From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 November 2026 17:27:53 UTC+00:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/1471
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 18/11/2026 5:27 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land West Side of Tiptoe Sandgate Lane Storrington West Sussex
Proposal:	Erection of a detached chalet bungalow, associated access, car parking and landscaping.
Case Officer:	Sam Nye

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	Little Downs Sandgate Lane Storrington

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I'd like to object to this application. Even though the design has changed and planning policy has moved on since the previous appeal, this is still housing on the same countryside site. Its rural character, its link with Sandgate

Park and its poor access to services were all part of the earlier decision to refuse the appeal. These have not changed.

Summary of points
- The same site was refused in 2014 (DC/14/1150) and dismissed on appeal because of countryside encroachment and poor access to services.
- The site is still outside the Built Up Area Boundary, so Policies 25, 26 and 31 matter.
- It borders Sandgate Park/Woods (south) and undeveloped wooded land (east and west), so it feels and looks like countryside, not infill.
- I have used the footpath on the eastern edge as an entrance to Sandgate Woods for over 50 years, walking down this path the plot is visually part of the Woods with heath/woodland on either side.
- The rhododendron hedge on Sandgate Lane has been lowered significantly. The site looks more open from Sandate Lane now, but that doesn't mean its character has changed. Future residents may well want privacy screening, which would change the site again.
- Five of the 26 surveyed trees would be removed.
- The landscape survey was done in full leaf, so winter views need considering.
- The ecology report accepts about 750 m² of grassland would be lost, with possible net biodiversity loss and a risk to bats from lighting.
- The impact of the upper-floor windows on the two neighbours needs assessing due to the higher levels of those properties.
- Three parking spaces are proposed, but Sandgate Lane is single-track, so parking, turning and deliveries must work within the site. This is too few for a four bedroom house.
- The proposed entrance is at the most dangerous part of the lane, just after a blind bend at the bottom of a steep hill.
- Waitrose is about 26 minutes on foot and back up hill with shopping versus 4 minutes by car, so residents will probably drive.

1. The previous appeal
The applicant's own Planning Statement says DC/14/1150 was refused in 2014 and dismissed on appeal. The Inspector said the dwelling would "encroach into the countryside" and that this, together with the difficulty of getting to local services, outweighed the modest benefit of one new home. That was the case even though the Council couldn't show a five-year housing land supply. I accept that today's policy applies. But policy changes don't change what the site is physically like or how it relates to the countryside and Sandgate Park. The reasons given in the Inspector's refusal still stand, and I'd ask the Council to give the Inspector's site-specific findings proper weight.

2. Outside the settlement boundary
The site is still outside the Built Up Area Boundary. The

applicant's Landscape Appraisal accepts that HDPF Policies 25, 26 and 31 are relevant. Policy 26 says the rural character and undeveloped nature of the countryside should be protected. So this should be judged as development of countryside land, not just as another house next to existing ones.

3. Sandgate Park and the surroundings
Houses lie to the north across Sandgate Lane, but the site has Sandgate Park to the south, a wooded strip with a footpath to the east, and more undeveloped wooded land to the west. The applicant's own Tree Survey describes the area as "low-density, semi-rural housing surrounded by open, lightly wooded heathland." That context matters when deciding whether the site really sits with the settlement or with the countryside. The Inspector found that the plot was separated from the houses to the north by Sandgate Lane itself and the (now much reduced) rhododendron hedge, and was therefore more closely linked to the Woods. That hasn't changed.

4. The footpath
I have walked the path along the eastern edge into Sandgate Park for more than 50 years. I'm not claiming it is a legal right of way, but it is first-hand evidence of long use, and the Tree Survey also records a footpath on the eastern boundary. Please assess the proposal as seen from this path as well as from Sandgate Lane. At present you step straight into the woods; with the propsed house next door, the path would instead run beside a dwelling before reaching the Woods. Any fencing or screening would add to that change and weaken the sense of the plot as an extension of the open heathland to the south.

