

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 27 May 2026 15:12:41 UTC+01:00  
**To:** "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0585  
**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 27/05/2026 3:12 PM.

### Application Summary

|               |                                                                                                                              |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Address:      | Land at Station Road Warnham West Sussex RH12 3SR                                                                            |
| Proposal:     | Outline application for the erection of approximately 24 residential dwellings, with all matters reserved except for access. |
| Case Officer: | Alice Johnson                                                                                                                |

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

|          |                                             |
|----------|---------------------------------------------|
| Address: | 17 Station Road Warnham Horsham West Sussex |
|----------|---------------------------------------------|

### Comments Details

|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Commenter Type:      | Neighbour                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Stance:              | Customer objects to the Planning Application                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Reasons for comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Design</li><li>- Highway Access and Parking</li><li>- Loss of General Amenity</li><li>- Overdevelopment</li></ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Comments:            | I write as a resident of 17 Station Road, Warnham, in immediate proximity to the proposed development, to register my formal objection to planning application DC/26/0585 in its current form. My objection is shared by several neighbouring residents, and I would ask that this letter be read alongside any representations they may submit independently. |

I wish to make clear at the outset that I am not opposed to development on this land in principle. However, the application as submitted raises serious concerns regarding highway safety, parking provision, flood risk, and the character of the existing settlement that I do not believe have been adequately addressed in the supporting documents. I address each of these in turn below.

### 1. Scale of Development and the Character of the Existing Settlement

Station Road, Warnham is a rural lane of just 21 dwellings, a settlement that has remained largely unchanged for over 100 years. The proposed development of 24 new homes would more than double the number of properties on this road in a single phase of development. This is not a modest infill, it represents a transformation of the fundamental character of a long-established rural community.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that development be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF specifically requires that developments add to the overall quality of the area and respond to local character. A development that exceeds the size of the entire existing settlement cannot reasonably be said to meet this test. I urge the Council to give serious weight to this point.

### 2. Loss of Long-Established Community Green Space

The area of green space adjacent to the existing properties has been maintained by the local community for the use of children as an informal play area for over 44 years. This is not unused or incidental land; it is a valued community resource with a well-established history of active use by local families. Its loss to the proposed development would remove the only accessible outdoor play space available to children on Station Road, with no equivalent replacement identified in the application.

I would ask the Council to consider whether the application adequately assesses the impact of this loss on the existing community, and whether Policy 43 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (which seeks to protect and enhance open space, sport and recreation facilities) has been properly engaged with by the applicant.

### 3. Highway Safety, Pedestrian Risk, and Sustainable Transport

#### 3a. The Station Road Junction

The Transport Statement submitted by the applicant asserts that none of the recorded collisions in the vicinity were attributable to

---

the layout of the highway, and attributes two collisions solely to drivers failing to look. I must respectfully but firmly challenge this conclusion.

The junction of Station Road with the A24, offset to Bell Road, is materially compromised by a bend on the major road that severely restricts sightlines for drivers emerging from Station Road. As a resident who uses this junction regularly, I can attest that it is not possible to see oncoming vehicles travelling at speed (particularly those travelling over the 40mph limit) around this bend until they are already dangerously close. I have personally been flashed by speeding drivers who were simply not visible to me until I had already begun to pull out. I am also aware of at least one resident having been rear-ended on the A24 while slowing to turn into Station Road.

This junction is the only means of access to and from Station Road for all 21 existing households, and is the route used daily by children travelling to school. Its danger is not merely anecdotal. On record is a fatal collision in 2012 (accident reference 2012471201811, police reference 471201811) in which there were 8 casualties and 1 fatality. Since that incident, there have been numerous further serious accidents at this junction, in addition to a significant number of near misses that residents have witnessed first-hand, but which do not appear in any official record. The junction has previously been considered for redesign as part of the review of the A24 corridor between Dorking and Worthing, which is itself an acknowledgment by the relevant authorities that its safety record is a matter of concern. The applicant's claim that collision causes can be definitively attributed to driver behaviour, rather than highway layout, is not one they are qualified to make, and it is directly contradicted by this documented history.

A significant increase in vehicle movements generated by 24 additional dwellings will compound this risk substantially. I ask that the Council commission an independent audit of this junction before any permission is granted, and that the applicant's dismissal of highway layout as a contributing factor be scrutinised accordingly.

I do acknowledge the applicant's proposal for improved road markings and a pedestrian island, which I welcome as a positive step. However, these measures do not address the fundamental sightline deficiency for vehicle movements at the junction itself.

