

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 April 2026 19:19:34 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0509
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 15/04/2026 7:19 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land To The South of Lynwick Street Rudgwick Horsham West Sussex RH12 3DJ
Proposal:	Permission in Principle for the erection of 2 - 4 dwellings along with open space, landscaping, parking and access from Lynwick Street
Case Officer:	Daniel Holmes

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Little Hawks Rudgwick
----------	-----------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Formal Policy-Led Objection
	Proposed Development at Lynwick Street, Rudgwick

Summary of Key Planning Objections (Development Plan & NPPF)

- Unacceptable highway safety impacts on a narrow rural lane with no pavement, contrary to HDPF Policy 40 and NPPF §109
- Failure to prioritise pedestrian and cyclist safety, contrary to HDPF Policy 40 and NPPF §109(a) and (e)
- Development in an unsustainable and inappropriate location, contrary to RNDP Policy RNP1 (Spatial Strategy) and the strategic objectives of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF)
- Inappropriate form of development that disrupts the established linear settlement pattern of Lynwick Street, representing opportunistic rather than plan-led growth, particularly given that Rudgwick has already exceeded its housing allocation, contrary to RNDP Policy RNP1, HDPF strategic objectives, and NPPF §130
- Disproportionate and illogical concentration of housing in Rudgwick, contrary to HDPF Clause 6.3, Policies 15 and 17, and the District's strategic housing distribution
- Unjustified harm to landscape character, woodland and biodiversity, contrary to HDPF Policy 25 and NPPF §174
- Harm to the setting of a Grade II listed building, contrary to HDPF Policy 33 and NPPF §§202-208
- Risk of exacerbating surface water flooding and drainage problems, with potential impacts on existing housing and the highway, contrary to HDPF infrastructure policies and NPPF §§159-167
- Serious deficiencies in notification and public engagement, resulting in clear prejudice to immediately affected residents
- Failure to assess cumulative impacts, contrary to the HDPF, RNDP, and NPPF §§110-111
- Erosion of legitimate expectations of local residents who chose to live in a rural setting, undermining residential amenity, character and confidence in the plan-led planning system.

1. Highway Safety - Conflict with HDPF Policy 40 and NPPF §109

Lynwick Street is a narrow rural village lane in poor condition, with surface failure and potholes, and critically, no pavement. Pedestrians - including children - are therefore forced to walk

within the carriageway.

HDPF Policy 40 (Development and Highway Safety) requires development to provide safe and suitable access for all users and to avoid unacceptable highway safety impacts.

The proposal would introduce construction traffic, heavy goods vehicles and increased daily vehicular movements onto a route already under significant strain from visitor traffic associated with nearby uses, including the Milk Churn café and Firebird Brewery. This would materially intensify conflict between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists.

Given the physical constraints of Lynwick Street, these impacts are not capable of satisfactory mitigation. The proposal therefore conflicts with HDPF Policy 40 and, in accordance with NPPF §109, should be refused.

2. Unsustainable Location and Conflict with Spatial Strategy - RNDP Policy RNP1

The Rudgwick Neighbourhood Development Plan (2021-2031) is a made plan and forms part of the statutory development plan.

RNDP Policy RNP1 (Spatial Strategy) directs development to sustainable and appropriate locations within the settlement and resists development that undermines village character or places inappropriate pressure on rural infrastructure.

Development on Lynwick Street - an already overstretched rural lane with no pedestrian infrastructure - is inherently unsustainable and fundamentally at odds with this spatial strategy.

3. Disproportionate Housing Delivery and Conflict with District-Wide Strategy HDPF Clause 6.3, Policy 15 and Policy 17

Clause 6.3 of the HDPF identifies an overall housing delivery target of approximately 800 dwellings per year across the entire Horsham District, with growth explicitly centred on the Gatwick area, plus a limited allowance for the Coastal Housing Market Area. Rudgwick lies within neither.

Despite this, proposals currently under consideration, including the A281 scheme for approximately 90 dwellings, would equate to around 12% of the District's annual housing target being directed toward Rudgwick.

Based on the 2021 Census, Rudgwick has a population of approximately 3,000, compared with a total District population of around 148,000 - meaning only around 2% of the District's population lives in Rudgwick. The allocation of already potentially

c.12% of the annual District housing target to a village accommodating just 2% of the population is entirely disproportionate and illogical.

This runs directly contrary to HDPF Policy 15 (Strategic Policy: Housing Provision), which clearly directs growth towards Horsham, Southwater and Billingshurst, not small rural villages such as Rudgwick.

