

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 August 2026 16:45:23 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0530
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 03/08/2026 4:45 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land at Hornbrook Farm Brighton Road West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application for up to 180 dwellings, open space and associated works and infrastructure with all matters reserved apart from access.
Case Officer:	Nicola Pettifer

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	4 Ghyll Crescent Horsham
----------	--------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Response to Public Rights of Way Consultation - DC/26/0530 I note the consultation response from West Sussex County Council Public Rights of Way dated 30 July 2026, which raises no objection to the proposal. Whilst I acknowledge that there are no recorded Public Rights of Way within or immediately adjoining the application site, I am concerned that the consultation appears to adopt an unduly

narrow interpretation of its role and does not fully engage with the objectives of national planning policy.

The response correctly cites paragraph 105 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that planning decisions should protect and enhance Public Rights of Way and should take opportunities to provide better facilities for users, including improved links to existing networks. However, having referred to this policy, the assessment proceeds only to conclude that no Public Rights of Way are present within or immediately adjacent to the site and therefore raises no objection.

No consideration is given to whether the development presents opportunities to improve pedestrian connectivity to the surrounding network, nor whether additional links, permissive routes or enhanced access could reasonably be secured as part of a development of up to 180 dwellings. The response therefore addresses protection but does not demonstrate any assessment of the policy objective to enhance access.

The statement that "those within the vicinity are considered urban paths" is also unsupported. It does not identify the routes concerned, explain why they are classified in this way, or clarify the relevance of this description to the planning decision. As presented, the statement carries little evidential value.

Furthermore, the consultation confirms that no site visit was undertaken and that the assessment was completed solely as a desktop exercise. Whilst this may be appropriate in some circumstances, the absence of any discussion of existing pedestrian movement, connections to nearby routes, or opportunities for improved accessibility results in a consultation response that is notably limited in scope.

This representation is not intended to suggest that the Public Rights of Way Officer should necessarily have objected to the application. Rather, it is submitted that the consultation does not demonstrate that the wider policy objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework have been fully considered. The Local Planning Authority should therefore attach only limited weight to this consultation when determining the application.

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