

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 September 2026 16:50:14 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0913
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 18/09/2026 4:50 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land East of Oaklands Henfield Road Cowfold West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application for a phased development of approximately 40 residential dwellings, vehicular access, car parking, landscaping, open space and other associated works and infrastructure. All matters reserved except for access.
Case Officer:	Alice Johnson

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	8 Barleycroft Cowfold
----------	-----------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Objection to Planning Application DC/26/0913 - Land East of Oaklands, Henfield Road, Cowfold

I wish to object to the outline planning application for approximately 40 dwellings on land east of Oaklands, Henfield Road, Cowfold.

I recognise the need for housing, but I have concerns regarding the suitability of this particular site and, in particular, the proposed access, impact on existing residents, local infrastructure and the way the development has been presented.

1. Highway safety and suitability of the proposed access

The proposed development would introduce a new access serving approximately 40 dwellings from the existing private access arrangement.

I have concerns about the interaction between vehicles leaving the development, pedestrians using the surrounding footways and traffic on Henfield Road. The approach to the existing private driveway is relatively steep, which is relevant when considering the stopping distance available to vehicles leaving the development, particularly where pedestrians may be crossing the proposed junction.

The Highway Authority's response records 85th-percentile speeds of approximately 37.5 mph southbound and 32.5 mph northbound. I therefore consider that the practical operation of the junction needs to be considered in the context of actual traffic conditions rather than simply whether a vehicle can physically enter or leave the junction.

There is also an existing garage/business immediately opposite or close to the proposed access, where vehicles are regularly parked on or alongside the road. I have personally observed this parking and am aware of two collisions in the vicinity involving moving traffic and parked vehicles.

This is particularly relevant because the applicant's own swept-path assessment acknowledges that a refuse vehicle can require both lanes of the proposed access to be overrun when a parked vehicle is present. Although the Highway Authority has concluded that this does not constitute a safety concern, the assessment appears to consider a parked vehicle as a potential scenario rather than fully addressing the fact that parking associated with the existing garage is an established feature of the location.

I therefore ask the Council to consider whether the proposed access remains safe and practical under the existing, real-world conditions, including existing parking, pedestrian movements, vehicles entering and leaving the development and refuse collection vehicles.

2. Impact on existing properties at South Leas

The proposal would materially change the relationship between the proposed development and the five existing properties at South Leas.

At present, these properties have gardens which back onto an established boundary and private garden/field area. The proposal would replace this existing relationship with a new access road serving approximately 40 dwellings.

This would introduce regular vehicle movements, headlights, deliveries, refuse collection vehicles and associated activity immediately adjacent to properties which currently benefit from a much quieter and more private outlook.

The removal of the existing hedgerow and trees associated with the creation of the access would also reduce the established visual screening between the existing properties and the site.

I therefore ask that the impact on the residential amenity of these existing properties is properly assessed, including noise, disturbance, vehicle headlights, loss of screening, privacy and the change from an established garden/field boundary to a residential access road.

3. Local healthcare capacity

The capacity of Cowfold's medical provision is also a relevant infrastructure consideration.

The Cowfold Neighbourhood Plan records that Cowfold Medical Practice had a maximum building capacity of approximately 5,700 patients, with the practice identifying potential service reductions above approximately 5,400 patients. The Plan also records historical difficulties in recruiting additional GPs and constraints on the practice's ability to expand within its existing premises.

More recent published data indicates that Cowfold Surgery currently has approximately 5,040 registered patients.

The proposed development would introduce approximately 40 additional households and therefore potentially a significant number of additional patients into the existing catchment.

I therefore ask the Council to establish what additional demand this development is expected to place on local primary healthcare and whether an appropriate contribution or other mitigation is required to ensure that existing local healthcare provision is capable of accommodating the additional population.

4. Cumulative highway and construction impacts

The development should also be considered in the context of other significant construction activity planned in the surrounding area.

Rampion 2 involves the construction of a new onshore substation approximately 2 km east of Cowfold. The project has identified construction traffic as a specific consideration.

I appreciate that construction traffic associated with Rampion 2 may be subject to its own traffic-management arrangements, and I am not suggesting that all such traffic will necessarily use Henfield Road. However, given the scale and duration of the proposed construction activity in the wider area, I ask that the cumulative impact of construction traffic is considered alongside the construction traffic generated by this development.

This is particularly important given the existing concerns regarding parking, congestion and the operation of the proposed access.

5. Accuracy and consistency of submitted/public consultation material

I also wish to raise a concern regarding the aerial imagery used in the applicant's May 2026 Design and Access Assessment.

The aerial image presented in the document does not appear to represent the existing wastewater treatment facility to the north-east/east of the proposed site in the same manner as the other aerial and satellite imagery contained within the documentation. In particular, structures associated with the wastewater treatment facility which are visible in other imagery do not appear to be represented in the same way in the aerial image.

I contacted the applicant directly to ask whether this image had been digitally altered or edited to remove, obscure or otherwise alter the appearance of the wastewater treatment facility, and, if so, why.

The applicant has not provided a specific answer to those questions. Instead, I have been informed that a revised Design and Access Assessment will be uploaded to the planning application.

I recognise that there may be an innocent explanation for the apparent discrepancy, and I am therefore not asking the Council to assume that the image was deliberately altered. However, the image was included within material used to present the development to the public, and page 14 of the Design and Access Assessment records the contents of the presentation and subsequent public comments.

The fact that a revised document may subsequently be submitted

does not alter the fact that the earlier image formed part of the material presented during the public consultation process.

I therefore ask the Council to consider the original and revised imagery carefully and establish whether the existing wastewater treatment facility is accurately represented. If there is a material difference between the two images, I ask that this is taken into account when assessing the application's visual presentation and the relationship between the proposed development and the existing wastewater treatment facility.

Conclusion

For the reasons above, I consider that the application requires further consideration in relation to highway safety, the practical operation of the proposed access, the effect on existing residential properties, local infrastructure capacity and cumulative construction impacts.

I also ask the Council to ensure that the visual material submitted in support of the application accurately represents the existing surroundings, particularly the neighbouring wastewater treatment facility.

I respectfully request that these matters are taken into account when determining application DC/26/0913.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



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