From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 December 2025 19:11:25 UTC+00:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/1138
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 02/12/2025 7:11 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land North of Glebe Farm and Kings Barn Lane Steyning West Sussex BN44 3YR
Proposal:	Approval of Reserved Matters following the Outline Planning Permission (reference DC/21/2233) relating to the Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 265no. dwellings, demolition of No. 37 Kings Barn Lane to provide new pedestrian/cycle/emergency link, provision of vehicular access from the A283 Steyning by-pass, provision of public open space, community orchard, sustainable drainage and other ancillary and enabling works.
Case Officer:	Matthew Porter

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	39 Kings Barn Lane Steyning 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:

I wish to make the following formal representation on the Reserved Matters (RM) submission for DC/25/1138. My property directly adjoins the southern boundary of the site and is materially affected by the proposed layout, drainage strategy, and boundary treatment.

In relation to the 'Latest Plan' Dated 26/11/25 under reference '168719 -TOR-XX-XX-DR-L-SK-001 - REV C Sections G-GG and H-HH', I wish to make the following comments:

1. Section H-HH - The diagram is not a true representation of the current layout bordering the existing dwellings between No. 37 through to No. 43 Kings Barn Lane. If the Application Boundary is as stated in red, part of the so-called 'Existing Hedgerow' they are showing in the diagram would be in our gardens, which it is not, as it does not exist and the area directly behind the Application Boundary is covered in brambles.

I would like to request the following amendments on Section H-HH be amended as follows:

- Remove the the 'Existing Hedgerow (vegetation illustrative based on aerial) as it is mis-leading and change the narrative to 'No hedgerow inside the Kings Barn Lane residents' gardens'.

- Change the narrative from 'Proposed Hedgerow Estimated growth: Height at 5 years 2-2.5m' to 'Existing deep bramble hedge to be retained.' The existing bramble hedgerow provides a large biodiversity area for a variety of plant and animal life in their natural habitat. I believe it should be considered important enough and desirable enough to remain in its current state and not be removed.

2. Alongside the 'Latest Plan' mentioned above, I refer to the document 'Softworks 7 of 9', which indicates the planting of 2 Acer Pseudoplatanus 18 - 20cm girth trees directly on the Application Boundary behind my existing fence line. These trees will grow to a significant height and are showing as overhanging and will cause loss of light and potential root damage to the properties and gardens of No.'s 37a through to 39a. These trees need to be removed from their current site and placed elsewhere. I suggest they are repositioned into the area of native shrub mix to intensify the area adjacent to Plot 121?

With reference to the existing dwellings from No. 37 through to No. 43 Kings Barn Lane, the 5m Buffer Zone has always formed part of the development plans bordering the existing dwellings and formed an essential part of the Loss of Amenity mitigation at the Outline Planning stage to provide privacy and security screening for existing residents bordering the southern side of the proposed

development.

The current plan shows deciduous trees being planted adjacent to plot 121 through to plot 108 which will take several years to establish. However, the request for well-established evergreen trees has always been made to ensure year-long privacy and I would like to make a request for a mixture of both types of trees in this area.

Although Vistry are proposing to install a 1.8m close-board fence on the side of their proposed hedgerow, this fence is deemed useless if there are no security access gates installed at the ends to prevent public access through this area from plot 121 through to plot 108. The definition of a buffer zone clearly states:

- "In real estate, a buffer zone is a transitional area of land set aside to separate two different or conflicting land uses, such as a residential area from a commercial or industrial zone. Its purpose is to minimize negative impacts like noise or traffic and create a more harmonious coexistence between the two adjacent areas. These zones are often landscaped with vegetation and may have specific regulations that prohibit or restrict certain types of development or activity within them".
The main restriction in this case is no public access which Vistry have always maintained to be the case, yet I can see no suggestion of this on the current plan to ensure privacy and security for existing residents along this stretch.

Drainage & Flooding remains a concern especially as the latest exceedance modelling shows the flow being behind my property in the drainage swale. I cannot see an updated response from the Lead Local Flood Authority which gives me comfort they are satisfied with the exceedance flows. Until the LLFA confirms the revised design is acceptable, the Reserved Matters does not comply with HDPF 24, 31 or 33.

In conclusion, I believe Condition 17 of Outline Planning cannot be met until the issues surrounding advanced planting as detailed above are addressed and delivered.

Kind regards

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 E
aton