage. Once completed, the development would generate a permanent increase in traffic. It is estimated this could result in over 30 additional vehicle movements per day, which is wholly inappropriate for roads of this nature.

#### Ecology and biodiversity

The field was cleared of dense vegetation on 4 August, with the ecological survey carried out on 11 August. Prior to clearance, the field was inaccessible due to extensive vegetation. This action altered the ecological baseline and renders the survey unreliable.

All new developments are required to demonstrate a minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. By clearing the site before survey, the baseline has been artificially reduced, giving a false reading of existing biodiversity. Horsham District Council previously took issue with this approach when the site was refused planning permission.

██████████ bats are known to be present locally, and long-eared bats have been recorded foraging within this field. The loss of habitat cannot be adequately mitigated.

#### Conflict with planning policy

The Upper Beeding Neighbourhood Development Plan (SHELAA site SA629) explicitly states that this greenfield site is not suitable for development due to its location within environmentally sensitive designations and its unmitigable impacts on biodiversity, heritage and landscape character. As a made neighbourhood plan, this carries full statutory weight.

#### Heritage and character

The site forms part of the setting of the Grade I listed St Peter's Church and the historic Sele Priory. Development would urbanise the edge of the village and harm the rural character and heritage setting.

#### Lack of public benefit

The proposal is for a small number of luxury homes, which does not address local housing need or the affordable housing crisis. Significant housing development has already been approved nearby, including 265 dwellings north of Glebe Farm.

#### Conclusion

The site has previously been rejected due to fundamental constraints, which remain unchanged. For reasons of highway safety, flawed ecological assessment, failure to demonstrate biodiversity net gain, conflict with the Neighbourhood Development Plan, heritage harm and lack of public interest, this application should be refused.

---

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: [planning@horsham.gov.uk](mailto:planning@horsham.gov.uk)



Horsham  
District  
Council

