

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 13 April 2026 17:12
To: Planning
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 13/04/2026 5:11 PM.

Application Summary

Address: Land North West of Southwater

Proposal: Outline planning application, with all matters reserved (except for primary access to the highway) 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: 69 Cedar Drive Southwater

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

- Design
- Highway Access and Parking
- Loss of General Amenity
- Overdevelopment

Comments: Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object formally in the strongest possible terms to planning application DC/26/0366, submitted by Berkeley Strategic Land, concerning the proposed development on

land to the North West of Southwater.

Having reviewed the application, I believe the proposal is fundamentally unsound and should be refused for the following reasons:

1. Unsustainable development and infrastructure strain.

Southwater and the surrounding area already face significant pressure on local infrastructure. Roads in and around the village are frequently congested, particularly at peak times, and this development would substantially worsen traffic conditions and road safety.

In addition, local services such as GP surgeries, schools, and public transport are already operating at or near capacity. There is insufficient evidence that the necessary infrastructure improvements would be delivered in a timely or effective manner to support such a large-scale development.

2. Harm to the Character of the Area.

The proposed site forms part of the open countryside that contributes significantly to the rural setting and identity of Southwater. Development of this scale would result in the urbanisation of a currently undeveloped area, eroding the clear distinction between settlements and causing irreversible harm to the local landscape character.

3. Environmental Impact and Loss of Green Space.

The loss of greenfield land is deeply concerning. This site supports local biodiversity, including wildlife habitats that would be disrupted or destroyed by the development. At a time when environmental protection and biodiversity net gain should be priorities, this proposal appears to conflict with those objectives.

4. Conflict with Local Planning Policy.

The development appears to conflict with key principles of the local development plan, particularly those relating to sustainable growth, protection of the countryside, and the prioritisation of previously developed (brownfield) land. Approving this application would set a worrying precedent for further speculative development in the area.

5. Scale and Overdevelopment.

The scale of the proposed development is disproportionate to the existing settlement. It risks overwhelming the village's character, infrastructure, and community cohesion. Growth should be gradual, planned, and supported by adequate infrastructure-not imposed at a scale that fundamentally alters the nature of the area.

6. Lack of Justification for Site Selection.

There is insufficient justification for why this greenfield site has been chosen over more sustainable alternatives. Priority should be given to brownfield land and locations with existing infrastructure capacity.

7. Insufficient Secondary School Provision.

There is already a well-documented shortage of secondary school places in the area, with many children being forced to travel significant distances to attend school outside their local community. This is both disruptive for families and unsustainable in terms of transport and environmental impact. The proposed development would significantly increase demand for secondary school places, yet there appears to be no clear, deliverable plan to provide a new secondary school or expand existing provision to meet this need. This omission is deeply concerning and demonstrates a lack of proper planning for the long-term needs of future residents. Without adequate secondary education provision, this development cannot be considered sustainable.

In conclusion, this proposal represents an unsustainable and harmful form of development that would have lasting negative impacts on Southwater and its residents. I strongly urge Horsham District Council to refuse planning permission for application DC/26/0366.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted Signature]

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