

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 October 2026 10:27:32 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 01/10/2026 10:27 AM.

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:	96 Clarence Road Horsham
----------	--------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Other - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Please can the Council clarify the planning history of Triangle Field/Muggeridge Field and explain what weight, if any, is given to the previous decision to retain this area outside the built-up boundary? Please can the Council clarify the status of the Triangle Field and its relationship to the Chesworth Farm Local Wildlife Site, and

explain how the application has assessed any direct or indirect impacts on the Local Wildlife Site?

How has the application demonstrated that the development will not damage ecological connectivity between Chesworth Farm, the surrounding hedgerows, fields and other habitats?

The meeting was informed that hedgerows previously identified as having potential to support Hazel Dormice were removed before the current application was submitted. Please can the Council confirm the date and circumstances of that removal and explain how the removal has been treated in the ecological and Biodiversity Net Gain assessment?

What evidence has been used to establish the appropriate biodiversity baseline, and has the Council considered whether the condition of the site immediately prior to the hedgerow removal should be used when calculating biodiversity impacts/net gain?

Given the previous identification of potential Hazel Dormouse habitat in the site's boundary vegetation, what up-to-date dormouse surveys have been undertaken and what evidence supports the conclusion that the proposed development would not adversely affect dormice or their habitat?

The applicant's ecological survey records up to nine species of bats commuting and/or foraging around the site boundaries. Please can the Council explain how the development's impacts on these commuting and foraging routes have been assessed?

Please can the Council publish/identify the full Biodiversity Metric calculation underlying the claimed Biodiversity Net Gain, including the baseline habitat condition, habitat areas being lost, proposed habitat creation and the proposed off-site units, if any?

How has the biodiversity baseline been established given the removal of boundary hedgerows before submission of the application?

Has the Council considered whether the baseline should reflect the site's condition before those hedgerows were removed?

What mechanism will secure the proposed biodiversity enhancements for the required management period, who will be responsible for them, and what funding has been secured for their maintenance?

Does the assessment consider the loss of open land and boundary vegetation, increased lighting, buildings and domestic activity, rather than only the presence or absence of bat roosts within the proposed building footprint?

There are reported existing flooding and/or sewer overflow problems at Kennedy Road, Weald Close, the bottom of Athelstan Way and the allotments. Has the applicant's drainage assessment incorporated these existing problems into its baseline assessment? If not, why not?

What is the status, ownership and function of the ditch along the northern boundary, and has its current condition and capacity been independently assessed?

Has the drainage assessment considered the possibility that the existing ditch is partially blocked or constrained and the potential consequences of increased or redirected flows downstream?

If the ditch is not owned by the applicant, how will the proposed drainage system be maintained and how can the Council be satisfied that the necessary drainage infrastructure can be legally accessed and maintained for the lifetime of the development?

Please can the applicant demonstrate, using site-specific modelling, that the development will not increase flood risk to existing properties, roads, allotments or downstream drainage infrastructure under both normal and extreme rainfall events, including climate-change allowances? What existing baseline has been used for this assessment?

How has the visual impact of the development on the southern rural edge of Horsham been assessed, particularly from the public bridleway and from Chesworth Farm?

Has the assessment considered views towards the development in both summer and winter conditions, when vegetation provides substantially less screening?

Please can the Council explain whether the proposed building heights and massing are appropriate for this location at the rural edge of Horsham?

In particular, how has the visual relationship between the proposed two-storey houses and the surrounding lower-density/lower-height development been assessed?

Does the proposed development maintain or reduce the existing green infrastructure and ecological links between the Triangle, Chesworth Farm and the surrounding countryside?

If the development reduces connectivity, what specific mitigation is proposed and how will its effectiveness be monitored?

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



Horsham District Council, Alberty House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton