

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 01 September 2025 04:26:16 UTC+01:00  
**To:** "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application DC/25/1019  
**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 01/09/2025 4:26 AM.

### Application Summary

Address:	Land To The West of Shoreham Road Small Dole West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application for up to 45 dwellings (including affordable homes) with all matters reserved apart from access.
Case Officer:	Nicola Pettifer

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

Address:	Dei Gratia, Newhall Lane, Small Dole. West Sussex Henfield
----------	--

### 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>- Loss of General Amenity</li><li>- Other</li><li>- Overdevelopment</li><li>- Privacy Light and Noise</li><li>- Trees and Landscaping</li></ul>
Comments:	<p>I strongly object to this application for the following reasons:</p> <p>Design:</p> <p>This site lies outside the Building Area Boundary (BUAB 2023) in Small Dole.</p>

Other development applications in the village outside the BUAB have been refused, for reasons that additionally have included that they do not reflect the rural character, will result in the loss of countryside especially so close to the South Downs National Park (SDNP) and are unsustainable. This development is even closer to the SDNP than the refused applications.

The use of water boreholes to alleviate water neutrality is debatable. What is the backup plan should the boreholes for water dry up? Apart from seeing the water was clear, what evidence is there that the water is potable, given the presence of a waste tip nearby that exudes toxins?

What measures are in place to ensure any replacement of fixtures and fittings meet the same standard to maintain reduced water usage?

The amount of hard surfaces in the scheme will increase the possibility of flooding in the village. In periods of heavy or continuous rain, the field does flood, the run off from the field regularly flooding Newhall Lane.

The amount of hard surfaces will increase run off into the stream and increase possibility of flooding the village. Or is the ditch on the scheme anticipated to help manage this?

Pressure on the existing sewage and drainage is already a significant problem, with the existing number of properties. This scheme will only add to this problem.

I am extremely disappointed to see that effectively, Horsham District Council have effectively ridden roughshod over local democracy and the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan by now including the field in the Local Plan. Previously the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan rejected this site for building as it is an unsustainable location and would harm the landscape. Nothing has changed apart from reducing the number of properties from the original 60 and planting a few trees that will take 15 years to have any impact.

Loss of General Amenities:

I am not convinced by the data produced for wildlife and trees in the scheme.

The assessment reports regarding trees and wildlife on this site have failed to identify the owls, nightingales, bats, red kite, buzzards and sparrowhawks that are regularly seen and heard as well as insect life and small mammals such as hedgehogs and slow worms that are regularly seen.

The scheme states that tree whips will be watered for 2 weeks.

Are the developers aware that it is recommended that newly planted trees are given 50 litres of water per week during the summer months, for the first three years after planting

(<https://www.trees.org.uk>)

Overdevelopment:

This overdevelopment is unsustainable.

The average home has 2 cars. This scheme will therefore

---

potentially add another 90 cars to the volume in this small village. There is an absolute necessity in living in Small Dole to have access to a car for work, school, medical appointments, shopping (village shop is for small items only), etc. There has been no consideration in the scheme for the increase required for access to medical services or schools in the area, all of which are under pressure with existing population numbers. Any resolutions eg. transport plan have no immediate positive impact on the potential damage this scheme will create.

With reference to the transport statement, the traffic flow assessment was taken between 29/8 - 4/9/2023, just before schools returned and people returned to work and is therefore questionable as to how true a representation of the traffic volume and speed it reflects. The proposed access is near the brow of a blind summit of the hill. Drivers frequently ignore the signage, increasing the danger of collisions at this point.

The frequency and timing of buses 100 (last one at 18.26) and 106 (1 per day), clearly demonstrates why people need to use a car in order to access work and not rely on buses, even to access train stations.

It is puzzling as to why the transport statement considers the stations at Pulborough and Shoreham only, especially to access London. Most residents travel the 11km to Hassocks, from where trains to London are more acceptably 4-6 per hour and available beyond 18.26 and travel to the station by car. The bus routes do not go to Hassocks.

The proposed scheme of 45 homes is completely disproportionate to the size of Small Dole, representing an unreasonably significant percentage increase in the size of this small village with limited services. This scheme alone will increase the village by approx 10%, and together with the development of Oxcroft Farm, that was supposed to be the only development in the village, will increase it by approx 25%. This is an issue that the Neighbourhood Plans aimed to prevent and is totally unacceptable given the minimal services within the village and impacting significantly on traffic volumes.

Privacy, Light and Noise:

The NPPF states: "Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments ...create places that are safe..." the access from the north of the scheme to Newhall Lane will remove the privacy and sense of security of my property.

In addition, the access onto Newhall Lane is narrow, subject to a large number of delivery vehicles daily speeding up the lane and should not be used as an access, to maintain the privacy of residents and safety of walkers.

The Air Quality Assessment recognised the impact of the

---

construction phase vehicles and plant on residents. Given that any dust will be blown to the residential area to the north, in the direction of the prevailing wind, this is not acceptable.

The addition of light pollution at night created by the scheme is of concern. Currently the area to the north of the scheme is magnificently dark, having no street lights, so is not impacted by light. The scheme will negatively affect this and the wildlife in the area, plus the impact on the SDNP.

**Trees and Landscaping:**

The scheme includes planting of trees right by my property's back hedge. This is not acceptable as they will occlude the view we currently have of the South Downs, and increase the maintenance required, that I assume Wates are not undertaking.

---

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 Eaton