
From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 01 June 2026 12:08
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0530

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 01/06/2026 12:07 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land at Hornbrook Farm Brighton Road West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application for up to 180 dwellings, open space and associated works and infrastructure with all matters reserved apart from access.
Case Officer:	Nicola Pettifer

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	6 Ghyll Crescent 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 Planning Team, HDC I would like to strongly object to this proposed planning application like so many of the residents in the area have already done. At the outset, let me recap what I see is flawed in the process of this application and the approach taken including historically context:- 1) This very site has been refused planning permission on all occasions in the last 20 years, there were 2 attempts made in the past and what is shocking is that inspite of no changes to

the underlying conditions which led to the refusal and rather increase of factors which need mitigation (traffic, road safety, environmental protection etc), this proposal is being entertained informally by the council

2) The process in the lead up to this application in consulting the community, informing the relevant stakeholders (local schools), being compliant with regard to Horsham local plan have all being ignored. The community engaged was all about sharing the plans and not taking any feedback. While the initial intent was 100 odd houses, this has been now raised to 2x that amount. I know for a fact, local schools etc like Heron Way have not been informed or consulted when they need to be able to cater to the increased load from new families. The list goes on.

3) Council is enabling this by not challenging basic things which will be legally challenged if this proceeds like no need for an EIA, raising the proposed housing to 2x that stated amount in the intention of the local plan, underlying studies done using desktop research or done in a manner which is flawed i.e. doing a traffic assessment missing out key roads in the quietest of times during the year (Aug) and during the day (miss out school hours) etc

Coming to my formal objection to this application on the parameters above and policy from the council and national planning framework

1) Design: The proposal is so high level, that it can be twisted by the developer so easily if this is allowed to proceed. Keeping in mind the AONB and that this development is at the entrance of a historic town, these design flaws are most unfortunate. Here are the contradictions to NPPF and Horsham Local Plan

NPPF

Para 130: requires developments to be sympathetic to local character and history and establish a strong sense of place

Para 131: requires developments to be visually attractive and consistent with local policies

Para 134: permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take opportunities to improve character

Horsham Local Plan

Policy 32 - The Quality of New Development

Requires development to:

reflect local character

respond to landscape setting

provide high quality design

2) Highway Access and Parking: Here is one of the strongest flaws in this application. Traffic assessment was done at the wrong time in a wrong way. Proposed access in/out of the site is for this volume of houses is limited to 1 point creating a choke. With no improvement in surrounding road infrastructure, this increases traffic significantly on the surrounding roads and creates safety issues for pedestrians which is already a challenge in this part of town. Here are the contradictions to NPPF and Horsham Local Plan

NPPF

Para 114: development should ensure safe and suitable access for all users

Para 115: sustainable transport opportunities should be taken up

Para 116: development should only be refused where impacts are "severe"

Horsham Local Plan

Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport

Requires:

safe access

promotion of sustainable modes

3) Loss of General Amenity: This open green space of land is at the edge of an AONB. It is at the entrance of an historic market town. The elevation of this land is very high and any development will cause loss of open countryside and visual amenity. If approved, this will NOT integrate into the landscape and stand out as a piece of ill thought development standing out of character. Objections noted below

NPPF

Para 130(c): development should create places that are attractive and maintain a high

standard of amenity

Para 174: decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural environment

Horsham Local Plan

Policy 25 - The Natural Environment and Landscape Character

Development must:

conserve landscape character

protect beauty of the countryside

4) Overdevelopment: I am all for new housing that is sustainable and serves the growing needs of the community. Sadly this proposed planning application does exactly the opposite. It is in the wrong side of town, is cut off from bigger and better planned developments coming up which have the supporting infrastructure (read Mobray) and is being pushed at all costs with underlying greed (read 180 proposed units vs an original plan of 100). Hence its fair to conclude very clearly - Density exceeds site capacity and harms landscape edge.

NPPF

Para 124: development should make efficient use of land but not at the expense of:

local character

environmental quality

Horsham Local Plan

Policy 32 - Quality of New Development

Policy 26 - Countryside Protection (if outside settlement boundary)

Requires:

development to:

respect site constraints

avoid urban sprawl

5) Privacy, Light and Noise: As noted, this is on a piece of land with significant elevation. It creates significant loss of privacy for all of us who surround the development as houses overlook our gardens. Light pollution caused with the elevated nature of this land will cause disruption both to residents around and also wildlife which is abundant as this is at the edge of AONB and have wildlife corridors due to the brook. Lastly in winter when the trees loose their leaves, this development will stand out visually due to elevation of the land. Objections below

NPPF

Para 130(f): development should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users

Horsham Local Plan

Policy 33 - Development Principles

Requires protection of:

privacy

daylight

noise conditions

6) Trees and landscaping: Relates to the objections above. Loss of trees/hedgerows and insufficient mitigation.

NPPF

Para 131(c): development should enhance the natural environment by:

recognizing intrinsic character of the countryside

Para 174(b): protect and enhance biodiversity and natural habitats

Horsham Local Plan

Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

Development must:

protect ecological networks

provide enhancements

Policy 25 - Landscape Character

7) Others

7a. The applications if flawed as it has an over-reliance on assumptions, modelling, and future conditions. This is a huge issue per my opening remarks

NPPF

Para 189: planning decisions should be based on adequate, relevant and up-to-date evidence

Para 55: conditions should only be used where necessary and precise, not to defer essential detail

Horsham Local Plan
Policy 1 - Strategic Policy
Requires development to be:
sustainable
supported by robust evidence

7b. The proposed development ignores flooding risk. The applicant has not demonstrated with sufficient certainty that the site will be safe over its lifetime or that the development will not increase flood risk on or off site. The reliance on high-level modelling, assumptions, and future design detail means the proposal does not meet the requirements of the NPPF or Horsham flood risk policy. See below

The development relies on the fact that houses are in Flood Zone 1, but ignores the wider site context, including proximity to Flood Zone 3 and Horn Brook, meaning risk is shifted rather than removed.

- The Flood Risk Assessment is overly simplistic, treating flood risk as acceptable without fully assessing:

- o site-wide hydrology
- o impact on drainage infrastructure and open space

- The drainage strategy is conceptual, not detailed, and depends heavily on SuDS (swales, basins) that are:

- o not fully designed
- o not proven to work given limited ground infiltration

- There is over-reliance on a single discharge point (Horn Brook) without clear evidence that:

- o downstream capacity exists
- o cumulative impacts are acceptable

- The assessment does not robustly demonstrate that:

- o flood risk will not increase elsewhere
- o the system will remain effective under climate change conditions
- o Exceedance events (extreme rainfall) are not adequately addressed, meaning floodwater pathways across the site remain uncertain.

- Long-term maintenance is unclear, with no confirmed management structure or funding mechanism to ensure SuDS continues to function properly.

7c. The application fails to provide a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment despite the scale and sensitive location of the development. While individual technical reports are provided, these do not assess the cumulative, in-combination effects of the proposal on the environment. The absence of an EIA results in a fragmented and incomplete understanding of the development's true impacts, particularly in relation to landscape, ecology, drainage, and amenity. As such, the council should not be satisfied that the proposal will not give rise to significant adverse environmental effects, contrary to the requirements of the EIA Regulations, the NPPF, and Horsham District planning policies.

In conclusion, this is an ill thought development which has been refused many times before and should be refused this time as well. We should not let greed by-pass rule of law. The volume of objections received shows how unpopular this is with the local community. There are many reasons for which this can and will be challenged if the council decides to proceed with this. An approval harms the local community, environment and compensates very little to the needs of Horsham

Many thanks



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 Eaton