

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 May 2025 16:17:09 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/0629
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 19/05/2025 4:17 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Former Novartis Site Parsonage Road Horsham West Sussex RH12 5AA
Proposal:	Residential development comprising approximately 206 dwellings, including the conversion of 'Building 3' and demolition of 'Building 36'. Vehicular access taken from Wimblehurst Road. Car and cycle parking, landscaping and open space and associated works. The replacement of the existing cedar trees at the site.
Case Officer:	Jason Hawkes

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	12 Allcard Close Horsham
----------	--------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Highway Access and Parking- Loss of General Amenity- Overdevelopment
Comments:	We have lived within 200m of the former Novartis site since 1974 and have used the North Heath Lane/Parsonage Road/Wimblehurst junction on a daily basis as a driver, cyclist and pedestrian. To prepare this response I commissioned drone

photographs and video files of the area.

Let me state from the beginning that I am in favour of the former Novartis site being used for an appropriate level of housing development. However, there will be 450 dwellings in total and parking spaces for 568 cars, 10% more than the capacity of the Piries Place Car Park. There are likely to be substantially in excess of 1000 residents including children of all ages. That is around a 10% increase over the combined populations of Holbrook North and Holbrook South.

Given the number of additional cars, pedestrians and cyclists in the immediate vicinity of the very busy Wimblehurst Road/Parsonage Road/North Heath Lane mini-roundabout and its feeder roads it is important to have an independent and reliable assessment of the future impact of this additional traffic.

The Transport Assessment submitted for this Application is not fit this purpose. In many aspects it is both misleading and inaccurate. Some of these are a result of a near-total lack of local knowledge. In a list of local amenities (Table 1 p9) there is no reference to Holbrook and Bohunt schools, many nursery and pre-schools, St. Mark's Church and a doctors' surgery, all of which will generate traffic. The consultants have even failed to notice that ThamesLink trains serve Horsham station. This indicates a concerning lack of professional diligence.

With regard to encouraging cycle use, the Transport Assessment states "With wide carriageways [...] the site location provides a good opportunity to encourage cycling". Wimblehurst Road, Richmond Road and North Heath Lane are not wide enough for cyclists to travel safely and Parsonage Road is little better. There may be many cycle paths in the wider area but site residents will not wish to take high-risk routes out of the site to explore them. Again a lack of professional diligence!

I am completely mystified about the proposal to introduce a right-turn lane for traffic turning right into the site having driven over the railway bridge. The justification from the developers is that this will reduce the obstruction of vehicles turning right on the flow of traffic travelling northbound. There is also no assessment of the number of cars that can occupy the ghost lane and what happens if a resident approaches the site and there is no room. The developers seem not to be able to accept that only visitors ever used the small car park close to the gate houses.

Remarkably there is no comment on the impact of this ghost lane right turn on traffic approaching the site from the exit of the mini-roundabout travelling south and exiting from the development and turning right. Perhaps this is because there are no south-bound traffic arrows on the junction schematic in Appendix I?

In considering what might be an appropriate level of additional traffic there are two very important metrics that need to be reliably presented. These two metrics are the number of car journeys in and out of the site over the course of a day and the direction that drivers will take after leaving the site. Based on these metrics it is possible to determine whether the local road junctions can manage the increase in the flow of traffic.

In order to predict the number of trips associated with the level of occupation the consultants have used the TRICS database of traffic surveys at 9500 development sites. TRICS is owned by a consortium of six county councils, one of which is West Sussex County Council.

It seems strange that out of the 9500 sites in TRICS only seven matched the parameters of the site and only four of these were surveyed since 2020. This raises two questions. The first question is what is so unusual about the balance of cars and residents that there are just seven similar developments in the country. The Transport Assessment makes no comment.

The second question is whether it is justifiable to base this critical forecast on just a sample of seven sites, only four of which have 270 or more dwellings.

In 2024, eight fundamental principles of TRICS Good Practice were codified. These include providing clarity of methodology, understanding ranges and estimates and explaining selection. The presentation of the TRICS analysis is not consistent with any of these Good Practice principles. It will be interesting to see what the reaction of WSCC is to this clear breach of the use of the database.

Moving on to the second metric, having arrived at the number of departures the consultants then base their forecast on the directions that traffic will take leaving the site based on 2011 census data on work patterns. These have changed fundamentally since the Covid pandemic. According to the developers only 1 in 4 cars driving out of the site have Horsham town as their destination. Really?

In the final analysis the consultants offer some good news "A review of Personal Injury Accident data for the most recently available five-year period identified no existing trends or patterns regarding the design of the existing highway network in terms of a highway safety concern and this is not expected to change as a result of the proposed development."

With 568 car park spaces and over 1000 new residents? Really?

I wish to register my objection to this application as the developers have not provided any reliable evidence that their plans will have an acceptable level of impact on the surrounding area and its residents

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: 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 Chief Executive: Jane Eaton