

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 10 July 2026 18:35
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0782

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 10/07/2026 6:35 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	The Warren Horsham Road Handcross Haywards Heath West Sussex RH17 6DX
Proposal:	Permission in Principle for a minimum and maximum of 7no. dwellings (including 4 flats above replacement garages, 3 dwellings on land off Handford Way, and to replace 2 existing dwellings (one on the site of the existing summer house outbuilding), and Estate Office extension to create up to 600 sq m of Class E floorspace.)
Case Officer:	Daniel Holmes

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Flat 10 The Warren Horsham Road, Handcross Haywards
----------	---

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Copy of letter submitted by my wife, Dr. Ana Keefe-Clouder: Dear Sirs Planning Application Reference: DC/26/0782 - "The Warren Heritage Project". Application for multiple new residential and commercial developments at The Warren, Horsham Road, Plummers Plain, RH17 6DX. I write as a resident and co-owner of The Warren, directly impacted by the proposed developments. [REDACTED],

[REDACTED]

Myself and my husband Kether are writing to formally OBJECT to the application. We also write on behalf of our neighbour [REDACTED] Flat 7 The Warren, who has requested to be named in our letter.

We would also like to state our complete agreement with all objections to the application submitted by our neighbour, [REDACTED] at Long House, Handford Way, and fellow Warren residents, [REDACTED], Flat 9 The Warren, [REDACTED], Flat 3 The Warren and [REDACTED], Flat 5 The Warren. We are in absolute support and endorse the objections in their documents.

We also endorse the statement by Lower Beeding Parish Council that the application is not valid, and that the application should have been withdrawn and that Horsham District Council should not have allowed the application to remain validated for the various reasons notified to them.

We would also like to make the following objections.

Our objections rest most importantly on the fact that the application seeks permission for development affecting land, assets and rights that the applicant neither solely owns nor controls, and for which the necessary agreement and consent from affected co-owners has not been obtained. Indeed, co-owners at The Warren have already refused permission to demolish our garage buildings and have not granted consent for any development of shared infrastructure, land and access ways. The entire application rests upon justifications of a unified approach for sustainability and heritage benefits; however, this is misleading and inaccurate. The applicant has fundamentally failed to demonstrate the practical deliverability of substantial aspects of this scheme, without the appropriate consents and approval of effected co-owners and shareholders. The viability case is therefore profoundly flawed.

There are also serious concerns regarding the accuracy of the application, the justification advanced in support of the proposals and the treatment of existing residents and co-owners.

1. The Application Relies Upon Assumptions of Ownership, Control and Agreement That Do Not Reflect the Reality of the Site

A substantial part of the planning justification relies upon assumptions of unified ownership, management and control of the estate.

In reality, significant parts of the land and structures affected by the proposals are subject to multiple ownership interests, including shared ownership arrangements relating to garages, courtyard areas and accessways.

The proposal includes demolition and redevelopment of assets that are not under the applicant's sole ownership or control.

The planning documents repeatedly present the project as a coherent and deliverable estate-wide initiative. Certain statements within the supporting documentation also imply agreement, collaboration or shared vision amongst affected parties.

As co-owners of land and structures directly affected by the development, residents wish to make clear that we have already refused the demolition of our garages and no such agreement or informed consent exists in relation to redevelopment of shared areas or the wider proposals.

This issue is also particularly important because the planning justification itself relies heavily upon claims of integrated estate management and long-term stewardship. This is a perverse claim, given the application actively seeks the very division, loss of land, and decline of the Estate across its entire length by dividing up and disposing of large areas of the Estate for substantial residential development and commercial gain. Furthermore, The Warren is already integrated, run and maintained under an existing management structure (See Objection 4).

The application also appears to assume a future integration of additional land, buildings and residential units into the existing management structures at The Warren. The applicant does not have the power or authority to action this; nor does he have our consent to action such a plan, as co-owners or stakeholders. Viability is therefore not evidenced.

Without relevant consents from co-owners, the applicant is unable to deliver this plan, for which he seeks funds from enabling developments. This raises important questions about the reputability and genuineness of the applicant's proposal. The council are respectfully requested to scrutinise this carefully.

2. Affected Residents Were Informally Consulted and Objected

Residents of The Warren were approached by the applicant prior to submission of the application.

The applicant indicated that residents should comment only on whether they wished to retain their existing garages. At this stage, clear objections were communicated by multiple residents regarding demolition of the garage blocks.

Despite those objections, the application has proceeded substantially unchanged.

Similarly, residents were not made aware of the submission of a planning application and have not been formally consulted regarding redevelopment of shared areas, alterations affecting shared access arrangements or elements of the wider proposal.

Since submission, the applicant has not engaged affected residents in any meaningful consultation process, and has not provided any clarity or clear explanations regarding how key aspects of the proposal would operate in practice.

This has contributed to ongoing uncertainty regarding the practical implications of the development for existing residents and co-owners. Regardless, the applicant has failed to demonstrate how such a project could ever be delivered without the necessary consent and approval from co-owners. In fact, it appears that our collective refusal for significant aspects of the proposal has not been accurately reflected by the application, which raises considerable concerns.

