

RE: Submit your final comments: 6009474 - Sussex Topiary, Naldretts Lane, Rudgwick, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 3BU



East 2
To: Phil Rowe

This communication does not constitute legal advice.
Our [Customer Privacy Notice](#) sets out how we handle personal data in accordance with the law.

From: Phil Rowe
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 2:22 PM
To: East 2
Subject: FW: Submit your final comments: 6009474 - Sussex Topiary, Naldretts Lane, Rudgwick, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 3BU

Dear PINS,

If time had been a luxury I'd have gone into more detail – with current workload pressures and our original appeal statement I make the following final comments:

- Alleged “fragmentation and formalisation of an otherwise undeveloped and informal paddock” – this had been raised in a previous appeal for the permitted gypsy pitches to the rear. The point was not upheld by the Inspector.
- Horsham is currently calling for sites **as a result of having to substantially up its housing numbers** as part of the long running On.... Off and then back on Local Plan Inquiry over the last 18 months.
- As per the PERRYFIELD FARM appeal decision - ALLOWED 2025 - 27 houses it is our opinion, particularly given that travel by car distances would be short, that the following extracts favour allowing the appeal.

86. I am also conscious when considering the suitability of a site from a transport sustainability perspective that the Framework advice is that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making. I do not consider that the level of development, in the context of the housing supply figures and general background to this scheme, should be considered significant within the meaning of paragraph 110 of the Framework.

87. Also, by way of background, the Council is unable to demonstrate a Framework compliant supply of housing land and this will probably necessitate in the future the exploring of some sites to meet the housing need that require some compromises in terms of sustainable transport options, especially in a Council area that is predominantly rural. I also consider that this scheme for 29 additional units, with the likely level of additional movements and distances travelled by vehicles from this site, would not be unreasonable. Furthermore, given the range of transport options that would be available to various occupants and visitors, I am satisfied that safe and suitable access to the site would be achieved for all users. The scheme would be Framework compliant in these respects.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Kind regards

Phil Rowe, BA Hons, BTP (Planning)
PROwe Planning Solutions