

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 September 2026 17:00:08 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0954
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 29/09/2026 5:00 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land South of Athelstan Way Horsham West Sussex
Proposal:	Residential development for 21no. 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings with associated parking, hard and soft landscaping at Land South of Athelstan Way, Horsham.
Case Officer:	Nicola Pettifer

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	4 Paget Close Horsham
----------	-----------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I wish to expand on the above objections. Any reference to "The Triangle" relates to the land the subject of this planning application.

The Triangle site

In 1996 Inspector Stephen Fox dismissed the appeal against HDC including in their draft Local Plan the development of land south of Athelstan Way which included both Muggeridge Field and the Triangle. In his conclusion the Inspector stated;-

"...the seriously harmful impact of this proposed development of the character and appearance of the open rural area to the south of the town would not be ameliorated to any significant extent by the constraints imposed by the policy thus making the proposal unacceptable. "

The physical, visual and environmental reasons set out above remains unchanged today. Building here should be refused on the grounds that it represents an uncharacteristic and unjustified encroachment into the open countryside.

(1) The Horsham District Planning Framework Policy on Settlement Coalescence provides for a distinct green buffer as a local strategic gap to protect the open gap and maintain the separate built- up identities of Horsham and Southwater. This gap forms a critical visual transition zone between urban Horsham and the protected countryside. The application should be refused as the development will cause irreversible harm to the setting of Chesworth Farm..

(2) The applicant's reference in landscape and visual assessment p. 6 no. 2.1 planning background refers to the site being identified as HB27 in the Neighbourhood Plan as an aspirational site for development. Neither the referendum document or the adopted Neighbourhood Plan contains HB27 so reference to this should be ignored.

Habitat

In July 2010 WSCC arranged for an extended Phase 1 habitat survey of land adjacent to Athelstan Way (which included both Muggeridge Field and the Triangle) to be carried out by Ahern Ecology Ltd. So far as it related to the Triangle the habitat survey stated;-

(a) "running along the northern end of the western boundary from the woodland to the south was a well established area of dense scrub with some trees developing. Originally established as a hedgerow... ." "...and the shrub was dominated by mature blackthorn and bramble with good potential for dormice. " This scrub was depleted by the applicant.

(b) "running along the northern boundary from the western boundary to the gate was a well established area of dense scrub with some trees developing..." "the scrub was dominated by mature blackthorn and bramble. Moderate potential for dormice." This was taken out by the applicant.

(c) There is ongoing surveying for hazel dormice at Chesworth Farm which has identified the presence of hazel dormice. Hazel

dormice are good indicators of animal and plant diversity and dormouse friendly habitats are also good for woodland management.

It is not possible to know whether dormice were present in the hedges in (a) and (b) above before they were depleted or removed by the applicant but as stated in the habitat survey there was a strong possibility. There are photos of the hedges available.

(d) There are 5 known species of bats found on Chesworth Farm, including soprano pipistrelle, common pipistrelle as well as brown long eared bats. - a species often difficult to observe.

(e) Skylarks nest in the southern end of Muggeridge Field.

(f) Bats, skylarks and hazel dormice are protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981. Hazel Dormice are a Priority Species under the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework and are listed as a European Protected Species under Annex IV of the European Habitats Directive.

Obviously when the applicant's Summary Appraisal Landscape Character was carried out, they may not have been aware of these changes made by the applicant and I believe their conclusion could be different from the "minor adverse effect" stated.

The development replaces agricultural grazing land with housing and hard standing which will permanently destroy the open, rural views currently enjoyed and have a detrimental effect on these protected species and their natural habitat. It will also introduce domestic lighting and noise into a sensitive rural edge to the detriment of wildlife.

For these reasons the application should be refused.

Biodiversity net gain

As mentioned above, the applicant has removed a hedge and depleted another hedge. Therefore whilst it is noted that there is a net gain of 30.76%, it is unclear whether the biodiversity net gain calculations were made before the hedgerows were removed/depleted and were potentially a degradation of on-site habitat. Also the open space at the southern point of this development is already in existence. There appears to be an unreliable ecological baseline and no approval should be given until a revised biodiversity net gain calculation is carried out.

Drainage and pollution

6.1.1. of the applicant's surface water drainage report, confirms that the surface water is to be discharged into an existing privately owned ditch. There have been flooding issues associated with this site and the inadequate drainage. When it rains hard, the dwellings adjacent to the northern boundary experience flooding both in their gardens and houses.

