[redacted]

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 19 November 2026 18:53
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/1639

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 19/11/2026 6:53 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	The Warren Horsham Road Handcross West Sussex
Proposal:	Permission in Principle for the erection of one dwelling on the southern side of Handford Way and one replacement dwelling in the residential curtilage south of The Warren. Retention of Estate Management Building and a 150 sq.m extension, for commercial, business and service use within Use Class E(g).
Case Officer:	Hannah Darley

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	Flat 10 The Warren Horsham Road, Handcross Haywards Heath

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Dear Ms Darley, FORMAL OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION DC/26/1639 Application description: Permission in Principle for the erection of one dwelling on the southern side of Handford Way and one replacement dwelling in the residential curtilage south of The Warren. Retention of Estate Management Building and a 150 sq. m extension for commercial, business and service use within Use Class E(g). I am writing to formally OBJECT to the above application.

I also support the objections submitted by my neighbours, [redacted] (Flat 9, The Warren) and [redacted] (Long House, Handford Way). I would particularly like to emphasise the following concerns.

1. Harm to the High Weald National Landscape and the principle of development

The proposed development would introduce further residential and commercial development into an established woodland setting within the High Weald National Landscape. The character of The Warren is closely associated with its spacious, secluded setting and the surrounding woodland. The introduction of additional detached housing, residential curtilages and associated infrastructure would further fragment this environment and erode the relationship between the property and its grounds.

The proposed development sites are also outside the defined Built-Up Area Boundary of Lower Beeding and are not allocated for residential development in the Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan. The Council should therefore carefully consider the principle of introducing further residential and commercial development into this countryside location, having regard to the development plan's spatial strategy and policies seeking to protect the character of the surrounding countryside.

Although this application is smaller than the previous proposal (DC/26/0782), reducing the scale of development does not in itself resolve the fundamental concerns about its location and landscape impact.

Of particular significance is the Council's own landscape specialist's response to this application, which continues to recommend an objection. The response identifies that the revised proposal has not provided further information to address the previous landscape concerns and remains contrary to relevant landscape policies within the Horsham District Planning Framework.

The applicant's argument that the proposed dwelling does not constitute major development does not remove the requirement for all development within a Protected Landscape to be appropriately limited in scale and extent, and sensitively located and designed. The Council must consider the effect of the development on the landscape as a whole, rather than simply whether the proposal meets the definition of major development.

I do not believe that the application adequately demonstrates how the proposed development would conserve and enhance the natural beauty of this designated landscape.

2. The justification for the proposed dwellings and the claimed infill development

I am concerned by the description of one of the proposed detached houses as a 'replacement dwelling'.

The proposed development site does not contain an existing residential dwelling. The applicant's justification instead appears to rely on the proposed consolidation of Flat 1 and Flat 4 within The Warren, thereby reducing the number of separate residential units by one.

These are fundamentally different locations and forms of development. The proposed detached house would be a new building on a separate site, rather than a replacement for an existing dwelling on the land where it is proposed.

Furthermore, Flat 4 has previously been connected to Flat 1 and used as office accommodation, but is currently occupied as a separate rented dwelling. The Council should therefore establish whether the proposed consolidation is genuine, permanent and capable of being secured, and whether it provides a sound planning basis for describing the new house as a replacement.

I also question whether the Handford Way site can properly be regarded as limited infilling within an established group of houses. The Council should assess its actual relationship to the existing settlement pattern, rather than relying on the applicant's description of the plot as an

infill site. Residents understand that the land historically formed part of the grounds associated with Foresters and has been the subject of previous unsuccessful development proposals. Its development would therefore represent a change to the established pattern of this small and relatively stable group of rural properties, rather than an obviously appropriate infill opportunity.

I ask that both aspects of the application are scrutinised particularly carefully, rather than accepting the applicant's descriptions as sufficient justification for additional development within the National Landscape.

3. Woodland clearance, ecology and cumulative impact

There has been a progressive pattern of woodland thinning, tree removal and alteration within the estate over a number of years. This includes the apparent creation of a rudimentary access road connecting the main entrance driveway to the proposed development plot, involving the removal of trees and alteration of the existing woodland.

