

Appeal 6008205

Interested party comments

Appeal type	Planning
Appeal procedure	Written
Appeal site	Barnards Nursery, Rock Road, Washington, RH20 3BH
Agent contact details	OGUZHAN DENIZER [REDACTED]
Local planning authority	Horsham District Council
Application number	DC/26/0084

Interested party 1

Comments

A major concern if the loss of privacy an additional dwelling would bring. Since moving in to my property 10 years ago, we have been able to enjoy privacy from the natural screening provided by the trees and large amounts of open space. This has allowed us to enjoy making the most of the outdoors and spending time with family. The erection of an additional house, potentially along our joining fence line not only reduces any privacy, but leads to the potential of increased noise, visual disturbances and overall disruption of what once was a peaceful environment, surrounded by land.

In order to erect a further dwelling, you are removing habitats for the wide range of wildlife we are lucky to have in our area. To mention a few - rabbits, [REDACTED] hedgehogs, bats, owls and foxes. Not to mention the inevitable removal of trees, again vital for this ecosystem.

A further major issue and concern I have is the wellbeing of my horses. I own two horses, at home. One was a rescue from the RSPCA and the appeal to bringing her home was the knowledge that she was going to experience a quiet home, surrounded by wildlife, away from busy environments which cause her unnecessary stress. The addition of this house will no doubt mean increased traffic, both on foot and vehicles. I used to feel safe whilst out riding both horses. Now, I have to take additional precautions, take extra people with me due to the increasing number of cars, unaware of how to appropriately and safely pass horses on the road. The existing 2 bungalows at this address have already been renovated and already caused many of the issues I have mentioned above. Mine and my horses safety should not be compromised as a result of a further dwelling.

I do not understand why this lovely, quiet area has to be disrupted by people who are displaying no regard for those around them or the

consequences these houses may bring. If i wanted to be surrounded by people, houses and cars then I would live in a town or city.

I hope the points raised here will be adequately considered in line with those who already live here and act in their/our best interests.
[Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 2

Comments

Hello,
I am writing to object to the application because this site is outside a built up area and fails to respect the established pattern of surrounding plots/area. It is an over development of the site from agricultural to residential and would introduce an urbanising effect that is inappropriate for the location. The proposal appears to conflict with key local planning policies that seek to ensure development is proportionate, respects local character, and protects residential amenity. This site has already undergone a lot of development recently and has already had a six foot close boarded fence install to its extensive boundary which is again out of character with the area and can be seen from a long distance again making the area look urbanised. I hope that you can understand the impact this would have on a country side location which is supposed to be protected by local government policies.
kind regards. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 3

Comments

- Design
- Overdevelopment
- Privacy Light and Noise
- Concerns over wildlife (E.g. Bats)

Comments: There is still no need for this development.
It will cause more unrest in the local community, with more works going on next to a public footpath. Turning what was a peaceful walk, into a glorified allyway around houses.

The noise, the effect on nature and wilflide; specifically the local bats, birds. ████████ pheasant and many more. The general disruption for those nearby would not be worth it (unless theyve paid them all off, which i couldnt imagine).

Planning permission was rejected before. Likewise was rejected for the doggy day care. There is just no need for this. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 4

I am writing to strongly object to this application. My family and I have already endured well over a year of severe disruption from ongoing works on this land, and the prospect of further development is simply unacceptable. The cumulative impact on our home, health, and quality of life has been significant and well-documented.

1. Noise Disturbance and Loss of Residential Amenity

We have experienced constant loud noise, including heavy machinery, banging, and early-morning deliveries. This has caused prolonged stress for our household. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Our dog has become petrified of going outside, now a nervous wreck indoors because of the constant disturbance.

These are not minor inconveniences — they are serious, ongoing impacts on our daily lives.

2. Dust, Dirt, and Air Pollution

Last summer was horrendous. Dust and dirt from the site blew directly onto our property, forcing us to keep windows and doors closed. Washing hung outside had to be rewashed. The pollution from fires being lit on the site made it impossible to enjoy our garden or pool. We spent significant time and money cleaning the pool to prevent damage from the debris in the air. [REDACTED]

This level of pollution is unacceptable in a residential area and should not be allowed to continue.

3. Loss of Privacy and Light

The owners have already planted trees extremely close to our boundary, which will block light into our front room and dining room. The proposed dwelling would directly overlook [REDACTED] bedroom, causing a serious loss of privacy and reducing natural light. This is a clear and measurable impact on our amenity.

4. Impact on Children and Family Life

Our children were unable to enjoy the garden last summer due to noise, dust, and pollution. We could not use our pool because of the dirt and smoke. With children needing to do school work and university work, the noise and disruption have been especially harmful.

5. Cumulative Impact of Ongoing Development

We have already endured more than a year of disruption. Approving further construction would extend this misery for months, possibly years. The cumulative impact on our home life, mental wellbeing, and ability to enjoy our property must be taken seriously. We seriously have had enough we moved from town life to rural life for health reasons and so our children could enjoy the cleaner air and enjoy the country life so for this we strongly object for this planning to go ahead. [Read more](#)

Interested party 5

Comments

Objection to Planning Application DC/26/0084

Dear Planning Officer,

I write further to my previous objection regarding planning application DC/26/0084 and ask that the following additional information is taken into full consideration as part of the appeal review.

Despite suggestions made by others, our property is the most significantly affected by this development due to its immediate proximity to the active working area of the site. The skips, stored materials, heavy plant machinery, delivery lorries, and general construction operations are located only a few feet from our house. In addition, because our property sits downwind of the site, we are directly exposed to the dust, smoke, noise, fumes, and odours generated by the development works.

This level of disturbance has caused substantial and ongoing harm to our family's residential amenity and quality of life, contrary to Policy 24 (Environmental Protection) and Policy 33 (Development Principles) of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF), which require development to avoid unacceptable impacts from noise, dust, pollution, and general nuisance to neighbouring occupiers.

I am also disappointed to say that despite several discussions and agreements regarding quieter periods (particularly during school exam periods and holiday breaks) the builder has repeatedly failed to honour these commitments. For example, during the recent Easter holiday period, when we had specifically been assured there would be a reduction in disruption, diggers and dump trucks were used extensively for prolonged periods.

This has unfortunately led us to conclude that what is promised and what actually happens are very different. This ongoing lack of trust significantly increases the stress and anxiety caused by the development and raises serious concerns about how future works associated with the proposed development would be managed if planning permission were granted.

Further concerns arise from the previous development on the site, including the erection of a garage and the planting of trees along our boundary, both of which have negatively impacted our outlook and reduced natural light reaching our property. This raises additional concerns regarding compliance with HDPF Policy 32 (The Quality of New Development) and Policy 33, as well as the principles set out in the BRE Guidelines: Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight (2022), which seek to protect neighbouring properties from unacceptable loss of daylight and overbearing development.

This latest proposal must also be viewed in the wider context of repeated attempts to intensify development on this land. There have now been numerous applications and submissions seeking further expansion, many of which have previously been refused. The continued resubmission of proposals that conflict with planning policy and cause harm to neighbouring residents is creating significant emotional strain for our family and other nearby occupiers.

The repeated uncertainty, disruption, and need to continually respond to further applications has become a serious source of stress and has had a real impact on our health and wellbeing. We respectfully ask that the Council take this cumulative impact into

account.

I would once again strongly request that planning application DC/26/0084 be refused and that the continued overdevelopment of this land is brought to an end. This proposal remains contrary to the principles of sustainable development, residential amenity protection, and countryside character set out within the Horsham District Planning Framework.

I respectfully ask the Council to bring this matter to a close and protect the wellbeing of the existing residents who are already living with the consequences of this ongoing development.

Numerous appeal decisions have confirmed that development outside settlement boundaries causing harm to neighbouring amenity and countryside character should be refused. Inspectors have consistently dismissed schemes where proposals result in overlooking, overdevelopment, operational disturbance, and unacceptable encroachment into rural land. For example, appeal reference APP/Z3825/W/22/3306301 confirmed that unjustified residential development outside the Built-Up Area Boundary caused unacceptable harm to countryside character and conflicted with local plan policy. Similarly, APP/Z3825/W/21/3285726 was dismissed due to overdevelopment and unacceptable impact on neighbouring residential amenity. The current proposal raises the same concerns and should be refused for the same reasons.

Refusal Reasons

Reason for Refusal 1 – Development Outside the Built-Up Area Boundary

The development would conflict with Policies 1, 3, 25, and 32 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), which seek to protect the countryside from inappropriate development and ensure that new development is sustainably located and sympathetic to local character.

Reason for Refusal 2 – Harm to Residential Amenity

This would include loss of privacy, increased noise and light disturbance, overbearing impact, and reduced enjoyment of private gardens and habitable rooms. The proposal would therefore fail to provide an acceptable standard of amenity for existing residents and would conflict with Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Reason for Refusal 3 – Noise, Dust, Pollution and Construction Disturbance

Given the established evidence of significant disruption already experienced by neighbouring occupiers, the proposal would fail to safeguard residential amenity and would be contrary to Policy 24 (Environmental Protection) and Policy 33 (Development Principles) of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Reason for Refusal 4 – Loss of Daylight, Outlook and Overbearing Impact

The scale, siting, and positioning of the proposed dwellings, together with associated boundary treatments and landscaping, would result in an unacceptable loss of daylight, outlook, and openness for neighbouring occupiers.

The proposal would create an overbearing relationship with adjacent

properties and would fail to accord with the principles set out within the BRE Guidelines: Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight (2022). The development would therefore conflict with Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Reason for Refusal 5 – Highway Safety and Access Concerns
Insufficient regard has been given to highway safety, servicing arrangements, and the cumulative impact of additional traffic generation. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy 40 (Sustainable Transport) of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Reason for Refusal 6 – Failure to Overcome Previous Refusal Grounds

The application fails to adequately address concerns previously identified under earlier refused applications relating to the same site, including planning reference DC/21/1519. The repeated submission of materially similar proposals without sufficient mitigation or policy compliance does not overcome the fundamental planning objections previously established.

As such, the proposal would be contrary to the principles of consistency in decision-making and sound planning judgement.

[Read more](#)

Supporting documents

[2026_05_19_15_27_34.jpg \(/published-document/dc12dfce-9302-43f9-9af7-3672a745027e\)](#)

[IMG_20260320_181748.jpg \(/published-document/f6a2d021-0713-4061-ab62-60db8369ddc1\)](#)

[IMG_20260519_153356b.jpg \(/published-document/1a426c58-f1a6-45ae-89fa-cd97ae1ca5f2\)](#)

[2026_05_19_15_28_32.jpg \(/published-document/636d5270-57a6-46dc-941f-cf1c3382da1b\)](#)

[IMG_20260519_153337 \(2\).jpg \(/published-document/c2b5e971-6aba-4bb1-af73-df4dd243119a\)](#)

Interested party 6

Comments

Objection to Planning Application DC/26/0084

Dear Planning Officer,

I write further to my previous objection regarding planning application DC/26/0084 and ask that the following additional information is taken into full consideration as part of the appeal review.

Refusal Reasons

Reason for Refusal 1 – Development Outside the Built-Up Area Boundary

The proposed development, by reason of its scale, siting, and location outside the defined Built-Up Area Boundary, would represent an unjustified and unsustainable encroachment into the countryside. The proposal would fail to respect the rural character and appearance of the surrounding area and would result in harmful urbanisation of land currently contributing positively to the open and semi-rural setting.

The development would therefore conflict with Policies 1, 3, 25, and 32 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), which seek to protect the countryside from inappropriate development and ensure that new development is sustainably located and sympathetic to local character.

Reason for Refusal 2 – Harm to Residential Amenity

By reason of the number of proposed dwellings, their proximity to neighbouring properties, and the associated increase in vehicle movements, noise, activity, overlooking, and general disturbance, the proposal would result in significant and unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

This would include loss of privacy, increased noise and light disturbance, overbearing impact, and reduced enjoyment of private gardens and habitable rooms. The proposal would therefore fail to provide an acceptable standard of amenity for existing residents and would conflict with Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Reason for Refusal 3 – Noise, Dust, Pollution and Construction Disturbance

The siting of operational areas, construction access, parking, servicing arrangements, and associated plant and machinery in close proximity to neighbouring residential properties would result in unacceptable levels of noise, dust, fumes, smoke, vibration, and general disturbance.

Given the established evidence of significant disruption already experienced by neighbouring occupiers, the proposal would fail to safeguard residential amenity and would be contrary to Policy 24 (Environmental Protection) and Policy 33 (Development Principles) of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Reason for Refusal 4 – Loss of Daylight, Outlook and Overbearing Impact

The scale, siting, and positioning of the proposed dwellings, together with associated boundary treatments and landscaping, would result in an unacceptable loss of daylight, outlook, and openness for neighbouring occupiers.

The proposal would create an overbearing relationship with adjacent properties and would fail to accord with the principles set out within the BRE Guidelines: Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight (2022). The development would therefore conflict with Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Reason for Refusal 5 – Highway Safety and Access Concerns

The proposal would intensify vehicle movements along an access point where visibility is restricted and where the existing road conditions do not provide safe and suitable access for the scale of development proposed.

Insufficient regard has been given to highway safety, servicing arrangements, and the cumulative impact of additional traffic generation. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy 40 (Sustainable Transport) of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Reason for Refusal 6 – Failure to Overcome Previous Refusal Grounds

The application fails to adequately address concerns previously

identified under earlier refused applications relating to the same site, including planning reference DC/21/1519. The repeated submission of materially similar proposals without sufficient mitigation or policy compliance does not overcome the fundamental planning objections previously established.

As such, the proposal would be contrary to the principles of consistency in decision-making and sound planning judgement.

Given the repeated refusal of similar proposals on this site, the continued harm to neighbouring residents, and the clear conflict with Horsham District planning policy, I respectfully request that the Council and the Planning Inspector give significant weight to these matters and refuse planning application DC/26/0084. The cumulative impact on our family's health, wellbeing, privacy, and enjoyment of our home has already been substantial, and granting permission for further development would only intensify that harm. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

[IMG_20260304_132722.jpg \(/published-document/ac547734-698c-49ce-9a52-00aef60e8b9a\)](#)

[2026_05_11_11_09_23.jpg \(/published-document/46ff69ed-fb49-47e4-ae4d-0d100a67d6ff\)](#)

[IMG_20260303_131845.jpg \(/published-document/27cc87cc-8298-49e4-a9e9-51a77bfc84d2\)](#)

[IMG_20260303_131927.jpg \(/published-document/0a7dce7d-bd10-4f47-a27a-543f2dab111f\)](#)

[IMG_20260519_153524.jpg \(/published-document/6f6e54a7-290d-4b96-877a-6e7bf97e6291\)](#)

[IMG_20260327_120014.jpg \(/published-document/a274baa7-a2bb-4b1c-83ee-8f0c069b2991\)](#)

[IMG_20260303_131831.jpg \(/published-document/2add362a-1cbe-4a3b-ac98-e2f9f36fdbcdb\)](#)

[2026_05_12_14_35_09.jpg \(/published-document/e8e912f8-1f68-4f52-b5b6-f0d9cb94cb3d\)](#)

Interested party 7

Comments

My Comments...

Well I could just copy and paste every thing I've said over the last umpteen years with regards to the objection to planning applications for the development on this site.

But I feel it wouldn't do justice to the frustration felt by myself and the neighboring homes. Once again having to fight to not have our countryside homes turned slowly into an urban area.

There have been numerous developments in the area which impact everything, the countryside and its wildlife, roads, traffic, public safety, water, light, noise, pollution etc etc. adding more houses will not improve anything. Ever.

You say I'm not allowed to include personal opinion, but this 1 house is a stepping stone for more, the original application was for 4. once 1 is underway more will follow. This is just a loop hole, if you reject this objection because of that so be it. I can remove this section. I will however ask my question, Why move to the country only to try turn it into more bricks and mortar? When you have families who have been here generations see the peaceful scenic area around

them succumb to such needless development. With no improvement. Another straw to the donkeys back.

Storrington just down the road is a pollution nightmare. Numerous road problems. Ramblers, children, dog walkers and horse riders constantly fearing the growing busyness of the roads. Can't remember the last time I saw a [REDACTED] bat or heard an owl. I believe water issues for this area are a problem too. there are more and more lorries and delivery vehicles go up and down this road now. So many issues, for such a needless development. The Local council saw fit to decline these plans, twice, I really hope whoever reads this will too.

Thank you for your time. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents
