

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 May 2026 15:24:41 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0640
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 29/05/2026 3:24 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Cedar Cottage Sandygate Lane Lower Beeding West Sussex RH13 6LR
Proposal:	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 24no. dwellings including the creation of a new access from Sandygate Lane with associated works.
Case Officer:	Alice Johnson

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: The Hawthorns Sandygate Lane Lower Beeding

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	I wish to log a formal objection to the proposed residential development at Cedar Cottage, Sandygate Lane, Lower Beeding Objections to

1. Overdevelopment
2. Other - Pollution and Flood Risk
3. Design
4. Highway Access and Parking
5. Environment and Ecological Concerns

1. Overdevelopment.

The development was previously rejected by the Lower Beeding Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan on the grounds that it does not meet the vision and objectives of the parish. Some of those concerns have been highlighted in the various posted planning reports which are technical in nature's so I have summarised them below:

a) The Infiltration Rate failed the BRE365 test (Ref Surface Water Drainage Proforma) which means it is too permeable or saturated to support standard soakaways. The high groundwater level has significant implications for construction and drainage. The construction challenge to foundations and garden drainage have not been addressed in their reports.

As for drainage they appear to have addressed the weakness of drainage by installing massive SuDS Tanks (Storage 589.5 Surface Water Drainage Statement) to capture surface water from the roads

and houses into the South West corner of the site that will be pumped to the only facility offered to them by Southern Water which is in Trinity Fields that feeds directly by road drain into Leech Pond. The pump is being placed beside the SuDS tank in SW corner of the site. So water currently feeding across fields, supporting trees and vegetation and ditches, will in future be pumped back up to the entrance of the site, along Sandygate Lane and down into Trinity Fields to manhole TQ21279350 (Ref Southern Water Response)

b) the current sewage pipe stretches across the middle of the site and because the field is on a gradient of 1:35 18 of the houses located below the pipe level will only have access to the sewage drain via a managed pump which will also be located in the SW corner of the site. Sewage for those 18 houses will be directed by gravity to the SW corner and then pumped back up the road to drain into the middle far left corner of the site at drain ref 9202. (Ref Southern Water Response and the appendix Map attached to Flood Risk Assessment).

Southern Water are clear 'the applicant will need to ensure that the arrangements exist for the long-term maintenance of the SuDS facilities. It is critical that the effectiveness of these systems is maintained in perpetuity'. Good management will avoid flooding from the proposed surface water system, which may result in the inundation of the foul sewerage systems.

Objection statement to Overdevelopment 1. this solution has yet to be costed. It requires electricity, infrastructure, regular privately funded maintenance and insurance. Any short cuts could result in major failure as both storage and pumps are located together in

the SW corner of the site and output pipes from the tanks, should the break, are being placed in the direction of residential housing and Leech Pond. In addition to pollution and flood risk there is also the noise pollution of the pumps for both residence and neighbours. It also underlines, in my opinion, that this proposal will be neither energy efficient or cost effective.

2. Pollution and Flood risk - the site falls from northeast to southwest at a gradient 1.35 (ref Flood Risk Assessment)

a) However, the southern most part of the site falls towards the field of Timberlands and Leech Pond, only 100m away. The report incorrectly states that 'this pond which doesn't appear to have connection to a wider surface water network in the local area'. There are numerous maps that show this to be incorrect including Archaeological Desk Based Assessment Fig 2. This map shows that the overflow from Leech Pond links to the lakes of Leonardslee Gardens and AONB the High Weald National Landscape yet there is no mention of how site pollution during the building phase will be managed to protect these areas. In the last five years I have reported road work pollution to the Environment Agency that made its way from Sandygate Lane down the ditch to the west of The Hawthorn to Leech Pond. On that day a quarter of Leech Pond turned orange but thankfully the roadworks only lasted two days. I can only imagine what months of excavation work at this site will do to Leech Pond eco system and the surrounding areas.

b) beyond accepting that the ground water level is high, there is little in the reports regarding increase risk of flooding elsewhere including flow routing. For example, redevelopment may give rise to backwater effects or divert floodwater onto other properties. To assess this risk the report must understand the actual make up of the soil that cannot be gleaned from desk top Geology reports.

