

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 February 2026 09:43:35 UTC+00:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0041
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 09/02/2026 9:43 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Spring Acres West End Lane Henfield West Sussex
Proposal:	Permission in Principle for the erection of up to 9no. self-build dwellings.
Case Officer:	Hannah Darley

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Marden West End Lane Henfield
----------	-------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Formal Objection - Application for the Erection of up to 9 No. Self-Build Dwellings I wish to object to the above planning application on the following planning and policy grounds.

This proposal constitutes the creation of a new housing estate within an isolated countryside field and is fundamentally unsustainable in principle. The development is contrary to the spatial strategy of the Horsham District Planning Framework and represents unjustified development in a rural location, causing harm to countryside character, sustainability objectives, landscape value, biodiversity, and residential amenity.

Policy Conflicts

****Policy 1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development****

The site is not a strategic site identified in the Local Plan and is not located in a sustainable location. The proposal is car-dependent and lacks access to services and infrastructure.

****Policy 2 - Strategic Development and Neighbourhood Plans****

The site is not identified within any Neighbourhood Plan and has not been allocated for development through community planning processes.

****Policy 3 - Development Hierarchy****

The site lies outside any existing built-up area and is located within open countryside, contrary to settlement hierarchy principles.

****Policy 4 - Settlement Expansion****

The site is not allocated in the Local Plan or a Neighbourhood Plan and does not adjoin any defined settlement boundary. It is a clear countryside location and represents unjustified encroachment into rural land.

****Policy 10 - Quality of the Built Environment****

The proposal fails to maintain or enhance the character of the area. The surrounding development pattern consists of low-density, widely dispersed historic rural housing, including Victorian and Edwardian agricultural workers' dwellings.

The creation of a new housing estate in this location is out of character and would urbanise a rural lane, destroying its open, countryside setting and rural street scene.

****Policy 16 - Affordable Housing****

The site has no allocation for affordable housing and does not make a policy-compliant contribution to meeting local housing needs.

****Policy 23 - Infrastructure and Access****

The site cannot be safely or sustainably served by infrastructure or access:

- * The lane is narrow and unsuitable for increased traffic volumes
 - * There is no mains drainage
 - * The lane is heavily used by walkers, cyclists accessing the
-

Downslink, and horse riders from nearby livery facilities
This creates safety risks, conflict between users, and
infrastructure inadequacy.

****Policy 25 - Landscape and Biodiversity****

The proposal fails to protect or enhance the landscape character of the area, does not maintain biodiversity, and does not contribute to the Weald to Waves Nature Recovery Corridor. The development would result in ecological harm and landscape fragmentation.

****Policy 26 - Rural Development****

The site lies outside built-up area boundaries and does not support agriculture or forestry. The development is therefore inappropriate in principle.

****Policy 27 - Countryside Protection****

The proposal would have a clear urbanising effect on open farmland and does not conserve, enhance, or protect the countryside. It represents unjustified rural sprawl.

****Policy 33.2 - Residential Amenity****

The development would result in loss of amenity through increased traffic, noise, light pollution, and disturbance, transforming a quiet rural location into a permanent housing estate environment.

****Policy 33.4 - Design and Character****

The proposal fails to respect the character, scale, and form of surrounding rural development.

****Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport****

There is no sustainable transport access to the site. The location is over 1.5 miles from the High Street, school, and medical facilities, with no viable public transport or safe walking and cycling infrastructure, making the development unsustainable and car-dependent.

This proposal represents inappropriate countryside development that is contrary to the development plan, unsustainable in location, harmful to landscape and biodiversity, unsafe in access terms, and unacceptable in its impact on rural character and residential amenity.

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 Eaton