

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 May 2026 15:56:29 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
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 19/05/2026 3:56 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:	4 Ghyll Crescent Horsham
----------	--------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
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:	Transport Assessment by Richard Jackson Ltd (Project No. 62726)

I wish to object to the Transport Assessment submitted in support of the proposed development at Hornbrook Farm. The assessment materially understates the transport, safety and sustainability impacts of the scheme and fails to demonstrate compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and local transport policy.

1. The Site Is Fundamentally Car-Dependent

The Transport Assessment repeatedly claims the site is "sustainable" because some facilities fall within theoretical walking or cycling distances. However, the document itself demonstrates the opposite.

The site is located on a 40mph A-road corridor with limited existing pedestrian infrastructure. There is currently: no footway on the northern side of the A281 frontage, no footway provision on Doomsday Lane, reliance upon new mitigation infrastructure simply to make pedestrian movement possible. The development therefore depends upon: a new signalised crossing, relocated bus stops, indirect pedestrian routing, and future mitigation works before basic accessibility can be achieved. This is not a genuinely sustainable or "vision-led" transport location as required by the NPPF.

2. Walking and Cycling Claims Are Overstated

The assessment relies heavily on theoretical route distances rather than realistic travel behaviour. The report acknowledges: Horsham railway station lies beyond the normally accepted walking distance, the town centre is approximately 2km away, primary school walking distances may approach 2km, routes require multiple crossings of the A281, and some routes rely on indirect Public Rights of Way connections. These distances and routes are unlikely to encourage significant modal shift away from private car use, particularly for: families with young children, older residents, mobility-impaired users, winter and poor-weather conditions, or school journeys. The likely reality is a highly car-dependent development.

3. Existing Highway Safety Concerns Are Downplayed

The assessment identifies: 7 recorded injury collisions within the study area, including 4 classified as "serious". This is a significant safety record for a relatively small local road network. The report nevertheless dismisses concerns by stating there is no accident "cluster". This conclusion is not convincing. The proposal would introduce: 180 dwellings, additional turning movements, school traffic, delivery traffic, pedestrian crossing activity, and increased bus interactions onto an already constrained and hazardous corridor. The assessment also fails to properly

analyse: pedestrian safety risk, cumulative safety impacts, or the implications of increased active travel movements across a high-speed road environment. 4. Public Transport Provision Is Inadequate

The principal bus service is only hourly. Other services are extremely limited, operating only: on certain weekdays, at very low frequencies, or as occasional community routes. This level of provision is insufficient to support a major housing development or meaningful reduction in private car dependency.

The Transport Assessment significantly overstates the effectiveness of public transport accessibility.

5. The Assessment Admits Key Pedestrian Connectivity Failures

One of the most important conclusions within the report is that pedestrian access northwards towards the PROW network via Doomsday Lane is considered "unviable".

The reasons given include: ecological harm, severe engineering constraints, steep level changes, a strategic water main, and habitat impacts.

This admission is highly significant because it demonstrates that the site cannot achieve integrated

pedestrian permeability or connectivity with surrounding areas.

The development is therefore

constrained in a fundamental way and should not be presented as sustainably connected.

6. Traffic Generation and Capacity Impacts Appear

Underestimated

The projected traffic generation figures appear unrealistically low for 180 dwellings in a semi-rural edge

location with limited sustainable transport alternatives. The assessment relies upon TRICS comparator

sites which may not reflect the likely car dependency of this location. In addition: only a limited number

of nearby junctions are modelled, wider cumulative network impacts are not properly assessed, no

meaningful consideration appears to be given to future cumulative development pressures, and the

modelling assumptions appear optimistic. The conclusion that "no mitigation is required" is therefore not robustly justified.

7. Reliance on a Future 30mph Speed Limit Is Contradictory

The assessment repeatedly refers to a possible reduction of the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph as a

beneficial mitigation measure. However, the report simultaneously states that the development is "not

dependent" upon this change. This is contradictory: if the

reduction is necessary to achieve acceptable

safety conditions, the scheme should depend upon it; if it is

unnecessary, it should not be repeatedly

relied upon to support the application. 8. Excessive Reliance on Future Reserved Matters and

Conditions

A significant number of important transport matters are deferred to future stages, including: final pedestrian arrangements, internal layouts, detailed parking provision, Travel Plan effectiveness, construction traffic management, and detailed mitigation design. The outline application therefore fails to demonstrate with sufficient certainty that the transport impacts of the development can be acceptably mitigated.

Conclusion

Overall, the Transport Assessment does not provide convincing evidence that the development would comply with: the sustainable transport objectives of the NPPF, Horsham District transport policies, or highway safety requirements. The assessment understates: car dependency, safety concerns, pedestrian connectivity problems, and cumulative transport impacts. For these reasons, I object to the application and request that significant weight is given to the deficiencies within the submitted Transport Assessment.

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