

[REDACTED]

From: Planning
Sent: 20 April 2026 13:56
Subject: FW: *DC/25/1327*FW: Highways Concern – SA520 Ashington (Cumulative Impact and Safety)

Sent: 11 April 2026 22:20
To: PL Planning Applications <planning.applications@westsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Highways Concern – SA520 Ashington (Cumulative Impact and Safety)

****EXTERNAL****

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a local resident writing regarding a proposed development of approximately 65–70 dwellings at land north of Rectory Lane and west of Billingshurst Road, Ashington (part of the wider SA520 site).

I have significant concerns regarding the highways impact of this proposal, particularly in the context of existing constraints and cumulative development pressures in the area.

The B2133 (Billingshurst Road) already experiences congestion, particularly at peak times, and is not well suited to accommodate additional traffic at this scale. There are also notable safety concerns, including limited or discontinuous pavements and a lack of adequate street lighting in places, which makes pedestrian movement difficult and potentially hazardous.

Of particular concern is that this proposal appears to form part of a wider site (SA520) that could ultimately deliver a substantially larger number of homes — potentially up to around 400 dwellings — if brought forward incrementally through separate applications. This raises serious questions about whether the full cumulative traffic impact is being properly assessed.

National policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an “unacceptable impact on highway safety” or if the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be “severe.” Given the existing constraints on the B2133, combined with the potential for cumulative development across the wider SA520 site, I am concerned that this proposal risks meeting that threshold, particularly in terms of road safety, pedestrian accessibility, and peak-time congestion.

In this context, I would be grateful if you could confirm:

- Whether West Sussex County Council Highways has been consulted on this proposal
- Whether the cumulative impact of development across the wider SA520 site is being considered

- Whether the existing road network, particularly the B2133, has the capacity to safely accommodate this level of growth
- Whether any mitigation measures or infrastructure upgrades would be required

Given the existing constraints, I am concerned that this proposal would result in increased congestion, reduced highway safety, and a greater reliance on private vehicles in an area with limited alternative transport options.

I would appreciate any clarification you can provide and whether the Highways Authority anticipates raising concerns or objections.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]
Firtree Cottage
Billingshurst Road
Ashington
RH20 3AZ

Sent from [Outlook for Android](#)

[REDACTED]

Subject: OBJECTION: SA520 Land North of Rectory Lane and West of Billingshurst Road, Ashington

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to formally object to the proposed development of approximately 65–70 dwellings on land forming part of the wider SA520 site (land north of Rectory Lane and west of Billingshurst Road, Ashington). I understand this proposal is currently at a pre-application / consultation stage.

I request that this objection be fully considered by Horsham District Council, Ashington Parish Council, and local ward councillors, and that any future application relating to this site be subject to Member determination rather than delegated decision-making, given the scale of concern and clear policy conflicts.

1. Conflict with the Development Plan

The proposal is in direct conflict with the statutory development plan, including the Ashington Neighbourhood Plan 2019–2031 and the Horsham District Planning Framework.

- Under Neighbourhood Plan Policy 2, development is restricted to within the defined built-up area boundary. This site lies outside that boundary and is therefore contrary to policy.
- The site is not allocated for development within the Neighbourhood Plan, which sets a clear, community-led spatial strategy for growth.
- At district level, the proposal conflicts with Policy 26 (Countryside Protection), Policy 3 (Development Hierarchy), and Policy 33 (Development Principles).

Allowing development on this site would fundamentally undermine the plan-led system.

2. Previously Assessed and Rejected Site (SA520)

The site forms part of the wider SA520 “Ashington Northern Cluster,” which has already been assessed through the Local Plan process and rejected by Horsham District Council.

The Council’s own Regulation 19 Site Assessment Report identifies this location as unsuitable due to cumulative impacts, infrastructure constraints, and sustainability concerns.

The subdivision of this wider site into a smaller parcel does not overcome these issues and instead represents an attempt to bring forward development incrementally.

3. Infrastructure Capacity and Cumulative Impact

There are significant and unresolved infrastructure concerns, many of which have already been identified by the Council:

- Local road network constraints, including congestion on the B2133, particularly at peak times
- Lack of continuous pavements and poor or absent street lighting, creating safety concerns
- Limited public transport provision, resulting in high reliance on private vehicles
- Insufficient capacity in local schools
- Lack of available GP and dental services
- Cumulative pressure from recent and committed developments, including Penn Gardens

The proposal fails to demonstrate how these constraints can be adequately addressed and therefore does not represent sustainable development.

4. Drainage and Wastewater Concerns

Properties in this area, including along Billingshurst Road and Linfield Lane, rely predominantly on private drainage systems, which already indicates an absence of comprehensive mains sewer infrastructure.