5. Vegetation removal and future screening
There used to be substantial rhododendron along the Sandgate Lane boundary. It has been significantly lowered or removed and replaced by post-and-rail fencing. The ecological appraisal records the northern hedgerow as recently felled. Please don't treat the more open look as proof that the site's character has changed.
Once someone lives here, they may want privacy from the lane and add hedging or fencing. I'm not saying that will definitely happen, but it's foreseeable. Please can the council think about the lasting effect of the house, garage, driveway, cars, lighting, bins and garden use, and about Policy 26's focus on woodlands, fields, hedgerows and trees.

6. Trees and seasonal views
The Tree Survey covered 26 trees and says five would need to be removed. Please consider that alongside the clearance since the previous application, which makes the plot look more like an extension of the heathland and woods. The landscape survey was carried out on 26 June 2026 with the trees in leaf and accepts that views would be more open in winter. The Council should take in to

account how the house would look in winter.

7. Current policy and Council guidance
The applicant relies heavily on housing land supply, but the question is wider than that. The Council should also look at the location, the relationship with the settlement, the countryside character and sustainability under the current NPPF (including Policy S5 on development outside settlements). The Council's Shaping Development in Horsham District advice note, which the applicant relies on, asks that development sits within an existing defensible boundary and that landscape features are maintained and enhanced. With open land on three sides and the lane delimiting (pre previous Inspector's report) the site from housing on the northern boundary, I don't think anything has changed to override the Inspector's findings, which remain relevant to today's policies. The site should still be seen as related to Sandgate Park/Woods, not the rest of Sandgate Lane.

8. Biodiversity and neighbours
The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal says about 750 m² of grassland would be lost, which could mean a net loss of biodiversity. It also says lighting may disturb commuting bats. Policy 31 should be applied carefully.
Please also check the upper-floor windows against the two neighbouring homes for privacy (Policy 33). I'm asking for careful assessment, not claiming overlooking has already been proven.

9. Entrance, Parking and servicing
Until recently, when a gate was installed, the proposed entrance was a wire between fence posts at the edge of the lane, which was taken down on the rare occasions someone visited the site. A pull-off cleared area was previously further west on the plot. The proposed entrance is at a very dangerous spot on Sandgate Lane, a narrow, single-track, unadopted road: at the bottom of a steep hill, just round a blind bend and right by the pedestrian path into the woods. The entrance isn't big enough for delivery vehicles to pull off the lane and drive out, so in reality they will stop in the lane and block it. Anyone coming down the hill and round the bend could meet a stationary vehicle. If a vehicle does pull in, the size of the entrance and the gate position mean it would have to reverse back onto the lane. Three on-site spaces are proposed, which is not enough for a four-bedroom house when there is no on-street parking (Hillside Road is the closest, 5 min walk per google maps mostly on the narrow single track lane). Turning space for workmen and deliveries also needs to be considered. Houses already on the lane were approved with a similar level of space, but the expected number of vehicles is exceeded and vehicles often reverse onto the lane. Sufficient space is needed for the size of property and the cars it will need taking the location in to consideration. (Policies 40 and 41).

10. Getting around without a car

The Inspector previously found it hard to access local services easily. Google Maps currently gives about 26 minutes on foot to Waitrose in Storrington against about 4 minutes by car. Journey time isn't everything, but with shopping to carry home up hill most people will drive.
Active Travel England guidance talks about a genuine choice of transport modes, shops ideally within 800 metres of homes, and assessing the quality of existing walking routes. I'd ask the Council to consider whether walking is a realistic option here. If it isn't, that adds to the parking and traffic concerns on the lane.

Conclusion
Planning policy has changed and housing supply is a material consideration, but the site still has to be judged on its own character. The question isn't whether the chalet bungalow is smaller or better designed than the earlier proposal. It is whether housing on this countryside site is acceptable.
The site is outside the boundary and borders Sandgate Park and wooded land on three sides. It would lose trees, grassland and its footpath setting, and future residents would probably depend on cars. I don't think the concerns from the previous appeal have been overcome.
I therefore respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk

Horsham District Council