

Formal Objection to Planning Application DC/26/0954

Site: Land South of Athelstan Way, Horsham

Proposal: Residential development for 21 dwellings with associated parking, hard and soft landscaping

From: Resident of Weald Close, whose property backs directly onto the application site

1. Fundamental Site Constraints Make the Development Inappropriate

Triangle Field is a highly constrained site. The following physical limitations make it unsuitable for a 21-dwelling scheme:

The land slopes steeply upward away from my property, placing new houses on elevated ground and increasing overlooking, visual dominance and amenity harm.

The triangular shape severely restricts layout options, spacing, turning areas and safe access.

A single narrow access via Athelstan Way provides no secondary emergency route and is already congested.

The drainage ditch lies outside the applicant's ownership, yet has been interfered with and enlarged.

The ditch has been moved closer to my boundary, increasing flood and erosion risk.

The proximity of the site to neighbouring gardens leaves no meaningful buffer.

The applicant has already encroached onto neighbouring land by placing Heras fencing outside their boundary and leaning against my fence.

These constraints make the site fundamentally unsuitable for the scale and density proposed, contrary to HDPF Policies 25, 32 and 33.

2. Direct Harm to My Residential Amenity (Weald Close)

2.1 Elevated Ground Levels Increase Overlooking and Visual Dominance

The elevation drawings (Sections A-A and B-B) clearly show the land rising away from my property. Houses built on this higher ground will:

Overlook my garden and windows

Appear taller and more dominant

Cause significant loss of privacy

Create an overbearing relationship with my boundary

This is contrary to HDPF Policy 33.

2.2 Increased Noise and Light Spill

Elevated dwellings will direct noise and lighting downward toward my boundary, increasing disturbance.

3. Highway Safety and Access Risks

Athelstan Way is narrow, congested and heavily parked. Additional traffic from 21 dwellings would create unacceptable safety risks and obstruct access to Glen Arun Care Home, contrary to Policies 40 and 41 and NPPF para. 111.

4. Drainage, Flooding and Unauthorised Interference with Third-Party Land

4.1 Unauthorised Mechanical Excavation of the Ditch

The applicant has mechanically enlarged the drainage ditch outside their ownership, moving it closer to my boundary and altering the hydrological baseline.

This increases:

Flood risk

Erosion

Run-off velocity

Pollution exposure

Amenity harm

4.2 Slope Increases Run-Off and Pollution Flow Toward My Property and the Allotments

Because the land slopes toward my boundary, run-off from 21 dwellings will naturally flow downhill into the enlarged ditch and then into the allotments, carrying hydrocarbons, particulates, chemicals and sediment into food-growing plots. This is contrary to HDPF Policy 38 and NPPF paras. 167–169.

4.3 Vegetation Removal Has Altered Drainage Patterns

The removal of trees and shrubs has reduced natural absorption and increased run-off velocity.

5. Ecological Harm and Compromised Survey Integrity

5.1 Unauthorised Removal of Trees and Vegetation

Vegetation was removed before ecological surveys, altering the baseline and removing habitat.

5.2 Interference with Ecological Survey Mats

I witnessed the applicant and his associates lifting ecological mats and spraying substances underneath them, compromising survey integrity and potentially harming wildlife.

6. Construction Impact and Evidence of Encroachment

6.1 Heras Fencing Erected Outside the Applicant's Boundary

The applicant has already placed Heras fencing outside their boundary, leaning against my fence and causing pressure and risk of damage. This demonstrates poor site management and disregard for neighbouring amenity even before construction begins.

7. Requested Conditions if Permission Is Granted

If the Council is minded to approve the application, I request strict conditions:

Finished Floor Levels: No raising of land; levels must match existing ground.

Boundary Protection: Minimum 2m solid fencing and planting along the Weald Close boundary.

Ditch Protection: No further alteration; no works within a buffer zone; no discharge into the ditch.

Run-Off and Pollution Control: SuDS features and hydrocarbon interceptors.

Lighting Control: Downward-facing, low-level lighting only.

Construction Management Plan: Controls on vibration, excavation, access obstruction and spoil storage.

Boundary Encroachment Control: All temporary fencing must remain within the applicant's red line boundary.

Conclusion

Due to fundamental site constraints, elevated ground levels, direct amenity harm, highway safety risks, drainage concerns, unauthorised ditch excavation, slope-related run-off and pollution risks, ecological interference and boundary encroachment, the application fails to comply with multiple HDPF policies and the NPPF.

I respectfully request that planning application DC/26/0954 be refused.