### 3b. Pedestrian Safety and Vulnerable Road Users

Station Road is a rural road with no footpath between the A24 junction and the station, no street lighting, and no safe crossing point for pedestrians or cyclists wishing to access Warnham village. The road is used by families with young children who walk

---

and cycle to the primary school and local amenities in the village.

There is currently no pedestrian crossing on the A24 for Station Road residents to reach the village, nor for village residents to access Warnham Station. For those wishing to travel to Horsham, the only available routes - via Mercer Road and Langhurstwood Road - require crossing the A264 at a point where a 70mph speed limit applies, with no separation between pedestrians or cyclists and motorised traffic. Similarly, the route along Station Road to the A24 meets a poorly sighted 40mph speed limit with no provision whatsoever for vulnerable road users.

The NPPF actively encourages sustainable transport, and Horsham District's own transport policies seek to reduce conflict between vulnerable road users and motorised vehicles. This development, in its current form, does the opposite. By increasing traffic volumes on a road that has no footpath, no lighting, and no safe crossing infrastructure, it will materially increase risk to pedestrians and cyclists rather than reduce it. These concerns are not addressed anywhere in the applicant's supporting documents.

### 3c. Public Transport Provision and Car Dependency

The application area is served by Warnham Station, which provides a stopping service on the Horsham to London Victoria line. However, the service frequency falls below the threshold for what could reasonably be described as a regular service, at just one train per hour in either direction. Services operate Monday to Friday between approximately 0600 and 2330, with no service after 1900 on Saturdays and no service at all on Sundays. There is no bus service connecting Warnham Station to Warnham village, a distance of approximately 1.5 kilometres.

Local amenities in Warnham village include a primary school, two public houses, a village shop, and a village butcher. For any resident requiring access to wider retail, medical, or educational services in Horsham, private car use is effectively unavoidable. Given the absence of adequate public transport and safe active travel infrastructure, this development will generate a high level of car dependency that is at odds with the sustainable transport objectives of both the NPPF and the Horsham District Planning Framework.

### 4. Flood Risk

The field to the south of the existing Station Road hamlet is known to flood regularly during the winter months. As a long-standing feature of the local landscape, this is not a theoretical risk; it is an observable and recurring condition that residents are well acquainted with.

Any development to the north of the current dwellings that

---

increases surface water run-off, reduces permeable land, or alters local drainage patterns has the potential to exacerbate this flooding significantly. In the most serious scenarios, this could result in Station Road itself becoming impassable, or in water ingress affecting the existing homes. Given that Station Road is the only access route for all existing and proposed residents, any risk of the road flooding is a matter of serious concern for the safety and accessibility of the entire settlement.

I do not consider that the application has adequately assessed or mitigated this risk. I ask that the Council require the applicant to submit a detailed site-specific Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy that specifically models the impact of the proposed development on the existing flooding patterns to the south of the road, and that this assessment be independently reviewed before any decision is made.

## 5. Parking Displacement and Inadequate Provision

The Transport Statement states that the proposed site access point will not displace a significant level of car parking. I strongly dispute this characterisation on several grounds.

Displacement from the access road junction itself:

Based on my own observation, the formation of the proposed access road will directly displace a minimum of six vehicles that currently park in that area; to ensure sightlines are clear when entering or exiting the junction. This is not an insignificant displacement, it represents a meaningful reduction in available parking on a road that already experiences pressure.

Displacement from the rear lane:

Approximately 8 further vehicles currently make use of the lane and surrounding land to the rear of the existing properties for parking. If this access is removed or curtailed as a result of the development, these vehicles will be forced onto the road. The Transport Statement has not adequately accounted for this cumulative displacement.

Inaccurate baseline parking count:

The Transport Statement identifies approximately 4-6 vehicles parking on the road. This does not accord with my own regular observations, which consistently record 7 or more vehicles parked on the road. The Council should require the applicant to conduct a more thorough and independently verified parking survey before relying on this figure.

Road width unsuitable for overflow parking:

The Transport Statement suggests that the road is suitable for on-street parking beyond the currently used area. I do not accept this. The road narrows beyond the existing parking zone to a width that is insufficient for safe parking without obstructing the carriageway.

---

I have already observed vehicles parked in this section, in the vicinity of the substation, with damaged wing mirrors. Which is direct evidence of the inadequacy of the road width in that area. Directing displaced vehicles to park there is not an acceptable solution.