Areas not yet reported and risks considered:

- i. There are at least four operating wells within 200m of the property and one at the property at Sandygate.
 - ii. 1899 OS map for Lower Beeding show Brickworks at the junction of Sandygate Lane and a Clay pit or Marl pit beside what is now Cedar Cottage
 - iii. West Sussex Records Office report on Marl Pits records two Marl Pits in Lower Beeding
 - iv. The pond at Trinity Fields is recorded as a clay pit (local record)
 - v. The natural pond at Cedar Cottage has withheld water while others have dried up (ref Great Crested Newt EDNA sampling)
 - vi. It is the intention of the build to remove the pond (Preliminary Ecological Appraisal) but no details given of the impact
 - vii. In January 2020 the Horsham Environmental Health & Licensing Dept declined planning on a new build next to the Cedar Cottage site for reasons of 'Contaminated Land' stating 'Historic maps on our GIS show the potential infilled pits are present in close proximity to the application site. Given the lack of information on what was used to infill them these infilled pits
-

therefore present potential sources of contamination to the development and future occupiers of it'. They went on to request a contamination assessment (Ref DC/19/2336 Planning Portal). Objection statement Pollution and Flood Risk 2. The current planning application does nothing to address the risk of land pollution from historic clay pits that will be disturbed by the building work. I would hope based on new data, that this risk can be cleared with a complete contamination assessment of the site including why the pond doesn't drain. As for flood risk to surrounding property, due to the size of the pond at Trinity Fields (winter months it can reach 4ft in depth) and the confirm direction of land fall (NE to SW) I would expect to see confirmation that neither property of land around the site are put at risk from the proposed changes to the general direction of drainage and the removal of the pond at Cedar Cottage

3. Design

If my above concerns regarding the make up of the land are confirmed or that in-fill has been used then the risk of subsidence should be addressed including and not limited to the design and height of the new properties.

The existence of the brickworks and clay pits is well known to many in the village and it needs to be noted that there are no two storey brick buildings between The Hawthorn in the west of Sandygate lane and the new builds to the east at Trinity Fields. The buildings are either Bungalows, Chalet style or in the case of Sandygate, brick at lower level and wood upper level.

Objection to Design 3 - Why are these existing low level design aspects being ignored without questioning and without the need for supporting foundation checks.

4 Highway Access and Parking

Objection - There will be an increase in traffic at the area of Sandygate Lane where two roads already converge on the same zone.

The new entrance is adding yet another heavy volume crossroad for school children, parents and dog walkers.

I have yet to see a full report from the Highways agency.

5. Other Environmental and Ecological Concerns

The storage and dumping of surface water from SuDS tacks into the drains at Trinity Fields by private operators risks disturbing the natural balance of water flow into Leech Pond.

Southern Water have raised the risk that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site.

The plan makes no allowance for the flooding risks in the surrounding areas.

The plan makes no allowance/acknowledgement for the down stream pollution risk to an AONB High Weald National Landscape during the build period.

Objection: information as to who will be responsible for the management of the complicated drainage system has yet to be

decided. I have no option but to object to this solution until it is known who will have the expertise to control the release water from the SuDS tanks into the main drain and who will hold the necessary insurance coverage should the two pumping systems fail resulting in the uncontrolled release of surface water and foul water into the broad landscape?

With such a high risk location I also question why the Environment Agency is not involved in this development proposal?

Based on the above weaknesses and the costly haphazard drainage solutions presented to address the shortcoming of the site, which clear is not suitable for this level of development, I respectfully request that Horsham District Council refuse this planning application

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