

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 31 March 2026 17:03:07 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0366
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 31/03/2026 5:03 PM.

Application Summary

Address: Land North West of Southwater

Proposal: Outline planning application, with all matters reserved (except for primary access to the high-way) for a phased development comprising: the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of up to 1,000 residential dwellings (including affordable housing) (Use Class C3); up to 80 specialist accommodation units (Use Class C2); a mixed-use neighbourhood centre (Use Classes E and F); education facilities (Use Class F1(a)); business and employment floorspace (Use Classes B2, B8 and E(g)); redevelopment of existing agricultural buildings including construction of a building for community use (Use Classes E and F2); improvements to public rights of way; sports pitches; gypsy and traveller pitches/plots; public open space; landscaping, and associated infrastructure

Case Officer: Matthew Porter

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: Orvello, Southwater Street Southwater Horsham

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

- Loss of General Amenity
- Overdevelopment
- Trees and Landscaping

Comments:

1. The application is fundamentally inconsistent with the legally binding Southwater Neighbourhood Plan (SNP) and should be refused:
 - a. Scale: up to 1,000 homes, far exceeding the SNP's allocated number of dwellings.
 - b. Built-up area boundary: significant parts of the site lie outside the boundary defined in the neighbourhood plan.
 - c. Coalescence: the development would contribute to the coalescence of Southwater and Christ's Hospital, undermining settlement identity.
 2. The application is materially unclear on key points. As submitted, it prevents proper assessment of impacts and undermines meaningful public consultation.
 - a. Description of development: the operative description does not specify clear numerical limits (e.g., number of homes and/or floorspace).
 - b. Phasing: the phasing strategy is only described as "indicative", making it difficult to assess impacts over time.
 3. The claimed "benefits" are unconvincing and are not commensurate with the scale of development. Several are also uncertain in delivery and therefore cannot be relied upon in the planning balance:
 - a. Sporting provision: the proposed facilities are inadequate relative to existing shortages and future demand, with insufficient certainty on delivery, specification, and community access.
 - b. Settlement integration and movement: pedestrian and cycle links to Southwater village centre are inadequate, creating an isolated extension that would compete with-rather than support- Lintot Square.
 - c. Education: the proposed secondary school location is unsustainable, car-dependent, and contrary to neighbourhood plan policy.
 4. This proposal is, in substance, a re-submission of DC/22/1916. The objections raised previously by statutory bodies and residents remain outstanding and have not been adequately addressed, some of which are listed below;
 - a. Policing: Sussex Police has highlighted that additional strain on resources would negatively affect policing of both the development and wider district.
 - b. Heritage: Historic England has indicated the proposal would cause a high level of "less than substantial harm" (as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework) to the significance of Great House Farm.
 - c. Water scarcity as demonstrated by last year's hot summer combined with already failing sewage system are further critical aspects that haven't been addressed. Removing water neutrality
-

restrictions has equally not resolved the underlying problem and an adequate or robust analysis to ensure the viability of the expansion has not been performed.

d. Health: approved and proposed housing growth (including the golf course site, Mowbray, and this scheme) would further stretch limited local health services. There is no A&E/urgent care centre in Horsham or Crawley.

e. Public transport: the supporting public transport infrastructure appears insufficient, meaning residents are likely to rely heavily on cars. Worthing Road is already highly congested, and polluted, at peak times.

f. Biodiversity: loss of habitats for wildlife, including species currently using this farmland and surrounding woodland.

The cumulative impact of recent and ongoing development in Southwater and the surrounding area is already severe. Granting permission for this scheme would cause substantial harm to Southwater's village character, the local environment, and residents' access to the countryside-one of the defining qualities of this area.

Accordingly, I object to this application and request that the Council refuses permission.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**

Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton