

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 March 2026 21:58:33 UTC+00:00
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 22/03/2026 9:58 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 residential dwellings (including affordable housing) (Use Classes C2 and C3); 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: 8 Fletchers Southwater

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

- Design
- Highway Access and Parking

- Loss of General Amenity
- Other
- Overdevelopment
- Privacy Light and Noise
- Trees and Landscaping

Comments:

Dear Planning Officer,

I strongly object to the proposed development of 1,000 homes on land northwest of Southwater.

Fundamental Conflict with Planning Policy

This proposal directly conflicts with the adopted Southwater Neighbourhood Plan, which is up to date and carries full legal weight. National planning policy is clear that proposals which conflict with a made Neighbourhood Plan should not normally be approved.

On this basis alone, the application should be refused.

Prematurity and Delivery Concerns

The applicant, Berkeley Homes, has not yet completed the Broadacres development. Approving a further 1,000 homes before completion of existing phases is premature and risks extending disruption for potentially 15-20 years.

Questionable Housing Need

It is also concerning that Berkeley Homes markets properties overseas from the Horsham area. This raises legitimate questions about whether this development genuinely meets local housing need, which is a key test under planning policy.

Severe Infrastructure Strain

Southwater's infrastructure is already under pressure:

GP surgeries are oversubscribed

Schools are at capacity

Roads are increasingly congested

No clear, funded upgrades to utilities or sewage systems

There is no comprehensive cumulative impact assessment, which is a significant omission and risks rendering the application unsound.

Unsustainable Location

Southwater has no railway station and limited public transport.

This development would be heavily car-dependent, contrary to sustainability principles.

There is also no secured commitment to essential infrastructure such as a safe crossing of the A24 or proper cycle and pedestrian routes.

Water Supply and Legal Risk

The development lies within a water-stressed area. There is no independently verified evidence that water supply is sufficient. Without a robust and deliverable water neutrality strategy, the

proposal risks failing to comply with environmental and planning policy requirements. This creates a real risk of the development being found unlawful or unsound if approved without proper evidence.

Environmental Harm and Wildlife Impact

The site is adjacent to ancient woodland, including Courtland Wood and Smith's Copse, which are protected habitats.

From personal experience, we regularly see deer and foxes in the fields directly behind our home. These are active wildlife corridors that would be severely disrupted or destroyed.

We back directly onto the proposed development site. This means:

Immediate loss of habitat for local wildlife

Direct exposure to construction noise and long-term disturbance

Significant visual intrusion and loss of rural outlook

The absence of full, independent ecological surveys raises serious concerns. Failure to properly assess and protect wildlife could place the proposal in conflict with environmental legislation and biodiversity duties, making it legally vulnerable.

Impact on Residential Amenity

As a property directly adjoining the site, our home would be significantly affected by:

Prolonged construction noise and dust

Loss of privacy and open views

Increased traffic and pollution

These impacts are substantial and should carry significant weight in decision-making.

Conclusion

This proposal represents unsustainable, disproportionate development that:

Conflicts with the Neighbourhood Plan

Exceeds infrastructure capacity

Risks non-compliance with environmental and water regulations

Causes unacceptable harm to wildlife, landscape, and residential amenity

For these reasons, I respectfully request that this application be refused.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**



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