3. Ownership Notification and Validation

The application boundary includes land and structures that are not within the applicant's sole ownership, including garage buildings, courtyard areas and shared access infrastructure.

Residents of The Warren only became aware of the application on 06/06/2026, through neighbouring properties who had received notification, despite being among the parties most directly affected by the proposals.

As co-owners of land and assets directly implicated in the proposed development plans, this has caused significant concern regarding whether the application has been properly validated and whether the interests of affected landowners have been adequately considered.

The Council is therefore requested to confirm:

- which ownership certificate was submitted;
- whether all relevant landowners were notified;
- whether all statutory notification requirements were satisfied; and
- whether the Council is satisfied that the application has been correctly validated.

4. The Claimed Heritage and Enabling Development Case Has Not Been Demonstrated

The application relies heavily upon the assertion that substantial residential development is required to secure the future of The Warren and associated heritage assets.

However, insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate:

- that the proposed scale of development is the minimum necessary;
 - that demolition of existing structures is required;
 - that alternative funding mechanisms have been properly explored;
 - that the "heritage asset" faces the degree of risk suggested by the supporting documentation;
- or
- that the extensive enabling development proposed is proportionate to the claimed heritage benefits.

The Warren mansion, land and assets are occupied, managed and maintained through an

established management structure - The Warren Handcross Residents Association (WHRA) Ltd. The existing management arrangements have continued to operate without the need for the proposed enabling development.

There are 11 flats currently owned by 8 different proprietors. One flat represents 1/11th of a share of the freehold of The Warren. The applicant owns 4 flats and therefore 4/11ths of the freehold, but he is not the sole legal owner.

Each flat owns the title deeds to its respective property footprint, private garden, garage and wood store (Appendix A). Residents collectively own and share the full freehold for the entire boundary of The Warren (Appendix B), including communal and shared areas such as the courtyard, driveway and shared access areas.

Under this structure residents contribute an annual service charge for the maintenance of The Warren. Existing buildings, assets and land within The Warren continue to be maintained and used. The Warren mansion, associated assets and communal land are neither in a state of disrepair nor at risk of immediate or substantial decline.

The application has not demonstrated why demolition of functioning buildings and the creation of extensive new residential development are necessary to secure the future of the claimed heritage asset.

It is also notable that The Warren mansion is not a listed building. Whilst residents support appropriate conservation and maintenance of the site, the application places considerable weight upon claimed heritage benefits without demonstrating why development of this scale is necessary or proportionate to secure those benefits. The weight that can reasonably be attached to those claimed heritage benefits should therefore be carefully scrutinised.

Residents are also concerned that a substantial new market housing development is being presented as heritage-led, to enable development, without sufficient evidence demonstrating why development of this scale is required.

As the applicant has also not clearly detailed or demonstrated how the proposed new dwellings will be serviced for water, drainage, power and sewage, we would request for the council to investigate this directly. Submitted site drawings and plans remain vague and opaque. Given the proposals, we would like to ensure that the applicant does not intend to use existing infrastructure at The Warren, such as our septic tank system, shared driveway, courtyard areas or land, which the applicant does not solely own and which would be unsuitable and incapable of accommodating additional demand. Both the additional pressure on existing infrastructure or the creation of new infrastructure, for such extensive development would put our assets at risk and likely create the very to decline the applicant proposes to prevent.

4. Demolition of Existing Garage Buildings Has Not Been Justified

The proposal seeks demolition of three existing garage blocks serving residents of The Warren mansion.

These buildings are not derelict, unsafe or abandoned. They remain functional, maintained and in active use.

The application does not adequately demonstrate why demolition is necessary, nor does it properly assess the option of retention, repair and continued use.

Similarly, the proposed relocation of the existing garage blocks would materially reduce convenience and accessibility for existing residents. The replacement garages are proposed to be moved onto land owned by the applicant but not owned by The Warren residents. The applicant has not evidenced how these significant changes to resident's title deeds and property would be legally or practically managed. As residents, we do not consent for additional land, buildings or assets to be absorbed within our existing title deeds, nor do we wish for our existing assets to be moved onto land outside of our boundary, again raising questions about the deliverability of this proposal.

The removal and redevelopment of functioning buildings that continue to serve existing residents should not be accepted without compelling evidence that demolition is essential to achieve a clearly defined planning benefit.

The applicant seeks to remove garage buildings and alter driveway routes directly within the sightline of his own property (Flat 1); whilst imposing a large block of flats above garages immediately next to and in the sightline of other residents' properties. The proposed arrangement appears to prioritise the applicant's private objectives whilst creating material impacts for existing residents, including changes to outlook, amenity, access and the established use of shared facilities.

These concerns are compounded by the fact that the applicant has not demonstrated that the

necessary consents from affected co-owners have been obtained in relation to the demolition, redevelopment, relocation or replacement of these structures. We can again confirm that permission to remove, move and rebuild these garage buildings has already been refused.

6. The Application Does Not Accurately Describe the Development Proposed

The application repeatedly refers to two elements of the proposal as "replacement dwellings" and states that the scheme would result in a net increase of seven dwellings.