Furthermore, HDPF Policy 17 makes clear that development on countryside land will only be supported where exceptional circumstances are demonstrated. No such exceptional circumstances exist in relation to this proposal on a rural lane such as Lynwick Street. The development is therefore purely speculative, with no policy-based justification.

The Parish Council has also confirmed that Rudgwick has already exceeded its housing allocation requirement, removing any remaining strategic or numerical justification for further housing growth in unsustainable village locations.

4. Inappropriate Form of Development and Harm to Settlement Pattern

Lynwick Street is characterised by a linear pattern of development, reflective of its historic evolution as a rural lane.

The proposal introduces a "close-style" form of development, which would disrupt this established pattern and introduce a cramped, suburban form of housing that is wholly uncharacteristic of the street and its semi-rural context.

This represents opportunistic rather than plan-led development, directly conflicting with RNDP Policy RNP1, the strategic objectives of the HDPF, and NPPF §130.

5. Landscape and Environmental Harm - Conflict with HDPF Policy 25 and NPPF §174

HDPF Policy 25 requires the protection of landscape character, woodland and green infrastructure.

The proposal would result in the loss of woodland and green landscape that contribute directly to the rural character of Lynwick Street and provide ecological connectivity, including habitat for locally observed wildlife such as deer.

This harm is inherent to the proposal and has not been justified, contrary to HDPF Policy 25 and NPPF §174.

6. Harm to Heritage Assets - Conflict with HDPF Policy 33 and NPPF §§202-208

The site lies adjacent to the Grade II listed Old Vicarage.

The proposal would erode its historic rural setting and diminish its significance. No public benefits have been identified that would outweigh this harm, contrary to HDPF Policy 33 and NPPF §§202-208.

7. Flood Risk, Drainage and Impact on Existing Infrastructure

The site forms part of a naturally wet landscape, located on a slope with an existing stream that plays a role in dispersing surface water away from Lynwick Street.

There is significant concern that development would disturb this balance, potentially channelling water towards the natural dip in the road, increasing flood risk to existing homes and undermining the integrity of the highway.

The application fails to demonstrate that flood risk would not increase elsewhere, contrary to NPPF §§159-167.

8. Other Considerations - Inadequate Notification and Prejudice to Public Participation

Many of the properties most directly affected, including "Melbury" (directly opposite and overlooking the site), "Little Hawks" (opposite the site, next door to Melbury), "Clovelly" (adjacent to the site) - received no letter or email notification of the application.

No site notices were displayed. Awareness arose only through word of mouth on Tuesday 14 April, leaving less than 48 hours to prepare an objection and limiting engagement with other residents. (also note that workers were seen in the area over the previous months who when approached said they were assessing road quality, it would appear however that they were actually part of this planning application which was being hatched in secret and pictures taken by them are part of the proposal)

This has resulted in clear prejudice to effective public participation.

9. Failure to Address Cumulative Impacts

The proposal fails to properly assess cumulative impacts on highways, drainage, landscape, heritage and village infrastructure, particularly in circumstances where Rudgwick has already exceeded its housing allocation, contrary to HDPF, RNDP, and NPPF §§110-111.

10. Impact on Local Residents and Legitimate Expectations

Residents of Lynwick Street, including those occupying properties directly affected by the proposal, made a conscious decision to live in this location because of its established rural character, linear development pattern and countryside setting, all of which are strongly reflected in the adopted development plan.

The introduction of an intensive, close-style residential development in this location would fundamentally alter that character and undermine the very qualities that residents reasonably relied upon when choosing to live here and investing in their homes.

The planning system exists to provide certainty, consistency and fairness through a plan-led approach. Allowing speculative development that runs contrary to adopted policies would erode confidence in that system and result in material harm to the residential amenity and outlook of existing occupants, particularly where development is proposed directly opposite and adjacent to established dwellings.

This impact is not merely personal or subjective, but flows directly from the proposal's conflict with the development plan, its failure to respect settlement pattern, and its inappropriate intrusion into a rural environment that the planning framework seeks to protect.

Conclusion

The proposed development conflicts with the statutory development plan and national policy, including:

HDPF Policies 15, 17, 25, 33 and 40

RNDP Policy RNP1

NPPF §§109, 130, 159-167, 174 and 202-208

In light of disproportionate housing delivery, lack of exceptional circumstances, unresolved infrastructure and flood risk concerns, and inadequate public engagement, the proposal represents unjustified and speculative development.

The application should therefore be refused.

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 E
aton