

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 30 September 2026 14:57:39 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 30/09/2026 2:57 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:	15 Weald Close Horsham
----------	------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I object to planning application DC/26/0954 Reasons for comment : Design (including drainage), overdevelopment, trees/landscaping/loss of biodiversity, loss of amenity

Loss of amenity.

The site would not sit easily into the landscape without serious visual impact. This is especially the case at the southern end of the site due to the significant increased elevation. The views to and from the area would be adversely affected by the proposal. Although the planning inspector's 2011 appeal decision related to the proposed Muggeridge Field development, I consider that matters relating to landscape character mentioned in the report are equally relevant to the current proposal for the 'triangle'.

Loss of biodiversity

The applicant claims to have met the requirement for biodiversity net gain. This appears to have been based on the site as it was around the date of the application. However, since purchasing the property in 2024 the applicant has removed a hedge between the public bridleway and the western boundary of the site which was a nesting site for literally hundreds of birds. This resulted in a massive biodiversity net loss for the site. Similarly, all the non grass vegetation and trees were removed from the northern boundary. This formed an attractive buffer between the site and the current houses on Athelstan Way/Weald Close as evidenced by photos taken as part of the 2024 sales particulars relating to the site. This removal of trees etc was obviously done to maximise the site area that could be potentially developed but has resulted in the sterilisation of the site. The site may have been home to endangered species (which are found in the immediate vicinity) and are now much less likely to return.

Drainage

The site has been prone to flooding at its northern boundary. Removal of vegetation and increased run off from non porous surfaces will only make this worse and the drainage survey and mitigation appears inadequate, especially in respect of downstream drainage runs and capacity.

Design/overdevelopment

Reinstatement of the vegetation that has been removed would reduce the area available for development and mean that the all 21 houses could not be fitted on the site. In addition it appears that the two buildings backing onto Weald Close properties are located too close to the site boundary, especially considering the increasing elevation of the site.

My concerns, should the local authority be minded to approve the application, are (the local authority may wish to consider as reserved matters)

No gas supply should be allowed to the site and no provision for solid fuel heating should be permitted.

If there is no provision for solid fuel heating there is no need for any chimneys, which add to the height of the proposed houses.

The height of the houses and pitch of the roofs should be kept to a

minimum to reduce visual impact and should never be any higher than the height of the houses in the current estate (Weald/Athelstan/Paget).

Planning requirements should be put in place to ensure that the height of any building on the site is never increased and that dormer windows are not permitted.

The first floor flats in plots 6-9 have their kitchen/dining/living room immediately overlooking the rear of properties in Weald Close. This is overly intrusive and any overlooking from the first floor of buildings facing Weald Close should be from bedroom(s)/bathroom (with frosted glass) only.

Other much smaller developments (house extensions etc) in the existing adjacent housing estate resulted in a significant increase in on street parking (including on grass verges). Measures should be taken to ensure that contractors and staff do not park in the existing estate during the period of construction.

Any s106 agreement could provide for the applicant to fund repairs necessary to the bridleway between the site and the part of Arun Way that has a tarmac surface. This part of the bridleway regularly floods in winter. If repaired to a satisfactory standard it could be used year round as a shorter route for residents on the new site to walk/cycle to Horsham town centre. It would also benefit walkers/cyclists using the bridleway for recreational purposes.

Due to the elevation gain of the site, no part of any proposed building should be allowed above, say, the 53m contour in order to reduce visual impact.

A robust regime of future inspections and (if necessary) enforcement should be put in place by the local authority to ensure that the applicant or their successors properly maintain the drainage infrastructure and comply with any biodiversity net gain requirements.

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