

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 September 2026 18:20:29 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/1168
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 6:20 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land North of Melton Drive Storrington West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline application, with all matters reserved, for the phased development comprising: Phase 1 construction of the access road (to be delivered through a subsequent Reserved Matters Application pursuant to Outline Permission DC/24/2006); and Phase 2 residential development of up to 56 dwellings with associated landscaping, pedestrian and vehicular access
Case Officer:	Matthew Porter

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: South Wood Melton Drive Storrington Pulborough West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	We object to the Outline Planning Application (from Fairfax) for a further 56 houses on the Land North of Melton Drive, and believe

it should be rejected.

A summary of our key objections is shown below:

This location is again beyond the built-up boundary for Storrington, and the area was previously considered "Unsustainable" with planning applications and appeals rejected.

The site is part of the area that was designated a "Green Gap" and given specific protection from development in the Neighbourhood Plan, to prevent settlement coalescence.

The proposed access to Fryern Road through the Matthews Development (DC/26/0972) combined with the removal and damage to hedgerows and trees will harm the habitat and flight lines of the rare Barbastelle bat colony.

We have regular Bat flights across our garden, and a protected 12m wide "Dark Bat Corridor Zone" was included in the Matthews proposal, but there is nothing mentioned in this planning application to safeguard the Bats.

The flow of traffic from the site along Fryern Road and down into the roundabout at the bottom of School Hill, will further increase the traffic congestion and air pollution in the "choke point" in Storrington village.

The developers "Travel Plan" includes the proposed use of Footpath 2649 to the village centre, this is impractical and will lead to pedestrian use of a dangerous stretch of Fryern Road.

The Planning Inspector rejected development in this area, in the Appeal Decision 29/5/2014, as it would cause "significant harm" to the setting of the Heritage Assets, this proposal is even closer to those Heritage Assets.

The cumulative impact of these increased housing developments has been underestimated, they will significantly adversely affect Storrington's infrastructure and services for: schools, health, roads/traffic flow, and community facilities.

The further increase in Traffic Flow down School Hill into the village is a real concern:

This site is outside the previous built-up boundary, and will increase the traffic flow along Fryern Road and down School Hill into the village, as such it does not meet the HDPF criteria for Transport & Accessibility, and Environmental Protection.

The Developers have submitted a detailed 136 page Transport Assessment, but this really does not seem to fully assess the

cumulative impact of all the developments in the area on the existing "choke point" of the School Hill roundabout and through the village.

The Transport Assessment on page 33, 6.1.12 and 6.1.13 state that there is a "minor level of additional traffic... which will disperse quickly.... with very minor impacts on ... junctions", we disagree with this (see the notes below).

Storrington is a "hub" for the surrounding villages, and the traffic flow down to the village and through the village along the A283 is significant.

The Neighbourhood Plan (p14) had previously stated "the main challenge facing the Parish of Storrington & Sullington" is the management of traffic congestion and improvement of air quality".

We do not believe the potential increased traffic flow has really been fully assessed, the pages and pages of calculations submitted, do not seem to fully reflect the current issues that we are aware of, and the adverse impact of the developments which will exacerbate the traffic congestion in the village and increase Air Pollution.

We disagree with the "Transport Assessment" which states on page 33:

"Will the traffic impacts be acceptable?

6.1.12 The traffic generation scheme will be one vehicle movement every two minutes in the peak hours. This is a minor level of additional traffic, which will disperse quickly over the local highway network.

6.1.13 The assessments allow for background traffic growth and the cumulative impact with committed developments, including the adjacent consented Wates development.

6.1.14 The analysis shows that the minor traffic generation of the development proposal will have very minor impacts on the performance of local junctions, which currently work well in capacity and safety terms."

We do not agree with these statements, the increased traffic flow will not be "minor" in the context of the area, and it will not "disperse quickly".

We also believe as stated above, that the cumulative impact of all the current and proposed developments on the ("background") traffic growth has not been fully assessed correctly, and does not reflect the existing base level of congestion and traffic flow problems down School Hill and at the roundabout and along the A283 through the village.

The proposed use of Footpath 2649 is impractical and leads to a risk to pedestrians:

Pedestrian safety is still an issue, as the "Travel Plan" on page 8 refers to Footpath 2649 as a route to different areas of the village centre.

Footpath 2649 is actually an ancient, overgrown, dark and muddy path.

Pedestrians will undoubtedly choose the most direct but dangerous route to the village centre along Fryern Road, this requires pedestrians to use an unsafe 200yd narrow, dark, and winding stretch of road.

The undulations and junctions along Fryern Road, near the brow of a hill on a fast-moving road, together with increased traffic flow will further increase risks to pedestrians and drivers.

Additional points have been previously stated, but these remain relevant and should not have been overridden:

The Neighbourhood Plan was agreed after many years of consultation and working groups, and covers the period 2018-2031. It remains the definitive consultative current local community document.

The December 2024 NPPF reinforces the need for community consultation and clear Neighbourhood Plans, again why is this being ignored.

Development on this site will further erode the distinct separation between Storrington and West Chiltington and lead to settlement coalescence.

It should also be noted that there has not been any consultative community involvement or engagement on any changes to remove the Green Gap, or expand the outside boundary of the Storrington built up area.

Development in this area disregards the Representations against ST01 which were by far the most for any particular housing allocation in the Local Plan, (other than Ifield).

Other alternative sustainable sites have been ignored, they were proposed in the Neighbourhood plan and within the boundary of the built-up area, and assessed as being suitable.

Development on this Site is Not in accordance with the National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF):

The new December 2024 NPPF continues with the need for community consultation and clear Neighbourhood Plans, and the protection of the setting of Heritage Assets, again why is this being ignored.

In particular the NPPF December 2024 states:
para 14 "the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits"

para 36d that development needs to be "consistent with national policy - enabling the delivery of sustainable development"

para 96b promotes safe communities that "are safe and accessible.... (with) well-designed, clear and legible pedestrian routes"

para 109 "Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes"

para 135d "establish or maintain a strong sense of place"

para 199 with regard to Air Quality planning decisions should take into account "the cumulative impacts from individual sites in local area"

para 213a "Any harm tothe significance of a designated heritage asset or from development within its setting, should require clear and convincing justification". "Substantial harm to grade II listed buildings ..should be exceptional"

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