

---

|                        |                                                                                                     |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Sent:</b>           | 05 February 2026 17:00                                                                              |
| <b>To:</b>             | Planning                                                                                            |
| <b>Subject:</b>        | Planning Application DC/25/2079 – Cotlands Paddock, Horsham Road / Brighton Road, Cowfold, RH13 8AH |
| <b>Follow Up Flag:</b> | Follow up                                                                                           |
| <b>Flag Status:</b>    | Flagged                                                                                             |
| <b>Categories:</b>     | Comments Received                                                                                   |

For the reasons set out below—most notably the lack of demonstrable safe access, absence of a drainage solution proven to be deliverable within the site boundary, unresolved countryside and heritage setting concerns, and insufficient evidence on operational and amenity impacts I am requesting that planning permission for DC/25/2079 is refused.

### 1. Development in the Countryside: Principle, Character and Landscape Impact

The site lies outside the built-up area and comprises open paddock land. The proposal would introduce a new and intensified residential use which is likely to materially alter the rural character of the site and result in an urbanising influence inconsistent with countryside policy objectives. On the material submitted, the application does not demonstrate that harm to countryside character would be avoided or reduced to an acceptable level.

### 2. Highway Safety and Suitable Access

The proposed access is onto the **A281**, a major road and onto a bend where traffic is travelling at 60mph. The application documentation does not provide evidence addressing the safety of the access arrangement, visibility splays with appropriate speed evidence, swept-path analysis (including larger vehicles, refuse collection and emergency access) or pedestrian safety and connectivity.

### 3. Foul Drainage, Surface Water Drainage, and Pollution/Flood Interaction

There isn't a comprehensive drainage strategy. Environmental Health observations highlight that essential information is missing and that there may be **insufficient land within the red line** to accommodate an acceptable drainage solution, including any drainage field required for foul disposal.

### 4. Heritage: Setting of Nearby Listed Buildings

The representations reference nearby heritage assets. On the description of the submissions and concerns consolidated in the documents, the application does not provide a sufficiently rigorous heritage setting assessment supported by verified views and an appraisal of both daytime and nighttime effects (including lighting).

### 5. Residential Amenity, Lighting and Operational Impacts

A site of this type introduces domestic activity, vehicular movements, servicing, and potentially external lighting into a rural location. The submitted material, does not include the level of detail typically required to demonstrate the amenity impacts would be acceptable or reliably controllable via conditions—particularly regarding: lighting design (positions, heights, shielding, timers/sensors, and lux/spill contours), noise and disturbance potential from operational activity and the practical management of the site to

avoid nuisance. The lack of detailed operational controls and specifications is a significant concern where there are neighbouring receptors and sensitive rural character considerations.

## **6. Practical Layout, Servicing, and Site Functionality**

A further issue is whether the layout has been demonstrated to function safely and without creating knock-on harm. The evidence described across the documents does not clearly establish arrangements for turning and manoeuvring within the site, refuse storage and collection strategy, emergency access, parking and circulation; and containment of domestic paraphernalia and storage to reduce visual clutter. Environmental Health's concerns referenced in the documents underscore that these operational matters are not presently supported to a sufficient standard.

## **7. Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain**

The representations raise concerns as to whether the BNG and ecology package is internally consistent and correctly aligned to the red line boundary and baseline condition, including references to possible inconsistencies in site area assumptions and validity/timing. Where statutory BNG is relied upon, the calculations and evidence must be accurate, current at determination, and matched to the correct baseline.

## **8. Baseline Condition and Enforcement Context**

The documents refer to an enforcement context (including a Temporary Stop Notice) associated with alleged importation/deposition of material. This is a material consideration insofar as it may affect baseline ground conditions, drainage feasibility, pollution risk, and ecology baseline. Granting permission for residential occupation without clear certainty on baseline conditions would be premature and unsound.