These works appear to anticipate and facilitate the development now being proposed. I ask the Council to establish whether the access works and tree removals have the necessary planning and other relevant consents, and to take account of the resulting changes when assessing the current application.

The woodland also provides an important habitat for wildlife. Given the reported extent of tree removal and alteration, I ask the Council to ensure that the ecological implications of the proposed development and associated access arrangements have been adequately assessed, including any potential effects on protected species and their habitats.

The proposal should not be considered in isolation from the wider history of development and alteration within the estate. The cumulative effect of successive changes is progressively transforming an established woodland environment into a more fragmented and developed landscape.

The Council should not assume that further development is acceptable simply because some alteration has already taken place. The long-term integrity and natural character of the woodland setting must remain an important consideration.

4. Estate Management Building, proposed commercial use and access

The application also seeks retention of the Estate Management Building and a further 150 sq. m extension for Class E(g) use.

I am concerned that the application does not sufficiently establish the precise nature and extent of the commercial activities intended to take place within the building. In particular, the Council should be satisfied that the proposed Class E(g) use accurately reflects the intended activities, and that these are clearly distinguished from other forms of commercial activity, such as general storage and distribution, which may fall within a different use class.

Given the sensitive residential and woodland setting, I am concerned that further commercial development could increase activity and intensification in an area whose character should be protected. The Council should carefully consider the operational implications of the proposed use, including its potential effects on traffic, deliveries, noise and residential amenity.

There are also concerns about the suitability of the access arrangements and the potential impact of additional traffic on Handford Way, which is a narrow rural lane. The Council should consider the likely traffic generation associated with both the additional dwelling and the proposed commercial activity, including deliveries and collections. The suitability of this access for the scale and nature of the proposed uses should be established before the development is considered acceptable.

Any permission should be based on a clear and accurate description of the proposed use, with appropriate controls where necessary.

5. Planning history, incremental development and confidence in future compliance

The current application has been submitted shortly after the refusal of the previous application, DC/26/0782, and retains several elements of that earlier proposal, albeit in a reduced form. Residents are concerned that this may be the first of a series of smaller applications intended ultimately to achieve a similar overall development outcome to that previously refused.

We recognise that the Council must determine each application on its individual merits. However, we ask that the current proposal is considered in the context of the wider planning history and the cumulative pattern of development being pursued within the estate, rather than treating each proposal as an entirely separate and isolated change.

Residents also have concerns arising from the implementation of previous planning permissions within The Warren. In particular, permission was granted for an extension to the Applicant's flat to accommodate a communal biomass boiler intended to provide heating to all the residential properties. The associated arrangement was for the boiler to be supplied by logs processed within the woodland shed.

However, residents understand that the extension as constructed differs materially from the approved scheme, appearing in part to be almost twice the approved height and instead forming habitable accommodation connected to the Applicant's own flat. No communal biomass boiler has been installed, and the intended communal heating arrangement has not materialised. Similarly, the woodland shed does not appear to be used for the intended processing of logs, but rather for storage and office accommodation associated with the Applicant's private commercial business.

These circumstances have understandably affected residents' confidence that the purposes and requirements of future planning permissions will necessarily be implemented as approved. We therefore ask the Council to review the relevant planning history and establish whether the previous development has been carried out in accordance with the approved plans and conditions. We also ask that any proposed conditions or restrictions attached to the current application are sufficiently precise, realistic and enforceable to ensure that the development actually delivered corresponds with what is being applied for.

Conclusion

I strongly object to this application. Taken together, the proposed residential and commercial development would represent a further intensification of development within an established woodland estate and a nationally protected landscape.

The previous refusal of application DC/26/0782 identified fundamental concerns about the principle and landscape impact of development in this location. Those concerns have not, in my view, been adequately addressed by the revised proposal. The continued objection from the Council's own landscape specialist is particularly significant.

I respectfully ask the Council to give full weight to the countryside location, the landscape impact, the questionable justification for the proposed dwellings, the cumulative effects of previous woodland alteration, potential ecological impacts and the implications of further commercial activity.

I therefore request that planning permission is refused on the grounds that the proposal has not demonstrated that it is acceptable in principle or that it would conserve and enhance the natural beauty and character of the High Weald National Landscape.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Kind regards

Telephone:
Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk

Horsham District Council

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