

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 September 2026 13:28:20 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/2114
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 09/09/2026 1:28 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land at 519396 111237 Church Farm Walk Upper Beeding West Sussex
Proposal:	Erection of 4 No. detached dwellings with associated amenity space, car parking spaces, detached carports, access road and other associated infrastructure.
Case Officer:	Daniel Holmes

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 78 Church Lane Upper Beeding

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Other - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	SUPPLEMENTARY OBJECTION FOLLOWING AMENDED PLANS - PREVIOUS OBJECTION REMAINS IN FULL Planning Application DC/25/2114 - Land at Church Farm Walk, Upper Beeding

I wish to submit a supplementary objection to planning application DC/25/2114 following notification that amended plans/information have been received.

For the avoidance of doubt, my previous objection to this application remains in full, including my concerns regarding highway and pedestrian safety, construction traffic, ecology and biodiversity, the character and setting of the area, heritage impacts and the suitability of this site for residential development.

Having considered the further information now available, I wish to raise an additional significant concern regarding the proposed drainage strategy and, in particular, the arrangements for future maintenance of the proposed swale.

Drainage strategy and unexplained maintenance access:

I understand that the revised Aqua Terra Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy Rev 3, June 2026 states:

"Access for maintenance of the swale will be possible from the north due to the extensive land ownership to the north."

This statement raises a significant concern. The fact that land to the north may be within common ownership does not, in itself, demonstrate that a safe, practical and environmentally acceptable means of access to the swale actually exists.

From the information available to residents, I have not seen a clearly identified maintenance access route showing how vehicles and/or machinery required to maintain the swale would reach it from the north. In particular, it is unclear where such vehicles would enter, what route they would follow, what width and surface would be required, what size/type of vehicles or machinery would need access, and where those vehicles would manoeuvre or turn.

These are important matters because the ability to maintain a drainage feature throughout the lifetime of a development is fundamental to the effectiveness of the drainage strategy. An assertion that access is possible because of land ownership should not, in my view, substitute for demonstrating that the proposed access is actually achievable.

I therefore respectfully ask the Council to require the applicant to clearly demonstrate the proposed maintenance route before determining the application.

Potential impact of creating or using northern access:

There is a further concern about what works might actually be necessary to establish usable access from the north.

The land surrounding the proposed development contains environmentally sensitive areas and a network of established footpaths, including routes associated with the HDC Heritage Trail. The wider area is rural in character and includes land of recognised ecological importance.

If access to the swale would require the creation or improvement of a track, vegetation clearance, ground works, regular vehicle movements across currently undeveloped land, or interaction with public rights of way, these effects should be properly identified and assessed as part of this planning application.

This is particularly important if maintenance vehicles or machinery would need to operate during wet conditions, when drainage infrastructure is most likely to require attention. The implications for ground compaction, rutting, vegetation, habitats and the usability of nearby paths should therefore be properly considered.

I do not believe it would be appropriate simply to leave the identification of such an important access arrangement to a later condition if the acceptability and long-term operation of the proposed drainage system itself depends upon that access.

If additional plans or information are required to demonstrate the maintenance route, residents should be given an appropriate opportunity to see and comment upon those arrangements before the application is determined.

Highway and pedestrian safety concerns remain:

I also wish to reiterate my previous concerns regarding the suitability of the surrounding highway network for this development.

Church Farm Walk and Church Lane are narrow, effectively single-width roads with no pedestrian footway. They are regularly used by pedestrians, including children, parents with buggies, elderly residents, mobility scooter users, dog walkers and people accessing the church, river and surrounding countryside.

As stated in my previous objection, the areas sometimes perceived as "grass verges" along Church Lane include private front gardens and should not be treated as providing a safe pedestrian refuge.

The construction of four detached dwellings would inevitably involve a significant period of construction traffic, including deliveries and larger vehicles. Following occupation, the development would also create a permanent increase in vehicle movements.

I remain concerned about the interaction between additional

vehicles and pedestrians on roads where there is little or no opportunity for safe separation.

This concern is not simply about inconvenience to existing residents. It is fundamentally a question of highway and pedestrian safety and whether safe and suitable access can genuinely be provided for the proposed development.

Ecology, biodiversity and landscape:

My previous ecological and biodiversity objections also remain.

The proposed development is located in an environmentally sensitive area adjoining/affecting land of recognised wildlife value. I remain concerned about the loss and fragmentation of habitat and the wider effects of residential development on what is currently a rural edge-of-village environment.

The newly identified uncertainty surrounding maintenance access to the drainage swale adds another dimension to this concern. If the drainage solution relies upon future vehicle or machinery access across land to the north, the ecological consequences of that access must form part of the assessment of the development rather than being considered separately after permission has been granted.

The drainage strategy therefore needs to demonstrate not only that the swale can function hydraulically, but that it can realistically and sustainably be accessed and maintained without unacceptable harm to the surrounding environment.

Heritage and rural character:

I also maintain my previous concerns regarding the impact of the development upon the rural character of this part of Upper Beeding and the setting of nearby heritage assets, including St Peter's Church and the historic Priory area.

Four detached dwellings, their access road, parking, carports and associated domestic infrastructure would represent a further urbanisation of this sensitive village-edge location.

Any additional infrastructure required outside the immediate development site in order to provide drainage maintenance access should also be considered as part of that impact. It would clearly be unsatisfactory to assess the visual, landscape and heritage effects of the residential development without understanding whether additional tracks, access works or vegetation removal are necessary to make its drainage solution workable.

Conclusion:

For the reasons set out above, I continue to object to planning application DC/25/2114 and my previous objection should be read alongside this supplementary representation.

In particular, I am concerned that the revised drainage strategy appears to rely upon maintenance access to the proposed swale "from the north", based upon the extent of land ownership, without clearly demonstrating the actual route or practical arrangements by which that maintenance access would be achieved.

Before any decision is made, I respectfully request that the Council satisfies itself that:

- 1) a clearly defined, safe and practical maintenance access route to the swale exists;
- 2) the route is capable of accommodating the vehicles and/or machinery necessary to maintain the drainage system throughout the lifetime of the development;
- 3) any works required to create or facilitate that access are identified;
- 4) the consequences for ecology, the Local Wildlife Site/wider habitat, public rights of way, the Heritage Trail, landscape and heritage are properly assessed; and
- 5) where further plans or materially different access arrangements are required, residents are given the opportunity to consider and comment upon them before the application is determined.

Land ownership alone does not demonstrate that suitable access exists. If a safe, practical and environmentally acceptable means of maintaining the proposed drainage system cannot be demonstrated, there must be serious doubt as to whether that drainage solution is deliverable and sustainable for the lifetime of the development.

Taken together with the highway safety, ecological, biodiversity, landscape, heritage and other concerns raised in my original objection, I respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**



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 E
aton