

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 May 2026 10:54:38 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0640
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 15/05/2026 10:54 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Cedar Cottage Sandygate Lane Lower Beeding West Sussex RH13 6LR
Proposal:	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 24no. dwellings including the creation of a new access from Sandygate Lane with associated works.
Case Officer:	Alice Johnson

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: Sandygate Sandygate Lane Lower Beeding Horsham West Sussex

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 - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	I write to formally object to the proposed residential development at land to the rear of Cedar Cottage, Sandygate Lane, Lower Beeding.

I am the owner of Sandygate, which adjoins the application site. The proposed development would abut my eastern and southern boundaries, and the layout would materially affect the privacy, outlook and enjoyment of my house and garden.

My objection is based on the following material planning considerations.

1. Conflict with the development plan, especially the recently made Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan

The Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan was formally made on 8 October 2025 and forms part of the statutory development plan. It sets out a clear locally-supported strategy for growth in the parish, including four specific housing allocations and a limited windfall allowance. The application site south of Sandygate Lane, to the rear of Cedar Cottage, is not one of those allocations.

The Neighbourhood Plan allocates approximately 47 dwellings across four identified sites, with the remaining requirement met through a small windfall allowance. One of those allocations is Land north of Sandygate Lane for around 20 dwellings. The plan-makers therefore considered the Sandygate Lane area carefully and deliberately chose a different site, with detailed criteria to protect neighbours and provide landscape buffers.

The application site is also described by the applicant as lying adjacent to the settlement boundary rather than within it, and therefore it does not fall naturally within Policy 10 (Windfall Development) of the Neighbourhood Plan, which supports unidentified residential sites only within the defined built-up area and only where they avoid unacceptable harm to the amenity of existing and nearby properties.

In my view, this proposal conflicts with the plan-led strategy for Lower Beeding. The Neighbourhood Plan is extremely recent, contains allocations and policies intended to meet the parish's identified housing requirement, and is exactly the kind of plan the NPPF says should carry significant weight. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that where the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with a neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, provided the neighbourhood plan was made within the last five years and contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement. Lower Beeding's plan appears to satisfy those criteria.

2. Unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of Sandygate and adjoining neighbours

The NPPF requires planning decisions to create places with a

high standard of amenity for existing and future users, and the Horsham development plan / neighbourhood plan framework also requires development to avoid unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity.

My property, Sandygate, directly adjoins the site and the proposed development would run along my eastern and southern boundaries. I am particularly concerned that two-storey houses, rear gardens and associated domestic activity at this intensity would cause:

- material overlooking and loss of privacy to my private garden and to the living environment of my home,
- a significant urbanising and overbearing effect at the edge of my property, and
- increased noise and disturbance from a 24-dwelling estate immediately beside my boundaries.

These are direct and substantial impacts on my residential amenity.

The applicant's Planning Statement asserts that Sandygate would not be harmed because of a reported separation distance and "robust rear boundary treatment". However, boundary fences and planting do not prevent overlooking from first-floor windows, nor do they remove the sense of enclosure, activity and pressure arising from a dense estate layout hard up against established residential boundaries. The applicant's own consultation records that local residents raised concerns about proximity to existing properties, loss of privacy and overlooking, and that some respondents specifically said the layout should be revised so new houses do not impact the privacy of existing dwellings.

This is therefore not a speculative concern: it is a clearly identified and predictable amenity impact, and one that the developer's own documents acknowledge was raised by local residents.

3. Failure to respect the character, edge-of-village setting and prevailing density of the area

The Lower Beeding Neighbourhood Plan has strong and consistent objectives to keep the village feel and sense of place, protect openness, ensure new housing is developed in sympathy with adjacent buildings and its surroundings, and ensure that housing densities are in keeping with the surrounding area. Policies 12 (Design) and 13 (Density) reinforce those objectives.

The applicant's own Planning Statement describes the site as being on the western edge of Lower Beeding, comprising a dwelling, curtilage, grassland and paddock land, with spacious detached dwellings along Sandygate Lane and large plots to the south and west. The proposal for 24 dwellings on this parcel, laid

out as a cul-de-sac extension mirroring the more suburban form of Trinity Fields, would materially change this softer edge-of-settlement character and would not sit comfortably against the lower-density, spacious grain of development around Sandygate and the southern neighbouring properties.

Even if the overall site density is described by the applicant as "low", the issue is not simply the district-wide density figure. The real planning question is whether the layout, spacing and built form at the boundaries with existing homes reflect the prevailing pattern of development there. In my view they do not. This proposal would substitute a relatively open, green edge parcel with a much more enclosed estate form, contrary to the neighbourhood plan's clear emphasis on village character, openness and appropriate density.

4. Loss of green infrastructure and erosion of the site's existing green character

The Neighbourhood Plan strongly supports the conservation and enhancement of green infrastructure, including trees, hedges and the wider network of green space that contributes to Lower Beeding's rural character and sense of place. Policy 3 states that proposals causing the loss of existing green infrastructure will not be supported unless mitigation or compensation is demonstrated.

The application site currently includes grassland/paddock land and boundary vegetation, and the applicant's own Planning Statement confirms that the development would result in an on-site biodiversity deficit of 3.09 habitat units, requiring off-site compensation to achieve the statutory biodiversity net gain target. While off-site compensation may help in metric terms, it does not avoid the localised loss of green character, openness and habitat value at this specific village-edge site.

That local green character is an important part of the transition between the built form of the village and its rural surroundings, the proposal would erode that transition.

5. Traffic, access and cumulative pressure on Sandygate Lane require very careful scrutiny

The applicant proposes a new vehicular access onto Sandygate Lane to serve 24 dwellings. The Statement of Community Involvement records that traffic and access were the most frequently raised concerns during the developer's own consultation. The Neighbourhood Plan also records long-standing local concern about traffic speed, congestion, parking and pedestrian safety on roads including Sandygate Lane, and supports traffic management and improved road/pedestrian safety.

I appreciate the applicant relies on a Transport Statement, but given the rural nature of Sandygate Lane, the cumulative effect of recent / current development in the immediate vicinity, and the proximity to existing homes, I ask the Council and Highway Authority to scrutinise this aspect rigorously. At the very least, the fact that the developer's own consultation identified traffic and access as the leading concern shows this is a genuine local planning issue, not a trivial objection.

6. The housing benefits do not automatically outweigh the harms in this particular case

I recognise Horsham currently has a severe housing land supply shortfall and that this is a material consideration. I also recognise the scheme would provide market and affordable housing. However, Horsham's own Planning Advice Note makes clear that the tilted balance does not mean housing applications are automatically approved, and a proper planning balance still has to be carried out.

Here, the application causes clear conflict with a very recently made neighbourhood plan, would materially harm the amenity of adjoining residents including my own property at Sandygate, and would fail to respect the site's edge-of-village character and green setting. In those circumstances, I consider the adverse impacts are substantial and should be given very significant weight.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully ask Horsham District Council to refuse planning permission for this proposal.

If officers are nonetheless minded to recommend approval, I request that the application be reported to the Planning Committee for determination and that members undertake a site visit, given the direct impact on adjoining occupiers and the importance of understanding the actual relationship between the proposed plots and the neighbouring properties, especially Sandygate.

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