

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 June 2026 16:48:25 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/2087
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 29/06/2026 4:48 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Thakeham Tiles Ltd Rock Road Storrington West Sussex RH20 3AD
Proposal:	Outline application for the demolition of existing buildings, and the re-development of the site for up to 108no. dwellings (including a mix of private and affordable housing units), with associated infrastructure including vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access, parking, landscaping, open space and play provision, and sustainable drainage with all matters reserved except access.
Case Officer:	Sam Whitehouse

[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:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping

Comments:

Although permission was previously granted for 90 homes, the current application must be assessed on the basis of the updated circumstances and the additional information now available.

I object to the proposed development of 108 homes. While the site may be more suitable than some alternatives for housing, the scale and layout now proposed are unacceptable for the following principal reasons:

- Risk to the stability of the steep southern bank, which lies close to neighbouring properties.
- Underestimation of traffic and infrastructure impacts, including errors and omissions in the submitted material.
- Unclear and potentially significant loss of protected trees, particularly along the southern boundary.
- Proposed housing outside the built-up area boundary, which would set an unacceptable precedent.

Steep Southern Bank

The submitted documents do not clearly show how close the proposed access road and houses would be to the steep bank at the southern end of the site. This information is essential to assess both land stability and the extent of tree loss.

Neighbouring properties, including my own, have boundaries approximately 10-15 feet from the top of this near-vertical bank, which is around 50 feet high and has eroded over time.

I am particularly concerned that the proposal could destabilise the bank through:

- removal of trees close to the base of the bank, including trees that may currently provide support in adverse weather;
- construction activity and ongoing vehicle vibration from an access road close to the bank;
- surface water drainage towards the base of the bank, which could weaken it; and

If the bank fails, the consequences could be serious to properties at the top of the bank, and those at the bottom. This is not a minor issue and should be fully assessed before any permission is granted.

This concern is supported by the Thakeham Tiles, Rock Road Phase 1 Desk Study Report by Stantec, which states at section 6.1 that "landslides are considered to be at low risk of occurring onsite although the steep cut face at the extent of the former sand pit may be at an angle uncondusive to stability".

The application does not include adequate cross-sections or photographs of this critical area. This omission prevents proper assessment of the risk.

This issue was not properly examined in the previous application and is now supported by new information in the submitted documents.

The southern part of the site is therefore unsuitable for housing, (which would look straight at the bank, be at risk from it) and roads in the form proposed. Any stabilisation works would likely require further tree removal and would erode the natural boundary

between the proposed development and the semi-rural area to the south.

Traffic and infrastructure

Since the original approval, further developments have been approved and built locally while there has been no change to the infrastructure and pollution levels continue to rise. Storrington does not have sufficient infrastructure to accommodate the additional pressure created by 108 homes on this site.

The traffic assessment appears to underestimate the impact of the development. It relies on assumptions that are either incorrect or incomplete, including references to walking distances to a Tesco and doctors' surgery to the south that do not exist. Walking times to Storrington shops also appear understated and do not reflect the practical difficulty of walking uphill with shopping.

Tree loss

The submitted documents are unclear and inconsistent on the extent of tree loss, particularly in the southern part of the site. The biodiversity metric is difficult to interpret and appears to contain figures that conflict with other documents.

The bat survey information does not appear to include oak trees in the southern part of the site, despite oak trees being present there.

Some documents state that trees in the southern area were not accessible, which appears to reflect the steepness of the bank. This reinforces the need for a full assessment of both tree loss and land stability.

The Biodiversity Net Gain assessment also appears not to address the southern section in the same way as the eastern and western areas.

It is not clear how trees at the edge of the proposed development would be protected.

The majority of trees in the southern part of the site appear to be protected by a Tree Preservation Order and are proposed for removal. These trees form an important boundary between the site and the semi-rural land to the south. Their removal would cause significant harm to local character, amenity and stability.

The trees in this area appear to provide mutual support, including to trees on the lower part of the bank. Removing them could further increase the risk of destabilisation.

Built-up area boundary

Some proposed homes appear to fall outside the built-up area boundary, as shown by the Neighbourhood Plan and the Phase 1 Desk Study Report Constraints Drawing. The boundary should be respected. Allowing development beyond it would set an unacceptable precedent for further encroachment.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, I object to this application. The proposed scale of 108 homes is excessive for this site and would

place unacceptable pressure on local infrastructure, risk destabilising the southern bank, result in unclear and potentially harmful tree loss, and breach the built-up area boundary. The application should therefore be refused unless these issues are fully addressed and the scheme is substantially reduced and redesigned.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



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