In addition, Billingshurst Road is known to rely on multiple surface water pumps to manage drainage, which highlights existing constraints within the local drainage network.

Against this context, it is entirely unclear how foul and surface water drainage from a development of 65–70 dwellings would be effectively managed. There is no evidence that sufficient capacity exists within the local sewer network, nor clarity on whether significant new infrastructure, such as pumping stations or treatment facilities, would be required.

This raises serious concerns that the development could:

- Exacerbate existing drainage pressures

- Increase the risk of localised flooding
- Lead to system overload or failure
- Result in potential pollution incidents

Given the known reliance on private systems and existing engineered drainage solutions in the area, this is a fundamental constraint to development rather than a minor technical matter. Robust and evidenced solutions must be provided before the site can be considered suitable.

5. Environmental and Ecological Impact

The site comprises open countryside with established hedgerows and field boundaries that are likely to function as important wildlife corridors.

Development would result in:

- Habitat loss and fragmentation
- Disturbance from increased activity and lighting
- Harm to local biodiversity

It remains unclear how biodiversity net gain could be achieved on-site without significant ecological harm.

6. Landscape and Rural Character

The site forms part of the rural setting of Ashington and contributes to the transition between the built-up area and open countryside.

Development would:

- Erode the village edge
- Result in the urbanisation of a currently rural landscape
- Harm the character of the surrounding Low Weald countryside

7. Residential Amenity Impact

My property at Firtree Cottage directly backs onto the proposed site.

The development would have a significant and harmful impact on residential amenity, including:

- Loss of outlook over open countryside
- Loss of privacy
- Noise and disturbance from both construction and occupation
- Visual intrusion and encroachment at the settlement edge

The proximity of new dwellings to my rear boundary would result in direct and unavoidable overlooking into my garden, which is a primary private amenity space and includes an outdoor swimming pool that is regularly used. This would result in a serious and unacceptable loss of privacy and enjoyment of the property. The current open, private outlook would be replaced by close-range views from neighbouring dwellings, fundamentally altering the use and character of the space and creating a sense of intrusion that cannot be adequately mitigated.

The construction phase would result in severe and prolonged disturbance to my household. My husband and son both work 12-hour night shifts and must sleep during the day. Construction activity taking place in close proximity to our boundary would make daytime rest extremely difficult, if not impossible, due to continuous noise, vibration, and site activity. This would have a direct and sustained impact on health and wellbeing over what is likely to be a lengthy construction period. Given the lack of any meaningful buffer between the proposed development and existing homes, this impact would be both immediate and unavoidable.

There appears to be little or no meaningful buffer between existing properties and the proposed development.

8. Sustainability and National Policy (NPPF)

Due to the lack of infrastructure, limited public transport provision, and the site's richly biodiverse greenfield nature, this location cannot meet the definition of sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

The site would result in a car-dependent form of development with insufficient access to services and facilities, placing additional strain on already constrained infrastructure. These issues are fundamental and cannot be resolved through mitigation.

9. Local Plan Context

Horsham District Council has recently reopened the examination into its Local Plan (2023–2040).

Given that this site has already been assessed and rejected, and that it cannot meet the requirements of sustainable development, it is essential that SA520 remains excluded from the Local Plan. This will ensure that the site continues to be protected from inappropriate development over the plan period.

10. Request for Decision-Making Transparency

Given the scale of policy conflict, level of public concern, and strategic implications of developing part of the rejected SA520 site, I formally request that:

- Any future planning application is referred to Planning Committee rather than determined under delegated powers
- Local ward councillors consider formally calling in the application
- The Council maintains the “rejected” status of SA520 within the emerging Local Plan

11. Invitation to Visit the Site

Given the site-specific nature of many of these concerns, I would welcome the opportunity for relevant councillors and planning officers to visit my property and view the site from the perspective of directly affected residents. This would allow a full appreciation of the proximity, landscape impact, and residential amenity issues that cannot be fully understood from plans alone.

Conclusion

This proposal is contrary to the development plan, unsupported by infrastructure, environmentally harmful, and unsustainable in both scale and location. It also represents an incremental attempt to develop a site that has already been robustly assessed and rejected.

For all of these reasons, I strongly object and request that the site remains excluded from development both now and within the future Local Plan.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

Firtree Cottage
Billingshurst Road
Ashington
RH20 3AZ

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

LEGAL DISCLAIMER

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please reply to advise us but you should not read it, copy it, show it to anyone else nor make any other use of its content. West Sussex County Council takes steps to ensure emails and attachments are virus-free but you should carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.
