

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 September 2026 11:25:11 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0954
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 29/09/2026 11:25 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land South of Athelstan Way Horsham West Sussex
Proposal:	Residential development for 21no. 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings with associated parking, hard and soft landscaping at Land South of Athelstan Way, Horsham.
Case Officer:	Nicola Pettifer

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	5 Paget Close 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 - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I wish to object to the proposed residential development of land

south of Athelstan Way, Horsham.

The site lies outside the built-up area of Horsham and forms part of the open countryside immediately south of the town. Its undeveloped character makes an important contribution to the setting of Horsham and the transition between the town and surrounding countryside. It is also a valued recreational area used regularly by local residents for walking, cycling and dog walking.

The development would result in the permanent loss of this open countryside and cause significant harm to the character, appearance and visual amenity of the landscape. The site is elevated and visually prominent, making the introduction of two-storey housing particularly intrusive.

Although the bungalows at the highest point may reduce some of the visual impact, the taller houses in front would substantially diminish this benefit. The site is not a self-contained parcel of land capable of readily absorbing development, it forms part of a wider rural landscape rising from the southern edge of Horsham. The proposed housing would therefore introduce a substantial built element into an open countryside setting and would not adequately respond to its rural character. The loss of this valued recreational resource is also contrary to HDPF Policy 43.

The Design and Access Statement refers to previous residential proposals on land to the south and east which were refused because of their impact on the countryside. The elevated nature of the land and its effect on views were recognised by the Planning Inspector. The current site remains at a similar elevated level and the fundamental characteristics which led to those decisions have not changed. The contours, elevation and relationship with the surrounding countryside remain the same, and changes to the design or scale of the current proposal do not overcome these underlying landscape and visual constraints.

The site forms part of a wider countryside landscape incorporating meadow, wetland, woodland and river habitats. Muggeridge Field, Chesworth Farm and surrounding areas have Local Wildlife Site status, demonstrating the wider environmental importance of this area. Development should therefore be considered in the context of its cumulative impact on this wider rural landscape.

There are particular concerns about the western boundary and the adjoining bridleway. The existing mature trees and hedgerows provide an attractive rural setting, whereas the proposed close-boarded fencing and built edge would create a much more enclosed and urbanised corridor. The proposed landscaping does not appear sufficient to adequately soften this impact, resulting in a permanent loss of the bridleway's existing rural character and visual amenity.

There are concerns regarding the previous removal of mature hedgerows along the southern and western boundaries. This appears inconsistent with the Design and Access Statement, which states that existing trees and hedgerows would be retained and protected. These hedgerows had previously been identified as potential dormouse habitat, so their removal should be properly addressed within the ecological assessment.

It is particularly concerning that clearance appears to have taken place before determination of the application. Any Biodiversity Net Gain assessment should accurately reflect the site's condition before this clearance rather than allowing established habitat to be removed and thereby reducing the biodiversity baseline. The application should also demonstrate how the required habitat creation and long-term management will be secured, including the Neighbourhood Plan requirement under Policy HB10 for sufficient funding to support at least 30 years of post-development habitat management or land-use change.

There is also an apparent error in paragraph 5.10 of the Design and Access Statement, which refers to the site as part of HB27: Athelstan Way and appears to suggest that this supports sensitive development. HB27 was subsequently removed and there is no adopted housing allocation supporting residential development of this site. The former HB27 reference should therefore not be relied upon as evidence of a planning allocation or endorsement of development.

The Design and Access Statement also contains apparent editing errors, including consecutive duplication of planning policies. This makes the document difficult to follow and raises concerns about the accuracy and clarity of the planning justification, particularly given the reliance placed upon planning policy and previous planning history.

There are further concerns about drainage and surface-water runoff. The applicant should demonstrate that the development, including buildings, roads and hardstanding, would not worsen existing drainage or flooding problems affecting neighbouring properties, taking full account of the site's elevated position and topography.

Parking and highway safety are also concerns. Inadequate on-site parking could result in additional vehicles parking on Athelstan Way and surrounding roads, which are already busy. This could increase congestion and potentially obstruct emergency access, including access to neighbouring properties and the nearby care home.

Finally, development of this site would risk setting a precedent for further residential development of neighbouring fields and the wider Chesworth Farm area. The importance of this countryside

lies not only in the individual field but in its relationship with the surrounding undeveloped landscape. Incremental development would progressively erode the rural setting and the separation between Horsham and the countryside.

Overall, this proposal would introduce residential development into an elevated and visually prominent area of open countryside outside the built-up area of Horsham. It would result in the permanent loss of countryside and harm the landscape, views, recreational value, bridleway and rural setting of the southern edge of the town.

These concerns are reinforced by previous refusals of residential development on neighbouring land, the removal of established hedgerows, ecological and Biodiversity Net Gain issues, drainage and highway concerns, and apparent inaccuracies within the Design and Access Statement, including the reliance on the former HB27 designation.

I therefore strongly object to the application and request that planning permission is 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