There is no reference in the drainage report to the onward route of this ditch and whether this is viable. However it is understood that this ditch then runs through an underground water course coming

out into Chesworth Allotments. It then goes through open channels and an underground culvert before it goes into a stream and then the River Arun. The drainage strategy fails to respect this downstream connectivity path and ignores asset contracts under the Chesworth Allotments.

If the onward route of the ditch is correctly understood, then where the ditch passes overground through the allotments, the water could overtop its banks, causing physical flooding and topsoil erosion. The run off could carry a toxic mix of contaminants such as oil and petrol. Discharging this polluted water into a ditch which then goes into an open channel alongside food crops creates an unacceptable environmental health hazard.

No planning permission should be granted until a full investigation has been made into the viability of the present drainage route and if it does go through the allotments until the treatment train is adequate and guarantees the level of water purity required next to agricultural plots.

It is noted that the drainage report does set out the frequency of the maintenance required for the SUDS. It is also noted that the applicant intends to secure a long term SUDS maintenance via a S106 agreement before being transferred to a private Management Company. However this does not provide any material protection to the adjacent houses and, if appropriate, the Chesworth Allotments or the River Arun catchment. Also the S106 agreement cannot legally enforce maintenance on the privately owned ditch or the downstream allotment culvert.

The treatment train outlined by the application is entirely inadequate for preventing urban contaminants from moving through the open ditch sections onwards. This is a major threat both to local flood resilience and the wider River Arun habitat. By converting this open greenfield may cause prolonged and continuous discharge into the local stream network after severe rain events which will ultimately flow into the River Arun. The River Arun is environmentally sensitive.

The removed hedge would have absorbed significant amounts of ground water.

As the developments threatens local flood resilience and the wider River Arun habitation, the application should be refused on these grounds.

Wildlife corridors

Chesworth Farm, which includes the Triangle, was designated a Wildlife Site in 2021. The Farm's ecological network act as vital "stepping stones" and green corridors. This lets animals and plants move safely as the climates or environment changes. As the triangle is included in the Wildlife Site then it is part of the

natural wildlife corridors which provides a safe passage for wildlife to move freely. A pollinator flyway traverses this site providing habitat links to help bees, moths, butterflies and other pollinators to thrive in the surrounding locality.

This application must be refused on the grounds that it will cause irreversible harm to the existing corridors and cause negative effects on habitat fragmentation.

Height of dwellings

It is noted that 2 bungalows will be built on the south side of the development. However the rooflines of the other buildings to the north of the bungalows are higher than those of the bungalows thus impacting on the skyline and will be dominant.

The application must be refused on the grounds that the dwellings will be intrusive and intrude on the skyline as seen from a number of public viewpoints and public rights of way and detrimental to the visual amenities. It will also be an intrusion of privacy and cause overlooking to neighbouring properties in Weald Close and Athelstan Way.

Parking

It is appreciated that the development provides 41 parking spaces for use by the dwellings. It is noted that there is provision for 4 visitor parking spaces. This number of visitors space does not seem sufficient and will encourage visitors to park along the existing Athelstan Way and surrounding roads. There is already excess demand for parking particularly from Glen Arun Nursing Home.

If however this application is approved can conditions please be included as follows;-

- That the bungalows cannot be more than 1 storey high nor can the roofs be converted into living accommodation
 - That the roofs of the houses cannot be converted into living accommodation or have dormers installed
 - As a standard S106 framework appears to be an inappropriate mechanism to safeguard this sensitive ecological location, no building works should commence until a satisfactory and robust strategy extending for 30 years is in place relating to SUDS maintenance.
 - There appears to be no management recommendation in the ecology report. Policy HB10 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that there must be sufficient funding to support at least 30 years of post development habitat management. The application should not be approved until a satisfactory enforceable agreement is reached regarding the future habitat management.
 - That all first floor windows on dwellings facing the present adjacent houses in Weald Close are obscure to avoid loss of privacy and overlooking
-

- To be included in the Construction Environmental Management Plan

☐ That during construction no lorries attend the site before 08.00

☐ that there is an approved off-site location for construction and delivery lorries until the site calls them forward for delivery.

☐ As the access for the construction will be Athelstan Way and there is a Nursing Home along this route, then conditions need to be placed to ensure vulnerable pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access regulations

☐ no construction or associated vehicles should block or cause obstruction to the adjoining neighbouring houses and roads

☐ that access to the site is only from Athelstan Way.

- That the 35% of social housing must be provided and cannot be decreased

- Any trees damaged should be replaced with like.

Finally, if this application is brought to HDC's planning committee as a member of the public, I would like to speak at that meeting.

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 E aton