Insufficient parking for new homes:

As set out in section 3c above, this is an area that relies on private cars by necessity. The 36 parking spaces allocated for the 24 new dwellings are not sufficient for a rural community such as this. This represents just 1.5 spaces per household, 0.6 spaces per bedroom, or less than 0.4 spaces for each of the 100 people the applicant expects to move into the development. By contrast, the typical number of cars among existing three-bedroom properties on Station Road is approximately 2.5 - not unreasonable for a household of two adults and two grown-up or near-adult children, each with independent travel needs. The Council should require the applicant to revisit parking provision against the actual car ownership rates of comparable rural properties in this locality, rather than applying a generic suburban standard.

#### 6. Historic Parking Rights for No. 16 Station Road

I draw the Council's attention to the parking space on the land to the rear of the existing properties, which has been used by the occupants of No. 16 Station Road for over 35 years. My understanding is that this right of use was bequeathed to a previous occupant of No. 16 by the landowner (the same party now bringing forward this application) in connection with their former employment. The application does not appear to address the fate of this longstanding arrangement. I would ask the Council to seek clarification from the applicant as to how this historic use will be protected.

#### 7. Right of Access to the Rear of Existing Properties

Station Road residents hold an established right of access to the rear of their properties, as outlined in the property deeds, via the lane running behind the existing dwellings. This right of access is not merely a convenience; it is the only means by which residents are able to use their north-facing car ports and garages. For a vehicle to turn safely into these spaces from the lane, a minimum carriageway width of 7 metres is required.

The current proposal does not provide for this. As drawn, the plans do not preserve sufficient width along the rear lane to allow residents to exercise their right of access in any practical sense. A right of access that cannot physically be used is no right of access at all. The applicant must demonstrate, with dimensioned drawings, that the proposed layout accommodates a minimum 7-metre turning width at the point of access to each affected property's car port or garage. If it cannot be demonstrated, the

---

application should not be approved in its current form.

I would also ask the Council to satisfy itself that the applicant has properly identified all existing rights of access over this land, and that no development is permitted that would have the effect of extinguishing or materially interfering with those rights without appropriate legal process and re-provision.

#### 9. Parking Provision for No. 18 Station Road

The proposed access road, as currently designed, introduces a kerb alignment that directly obstructs the parking space in front of No. 18 Station Road. No. 18 is an existing dwelling, and its residents have a reasonable expectation of continued access to parking in front of their property. The application does not appear to provide any alternative provision for this loss. This is not acceptable. The Council should require the applicant to demonstrate how residents of No. 18 will be able to park, and this must be resolved prior to any permission being granted.

#### 10. Suggested Amendments That Could Make the Development More Acceptable

As stated above, I am not opposed to development on this land in principle, and I wish to be constructive. In my view, the following amendments would substantially improve the application and could make it more acceptable to existing residents:

- Retention and formalisation of the existing community green space as a publicly accessible play area for children, ideally in or near its current location. This space has served the community for over 44 years; its retention would provide meaningful amenity for both new and existing residents, create a natural buffer between the new and existing dwellings, and help the development integrate with the character of the wider settlement.
  - A significant increase in on-site parking provision to absorb the displaced vehicles identified above, to account for the car dependent nature of the locale, and to reduce the risk of displaced parking causing obstruction on the carriageway.
  - Redesign of the access road so that it does not sit immediately adjacent to the boundary of No. 18 Station Road and does not obstruct parking in front of that property. An alternative routing should be explored that demonstrates no material harm to existing residents.
  - A safe pedestrian crossing across either the A24 or the A264 would be a transformative improvement for the wider community, enabling residents to access Warnham village or Horsham by foot or bicycle without having to cross major roads at uncontrolled points. The net effect this would have on Warnham village and the surrounding area by encouraging the use of public transport would be significant.
  - A detailed, independently reviewed Flood Risk Assessment and
-

Surface Water Drainage Strategy, specifically addressing the impact of the development on the known winter flooding pattern to the south of the existing hamlet.

#### Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully ask that planning application DC/26/0585 be refused in its current form, or alternatively that the applicant be required to submit substantially revised plans that address the highway safety, pedestrian infrastructure, flood risk, parking, green space, and character concerns identified in this letter before any decision is made.

I would welcome the opportunity to discuss these concerns further and am willing to meet with the case officer should that be helpful. I ask that I be notified of any further consultation stages, and of the decision, in due course.

---

Kind regards

#### Telephone:

Email: [planning@horsham.gov.uk](mailto:planning@horsham.gov.uk)



**Horsham  
District  
Council**

---

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