Residents with direct knowledge of the site state that this description is factually incorrect.

The locations identified as replacement dwellings do not contain existing lawful dwellings.

There are therefore no dwellings present to replace.

These proposals should be assessed as new residential development rather than replacement dwellings, totalling nine new dwellings.

This distinction is fundamental because the planning balance, scale of development and claimed net increase in dwellings are all influenced by how these units are categorised.

The Council is therefore requested to independently verify the existing lawful status of these sites and reassess whether the application accurately describes the true extent of residential development proposed.

If these sites do not contain existing lawful dwellings, the application appears to materially understate the scale of net housing growth and misrepresent the nature of the development being sought.

7. The Supporting Documentation Contains Material Inaccuracies and Creates a Misleading Impression

Residents have identified a number of factual inaccuracies and inconsistencies within the application documents.

Particularly concerning is the inclusion of photographs depicting restoration and landscape works that were not undertaken by the applicant and are not located within the application site.

The inclusion of these images creates a misleading impression regarding the applicant's track record of delivering comparable restoration works and risks influencing decision-makers on an incorrect basis.

These images also appear to be relied upon as evidence of restoration capability, environmental stewardship and delivery of comparable projects, despite not depicting works undertaken by the applicant or within the application site.

When considered alongside the inaccurate description of new dwellings as replacement dwellings and the assumptions made regarding ownership and agreement, these issues raise broader concerns regarding the reliability of the information presented in support of the application.

9. Public Access, Traffic, Commercialisation and Intensification of Activity

The application proposes activities and uses that would introduce a significantly different pattern of activity into what is presently a private residential environment.

The proposal includes visitor, educational, heritage and commercial elements that would intensify activity within and around The Warren. The 6500sqft commercial building proposed, is wholly unsuitable for use and scale on the site. Associated road infrastructure, visitor and staff car parks will destroy the woodland character, with no clarity on vehicle access.

The Council should also carefully assess the implications of increased visitor numbers, vehicle movements, servicing requirements, parking demand and pedestrian activity on the amenity, privacy, security and enjoyment of existing residents.

Similarly, the increase in traffic generated by new flats and dwellings around The Warren will place additional pressure upon the existing narrow single-track access lane, which is unlikely to accommodate the increased level of activity without detriment to residential amenity and local character. It also remains unclear how parking for the increase in resident and visitor traffic at The Warren will be facilitated, given the reliance on transport by car to access and reside at The Warren, from Horsham Road. Although there are only 8 legal owners of the 11 flats at The Warren, there are currently 10 different individuals/families residing here, each with one or multiple vehicles. It remains unclear from the application how a sum total of 16 different dwellings with multiple occupants, vehicles and prospective visitors could reasonably be accommodated at The Warren without significant detriment and damage to residential amenity or local character.

Nevertheless, the proposed changes rely upon land, assets and rights that are not under the applicant's sole ownership or control. The applicant has not demonstrated how these works can be delivered without agreement from affected owners. If the applicant cannot deliver the work, for which he seeks funds from enabling developments; the viability case remains fundamentally flawed.

8. Concerns Regarding Ecological Stewardship and Environmental Management

The application places considerable emphasis on ecological enhancement, biodiversity, landscape restoration, agroforestry and long-term environmental stewardship.

Residents fully support genuine ecological enhancement and recognise the importance of protecting and improving local biodiversity. However, the environmental benefits claimed within the application should be carefully scrutinised and independently verified.

Given the size and extent of development proposed, the applicant has not provided evidence that professional master-planning teams, environmental consultants, ecological specialists or Environmental Impact Assessment practitioners have undertaken site analysis, evidential studies or contributed to the proposals in support of these aims. This feels essential given the site area being within an Area of Outstanding natural beauty and is of the upmost importance to protect.

Residents therefore request that the Council carefully scrutinise the ecological, biodiversity and environmental claims made within the application and ensure that any benefits relied upon in support of the proposal are evidenced and independently verified.

Similarly, as the applicant does not have the consent of co-owners and residents at The Warren to use our jointly owned, existing infrastructure to service the creation of new dwellings (nor would this be practical or appropriate), it is important to state that this would necessitate the creation of new infrastructure which will significantly disturb the local character, habitat and wildlife within the designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Conclusion

Taken together, these concerns raise significant questions regarding the accuracy, justification, reliability and deliverability of the proposals.

A recurring theme throughout this application is that significant weight is placed upon assumptions of heritage benefit, environmental stewardship, ownership control and stakeholder agreement. However, residents have identified multiple instances where the factual position on the ground differs materially from the picture presented in the supporting documentation.

The Council is therefore respectfully requested to independently verify the principal factual assertions made in support of the application before attaching significant weight to them.

The Council is dutifully requested to scrutinise the application carefully, verify the factual basis of the claims made in support of it, and satisfy itself that the proposal has been accurately described and properly justified.

If the applicant cannot demonstrate ownership, consent, accuracy and deliverability, then the fundamental question remains: what exactly is it that you are being asked to support?

For the reasons set out above, we respectfully submit that planning permission be refused.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted Signature]

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**



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