

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 28 May 2026 10:06
To: Planning
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 28/05/2026 10:05 AM.

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:	White Gables Sandygate Lane Horsham
----------	-------------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I write to register a strong objection to the proposed development of 24 dwellings on land to the rear of Cedar Cottage, Sandygate Lane, Lower Beeding. As a nearby resident whose property borders the site, I have serious concerns regarding the scale, density, and cumulative impact of the proposal on village character, local infrastructure, neighbouring amenity, and the rural setting of Sandygate Lane. My objection is based on the following material planning considerations. 1. Conflict with the recently adopted Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan The Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan, adopted in October 2025, forms part of the statutory development plan and allocates sufficient land to meet the parish's housing requirement. The

application site was not allocated, despite the Sandygate Lane area being fully assessed during the plan-making process.

The proposal therefore conflicts with the plan-led strategy. Under Paragraph 14 of the NPPF, where a neighbourhood plan is less than five years old and meets identified housing needs, the adverse impacts of allowing conflicting development are likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The Neighbourhood Plan clearly meets these criteria and should carry substantial weight.

2. Harm to village character and the edge-of-settlement setting

The site forms part of an important green transition between the village and open countryside. Its paddock land, vegetation, and spacious pattern of development contribute to the semi-rural character of Sandygate Lane.

The proposed estate-style cul-de-sac would introduce a denser and more suburban form that does not reflect the prevailing character or grain of the area. It would extend the urbanising influence of Trinity Fields into a sensitive edge-of-settlement location, contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan's emphasis on protecting openness and local distinctiveness.

3. Cumulative urbanisation

Recent developments, including Trinity Fields and The Gallops, have already altered the character of Sandygate Lane. This proposal would add further built form, traffic, and residential activity, contributing to the progressive suburbanisation of the village edge. The cumulative impact is significant and has not been adequately addressed.

4. Impact on neighbouring residents

The introduction of 24 dwellings, parking, lighting, and vehicle movements immediately adjoining existing homes will inevitably result in increased disturbance and loss of amenity. Boundary treatments do not mitigate the wider urbanising effect, nor do they prevent overlooking from upper-floor windows. The concerns raised by adjoining residents regarding privacy, outlook, and amenity should be given considerable weight.

5. Traffic, highway safety, and access concerns

Sandygate Lane is a narrow village road used by pedestrians, cyclists, and dog walkers. Additional traffic from a development of this scale would increase pressure on an already constrained route. The developer's own consultation identified traffic and access as the most common concern. The Transport Statement therefore requires close scrutiny by the Council and the Highway Authority.

6. Loss of green character and biodiversity

The site currently contributes positively to local green infrastructure and biodiversity. The proposal would replace open grassland with built form and hardstanding. The applicant confirms that biodiversity net gain cannot be achieved on-site and relies on off-site compensation, which does not address the direct localised loss of habitat and openness.

7. Housing benefits do not outweigh the harms

Although housing delivery is a material consideration, the proposal:

- Conflicts with a recently adopted Neighbourhood Plan
- Harms village character and the rural edge
- Contributes to cumulative urbanisation
- Increases traffic and infrastructure pressure
- Adversely affects neighbouring amenity
- Results in the loss of locally important green space

These harms are substantial and outweigh the claimed benefits.

Conclusion

For the reasons above, I respectfully request that Horsham District Council refuse planning permission.



Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



Horsham District Council, Alberty House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton