

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 19 November 2025 11:40:39 UTC+00:00  
**To:** "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application DC/25/0894  
**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 19/11/2025 11:40 AM.

### Application Summary

Address:	Land To The South of Broadbridge Way Broadbridge Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	Full Planning Application for the erection of 92no. residential dwellings comprising dwellings (54no.) and apartments (35no.), 36% affordable homes, creation of new vehicular access on to Sergent Way, provision of public open space, landscaping and drainage solutions.
Case Officer:	Matthew Porter

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

Address: Medecroft Cox Green Rudgwick Horsham West Sussex

### Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Other
Comments:	The acquisition cost of the land on the site proposed for development was all incurred in the original Wickhurst development for 963 homes back in 2011. The land was 'allocated' for community (school) use under S106.  So 100% of the acquisition cost was used by the applicant's

predecessor then to conclude 'poor' financial viability thereby gaining agreement to lower planning obligations (e.g. 20% affordable homes v policy compliant 40%).

Given that background, the financial viability of this development must be massive as the planning gain is effectively based on a land acquisition cost of NIL. The acquisition costs of the same piece of development land surely cannot be used in 2 separate viability assessments (from effectively the same applicant)?

Accordingly the application of HDC's existing 'bargain basement' CIL supplemented by the paltry contributions offered in addition (see ECE Planning letter dated 31st October) does not result in sufficient capture of an adequate share of the planning gain for the community.

HDC should therefore either:

\*\*Because of these exceptional circumstances (arising from the totally inadequate wording of the original 2011 S106 Schedule 5) declare the site to be excluded from CIL and subject to S106 where a reasonable expectation would be to capture significantly more financial contributions for infrastructure via S106

Or

\*\*Refuse to discharge the S106 being attempted under S106/25/0027 on the grounds that such proposed usage would not comply with the intended covenants that would ensure that Wickhurst Green residents are not adversely affected in any way.

They clearly would be badly affected (see the significant number of objections) by these development proposals and so the application should be refused.

In order to determine the best way forward HDC should insist that the applicant submits a full viability assessment and then HDC should arrange for it to be independently assessed and made public.

Given that the land cost should be NIL, even if it proves 'impossible' to prevent this unwanted development , then the additional contributions offered by the applicant must surely be massively increased.....even tenfold might far too small an uplift.

---

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 E aton