

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 23 March 2026 08:59
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0366

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 23/03/2026 8:59 AM.

Application Summary

Address: Land North West of Southwater

Proposal: Outline planning application, with all matters reserved (except for primary access to the highway) for a phased development comprising: the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of residential dwellings (including affordable housing) (Use Classes C2 and C3); a mixed-use neighbourhood centre (Use Classes E and F); education facilities (Use Class F1(a)); business and employment floorspace (Use Classes B2, B8 and E(g)); redevelopment of existing agricultural buildings including construction of a building for community use (Use Classes E and F2); improvements to public rights of way; sports pitches; gypsy and traveller pitches/plots; public open space; landscaping, and associated infrastructure.

Case Officer: Matthew Porter

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 33 Martindales Southwater

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

- Loss of General Amenity
- Other
- Overdevelopment
- Privacy Light and Noise
- Trees and Landscaping

Comments: I am emailing to state my rejection to the proposed plan for the following reasons:

1. The claim of a specified amount of green and bio-diverse space is irrelevant given a much more significant amount of green space is being destroyed. It's like demolishing a cathedral

and rebuilding a garden shed.

2. There is a claim of a 5km "trail" for walkers / exercise? The development, and the green space already there, includes the Downslink which is significantly longer, nearly 60km
3. There is allocated space for a primary school and secondary but these will not be built, I assume, by the developer. This is the usual attempt of playing the system by allocating space for facilities but if nothing is actually built, what is the point. I expect the build cost needs to come from local / national government... what will be on those spaces until then... rubbish/dumping?
4. There are no additional facilities such as doctor or dentist, or similar. Again, the usual approach of putting excessive numbers of houses in places without facilities. I think this is a national issue, but I still want to raise it as a complaint here
5. Where is the evidence for the need of these houses here? I understand the Highgate development in Horsham has slowed down as they cannot sell the houses they are building... the same will happen here and Southwater residents will end up with a half finished project for years and years
6. It isn't clear to me what the impact on the A24 will be? and additionally any claims of decent transport links to London are unrealistic due to the difficulties of getting to the stations and the capacity on the trains.
7. The offer of what appears to be two sports pitches is really poor considering 1,000 houses. The previous development of approx. 600 resulted in two football pitches, a re-located cricket pitch and a new sports club house. Surely 1,000 houses would result in greater returns to the community... where is the S106 money assigned?
8. Finally, the proposed development is literally on green field land. There are brownfield sites all of the place that should be developed first, for example the old Novartis building in Horsham itself.

I reject this development request.

[Redacted Signature]

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