

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 23 March 2026 13:23
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 23/03/2026 1:22 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: Bridleway House Two Mile Ash Horsham West Sussex

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 Sir/Madam

Objection - Site C (Area for potential off-site measures)

I write to object specifically to the inclusion of Site C, described as an "area for potential off-site measures if required." I object for the reasons below.

1. Lack of justification and policy compliance

There is no clearly defined or evidenced need for Site C to enable the proposed development. The application does not specify:

- * why this site is required,
- * why it cannot be accommodated within the main site, or
- * how Site C would function in practice.

As such, Site C represents speculative and undefined development, which is inconsistent with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that proposals be justified, necessary and evidence-based.

2. Conflict with countryside protection policy

Site C is located in open countryside, physically separate from the main development site and not contiguous with any existing built-up area.

Its inclusion conflicts with Policy 26 (Countryside Protection) of the Horsham District Planning Framework, which seeks to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and restrict development to that which is necessary and appropriate to a countryside location. No such necessity has been demonstrated.

3. Conflict with the Southwater Neighbourhood Plan

Site C lies outside the defined development boundary set out in the Southwater Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans form part of the statutory development plan and should be upheld unless there is clear and demonstrable justification to override them. No such justification has been provided in the case of site C.

4. Harm to landscape character and heritage setting

The introduction of a secured operational site in this rural location would result in urbanising and industrialising impacts that are out of keeping with the surrounding landscape.

This would conflict with:

- * Policy 25 (Natural Environment and Landscape Character), and
 - * Policy 34 (Cultural and Heritage Assets)
- particularly given the presence of historic properties in the vicinity whose setting contributes to their significance.

5. Unsuitable and unsafe access

Access to Site C is highly constrained and unsuitable for the types of vehicles likely to be required for its use.

In particular:

- * The route via Marlpost Road / Two Mile Ash is subject to a 10-tonne weight restriction at a narrow bridge, rendering it unsuitable for construction or service vehicles.
- * Alternative access via Bonfire Hill is narrow, steep, winding and prone to flooding, and would necessitate routing through residential roads within Southwater.

This raises clear concerns under Policy 40 (Sustainable Transport), which requires safe and suitable access and seeks to avoid severe impacts on the local highway network.

6. Deliverability and enforceability concerns

Given its separation from the main site, lack of clear purpose, and constrained access, there is significant uncertainty as to whether Site C could be delivered, managed, or enforced effectively.

The application provides no clear mechanism for how site C would work. This undermines the overall deliverability of the proposal and is contrary to the NPPF requirement that developments be realistic and deliverable.

7. Conclusion

In summary, Site C:

- * is unjustified and undefined,
- * conflicts with countryside protection policy and the Neighbourhood Plan,
- * would cause harm to landscape character and heritage setting, and
- * is not deliverable in a safe or practical manner.

As such, it should not be included within the application and should be refused or removed from the scheme.

I hope the Council gives full weight to these concerns in its determination.

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