

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 March 2026 18:06:42 UTC+00:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
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 22/03/2026 6:06 PM.

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: 22 Edinburgh Close Southwater

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

- Design
- Loss of General Amenity
- Overdevelopment

Comments: I strongly object to the Berkeley Homes application for 1,000 homes north-west of Southwater on the following planning grounds.

Firstly, the proposal directly conflicts with the adopted Southwater Neighbourhood Plan. This Plan, approved by referendum in 2021, sets a clear and legally binding housing requirement of 420-460 homes. The proposed 1,000 homes exceed this limit by approximately 117%. This is not a minor variation but a fundamental breach of a recently adopted, community-led plan. National planning policy is clear that proposals which conflict with an up-to-date Neighbourhood Plan should not normally be approved. The Plan remains current and carries full weight, and no robust justification has been provided to override it. This conflict alone is sufficient grounds for refusal.

Secondly, the proposal conflicts with the spatial strategy set out in the Neighbourhood Plan, in particular Policy SNP1.1(a), which requires Southwater to remain a single-centre village focused on Lintot Square. The application proposes a new cluster of shops, services, community facilities and a primary school on the western edge of the village, effectively creating a second village centre. This would fragment the village, draw activity away from the existing centre and fundamentally alter its character. The development also extends beyond the defined settlement boundary. These issues were central to the withdrawal of the previous 1,500-home application on this site and remain unresolved. This represents a clear policy conflict and is grounds for refusal.

Thirdly, there has been no proper assessment of the cumulative impact of development on Southwater. The village is already accommodating significant growth, with approximately 350 homes under construction at Broadacres and around 800 homes approved at the former golf club site. This equates to approximately 1,150 homes already committed. Adding this proposal would take total growth to over 2,150 homes, more than doubling the number of households in the village. Despite this, the applicant has assessed this development in isolation and has not undertaken a comprehensive assessment of the combined impact on infrastructure, including roads, schools, healthcare and utilities. This is not a sound basis for decision-making. Furthermore, at typical build-out rates, this development could take around 20 years to complete, effectively locking up land supply with a single developer well beyond the five-year requirement. Planning permission should not be granted without a full and independent cumulative infrastructure assessment.

Finally, there is a clear absence of deliverable healthcare

provision to support this level of growth. Local GP surgeries are already under significant pressure and face well-documented recruitment challenges. Access to NHS dentistry is limited, and many residents are unable to register with a dentist. Ambulance response times in this area are among the worst in Sussex. There is no confirmed, funded or deliverable plan to expand healthcare capacity to accommodate the proposed population increase. Crucially, the Berkeley Homes consultation materials and website contain no clear explanation of how local services, including GP surgeries and NHS dentists, will be expanded or adapted to cope with the additional demand. Statements about working with the NHS do not constitute a deliverable strategy. Previous developments have not always delivered infrastructure in a timely manner, and there is no certainty that this proposal would be different. Planning permission should not be granted unless and until adequate healthcare provision is secured.

For these reasons, the proposal fundamentally conflicts with the Neighbourhood Plan, undermines the agreed structure of the village, fails to address cumulative infrastructure impacts and provides no credible plan for essential services. It should therefore be refused.

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 E aton