

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 September 2026 19:20:30 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0954
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 27/09/2026 7:20 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land South of Athelstan Way Horsham West Sussex
Proposal:	Residential development for 21no. 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings with associated parking, hard and soft landscaping at Land South of Athelstan Way, Horsham.
Case Officer:	Nicola Pettifer

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	44 Elm Grove Horsham
----------	----------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I wish to object to the proposed development of the small triangle of land adjacent to the public footpath leading onto the surrounding farmland. While I appreciate the need for additional housing in Horsham, I

use the footpath that runs alongside this proposed development daily to walk our family dog, and have done for over 20 years. It is peaceful and has great unobstructed views over to the forest ridge that runs along from Brighton Road to Sedgwick Park House.

Although the site is relatively small, its location makes it particularly sensitive. The land forms part of the immediate setting of the public footpath and contributes to the open, rural character of the area. I regularly use this path to support my personal wellbeing and mental health.

Development on this site would risk changing the character and appearance of the approach to the farmland and could, I feel, adversely affect the experience of people using the footpath.

I also spend many winter evenings watching the moon rise here, and have seen deer (including a new family with at least 2 fawns in the long grass on the parameter of Muggeridge Field where the development is proposed in 2026), plus bats, lots of starlings and even an owl on occasions. At night there is hardly any light pollution. The proposed development of 21 houses with 41 parking spaces and 4 visitor spaces, would create a lot of light pollution at night, again altering the character of the footpath approach.

During the day, the public footpath provides an important route into the countryside and is valued by local residents, families and cyclists to access the surrounding agricultural land. Any development immediately alongside it should therefore be carefully assessed in terms of its visual impact, the sense of openness, and the potential effect on the amenity and safe use of the path.

If the proposed development receives approval I would like special consideration to be given to plots 16, 17, 18 and 19 to restrict additional extensions being added that could further obstruct any remaining views. In addition, plots 10-13 overlooking the bridleway appear on the proposed plans to be higher than the property on plot 16, which would therefore obstruct all views to surrounding countryside.

There are also significant ecological concerns. The footpath provides access directly into an area of farmland, and the surrounding fields have previously been recognised as important habitat for ground-nesting birds, including skylarks, and have been subject to protection measures. The proposed development should therefore be considered in the context of the wider ecological value of the area, rather than treating this small parcel of land in isolation.

Ground-nesting birds are particularly vulnerable to disturbance during the breeding season. Construction activity, increased

human activity, lighting, domestic gardens and associated noise could all have an adverse effect on wildlife using the adjoining farmland. The loss or alteration of even a small area of open land can also contribute to habitat fragmentation and reduce the value of the wider area for wildlife.

I can see from the plans that the developer has inserted into the plans biodiversity landscaping in section 8. I would like some assurance from the planning committee what the pre-development baseline score is going to be for the proposed development before permission is granted. It is my understanding that the 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirement is based on the pre-development biodiversity value of an on-site habitat (the baseline state of the land just before the proposed development takes place)

In this instance, the land owner and developer is suggesting that area 8 fulfils the BNG, but this was rich in hedgerows, trees and wildlife habitat, including bats and dormice (found in previous site surveys) before the developer degraded the site. I understand therefore that the 10% BNG should be based on the site as it was before the hedgerows adjacent to the allotments and at the lower ditch were removed. Additionally, I understand that there needs to be some type of conservation covenant in place to show adherence to the 30 year rule for BNG.

Although I am unsure how this is proven, from some desk based research I believe that the following should apply. Under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, if the unauthorised clearance happened any time after 30 January 2020, the baseline for the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) calculation must be taken as the biodiversity value of the habitat immediately before the clearance took place. The field was acquired in May 2024, and cleared shortly after.

My final concern after attending the meeting on 21st Sept is the response that Mr and Mrs Brazil shared regarding public right of way onto the footpath, which I believe is also a bridleway. Mr Brazil suggested that he owned the access road and if he wanted to he could prevent people walking and driving up it to reach the pathway. I would encourage the planning inspector to clarify this point as I have always understood that public bridleways are protected public right of ways. Does this mean that this road cannot be used by construction workers to access the Triangle? If this is the case, are there also other restrictions on how many lorries and other construction vehicles can access Athelstan Way? And if so, what measures will be put in place to ensure clear access, particularly emergency services for the care home that is to the immediate right of the development.

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 E aton