

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 September 2026 14:32:23 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/1204
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 22/09/2026 2:32 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land at Campsfield Linfield Close Southwater West Sussex RH13 9FR
Proposal:	All outstanding Reserved Matters for the erection of 82 dwellings with associated parking, landscaping, surface and foul water drainage, open space, and associated works and infrastructure pursuant to permission reference DC/25/0102
Case Officer:	Nicola Pettifer

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	9 Gratwick Walk Southwater
----------	----------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I am writing as a resident of Mulberry Field in relation to the reserved matters application for the Campsfield development.

I appreciate that outline planning permission has already been granted under DC/25/0102. My comments are not intended to revisit that decision. They concern the detailed form of the development now proposed and the consequences that it may have for existing residents in Mulberry Fields.

I am particularly concerned about traffic and parking, construction disturbance, the visual impact of the detailed development and the effect of permanent lighting and activity once the development is occupied.

TRAFFIC

As a resident, one of my principal concerns is the additional pressure which the development will place on Centenary Road.

I recognise that the permanent vehicular access from Centenary Road was approved at outline stage and is therefore not a matter which can now simply be reconsidered through the reserved matters application. Nevertheless, the detailed layout, parking provision and management of the development will have a direct bearing upon the amount of additional pressure experienced on Centenary Road and neighbouring residential streets.

From my experience as an existing resident, Centenary Road already experiences substantial residential traffic and parking activity. The addition of an estate of 82 homes will inevitably result in further regular vehicle movements associated not only with residents but also visitors, deliveries, servicing and refuse collection.

For that reason, I ask HDC and West Sussex County Council to consider very carefully whether the detailed parking arrangements are sufficient to contain the parking demand generated by the development within the application site, rather than allowing it to spill onto Centenary Road and adjoining roads.

VISITOR PARKING

The submitted Parking Plan identifies 154 surface parking spaces and 15 garage spaces, with garages counted as half a parking space. This gives 161.5 allocated spaces, together with only 17 visitor spaces for the entire 82-home development.

I am particularly concerned about the level of visitor parking.

The accommodation schedule shows that this is not predominantly a development of small properties. It contains substantial numbers of family homes, including 28 three-bedroom dwellings and 15 four-bedroom dwellings.

Seventeen visitor spaces for 82 properties appears very limited. If

those spaces prove insufficient in practice, visitors will inevitably look for somewhere else to park. Given the site's relationship with the existing estate, there is a real concern that this will place additional pressure upon Centenary Road and the surrounding residential roads.

This is not simply an objection to additional cars. It is a concern about whether the development has been designed with sufficient parking capacity to prevent foreseeable displacement of vehicles into the existing community.

I therefore ask that the Highway Authority specifically considers:

- the adequacy of 17 visitor spaces for 82 dwellings;
- the realistic parking demand associated with the larger three- and four-bedroom homes;
- whether the garages included within the calculation will realistically be available and used for vehicle parking;
- the distribution of visitor spaces throughout the estate; and
- the likelihood of parking displacement onto Centenary Road and adjoining residential streets.

Adequacy of parking, traffic generation and highway safety are recognised material planning considerations.

CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC

I am also particularly concerned about the construction phase. Construction of 82 dwellings is likely to take place over a significant period and will involve HGV movements, construction plant, material deliveries, contractors' vehicles and other associated traffic.

If that traffic is allowed to travel through Centenary Road, existing residents will experience a significant additional burden through noise, vibration, dust, congestion and increased conflict between construction vehicles, parked cars, pedestrians and normal residential traffic.

I understand that an alternative construction access was specifically considered during the outline application process. I strongly request that this alternative construction route is secured and used.

Construction traffic should not be routed through Centenary Road and the existing residential estate where the alternative route can reasonably be used.

The Construction Management Plan should also provide effective controls covering construction hours, HGV routing, delivery times, contractor parking, vehicles waiting or idling, wheel washing, dust suppression, noise and vibration, temporary lighting and a named contact through whom neighbouring residents can report

problems.

CONSTRUCTION DISTURBANCE

My concern is not simply the number of construction vehicles. An 82-dwelling development will inevitably result in a prolonged period of construction activity.

The effect upon existing residents should therefore be minimised as far as reasonably possible.

In particular, controls should be put in place concerning hours of construction, particularly noisy operations, deliveries early in the morning, weekend working, temporary generators and plant, construction lighting, dust and the positioning of compounds or equipment.

Given the scale of the development, I consider that clear and enforceable construction controls are essential rather than relying simply upon the developer being a "considerate neighbour".

VISUAL AMENITY

I appreciate that loss of a view is not, in itself, a material planning consideration. My concern is therefore not expressed on the basis that I have a right to retain the existing view.

The concern is instead the effect that the detailed development will have upon the visual amenity and character of this part of Southwater.

At present, the field contributes to the open and landscaped character experienced from the existing residential area. The reserved matters proposals will replace that environment with an estate of 82 dwellings, roads, parking, lighting and associated infrastructure.

The detailed design is therefore important in determining how prominent and urbanising that change will appear from existing properties and public areas in Mulberry Fields.

The submitted dwelling schedule confirms the full 82-unit development, including numerous three- and four-bedroom houses. The cumulative effect of buildings, roofs, roads and parked vehicles will represent a substantial visual change.

I therefore ask HDC to ensure that particular attention is given to:

- the height and massing of buildings visible from the existing residential area;
- the overall roofscape;
- the density and spacing of buildings;
- retention of existing mature trees and vegetation;

- substantial new boundary planting;
- the prominence of parked vehicles and hard surfacing; and
- the ability of the landscape scheme to soften the development when viewed from the existing community.

The submitted landscape drawings do show retained trees, new planting and areas of wildflower planting, including planting beneath retained tree canopies. This landscape framework should be protected and strengthened rather than subsequently reduced to accommodate parking, drainage, utilities or other infrastructure.

LIGHTING

I am also concerned about the change in night-time conditions.

The field currently has a substantially different night-time character from an occupied residential estate. Development will introduce street lighting, lighting associated with pedestrian routes and parking areas, domestic external lighting, illuminated windows and frequent vehicle headlights.

Because the development site is visible from my property, the cumulative effect of this lighting is relevant.

Light pollution and the effect of lighting upon residential amenity are legitimate planning considerations.

I therefore ask that HDC requires a detailed lighting scheme which demonstrates:

- the position of all external lighting;
- column and mounting heights;
- lighting levels;
- direction and shielding;
- measures to minimise upward and outward light spill;
- protection of retained trees, hedgerows and ecological corridors;
- and
- measures to minimise unnecessary illumination visible from the existing residential area.

Lighting should be restricted to what is genuinely necessary for safety and should respect the site's present relationship with the more open landscape.

OCCUPIED NOISE

My concerns about noise also extend beyond the construction phase.

An estate of 82 homes will introduce a substantially greater level of activity than presently exists on the site. This will include regular vehicle movements, visitors, delivery vehicles, refuse collections and general activity associated with the roads and

public spaces.

Again, I recognise that the principle of residential development has already been accepted. My request is therefore that the detailed layout minimises the effects of that activity upon the existing community.

Roads, parking areas and areas of greater activity should be appropriately screened and landscaped, and consideration should be given to the cumulative effects of vehicle movements and headlights upon existing properties.

LANDSCAPING

The importance of landscaping is greater because the development represents a transition between the existing residential area and what has previously been an open field. Miller Homes previously stated that they intended to retain and enhance existing boundary hedgerows and trees and maintain a strong landscape buffer around the development.

I ask HDC to ensure that this is delivered in practice.

Existing mature vegetation should be retained wherever possible and meaningful new tree and hedge planting should be provided, particularly where it will help soften views of the development from the existing community.

It is also important that landscaping is subject to an effective long-term maintenance and replacement regime. A landscape buffer offers little protection if planting subsequently fails or is removed.

I recognise that outline permission has established that the Campsfield site will be developed and that permanent vehicular access from Centenary Road has already been approved.

My concern is therefore about how this development is now implemented and how the effects upon the existing community are minimised.

I therefore ask HDC not simply to consider whether the submitted scheme accommodates 82 dwellings, but whether the detailed design provides sufficient parking, landscaping and mitigation to ensure that the consequences of those dwellings are properly contained within the development rather than being transferred to existing residents.

Thank you for considering my objection.

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