

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 May 2026 18:07:44 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0638
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 6:07 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	New Orchard New Hall Lane Small Dole Henfield West Sussex BN5 9YH
Proposal:	Permission in Principle for demolition of existing polytunnel and removal of hardstanding, and the erection of up to 9no. dwellings.
Case Officer:	Hannah Darley

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 3 The Beeches, Shoreham Road Small Dole, Horsham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I wish to formally object to the above application on the grounds that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to highway safety, residential amenity, drainage infrastructure, environmental interests, and the character of the area. The proposal also

conflicts with both local and national planning policy and relies upon an unsuitable private access arrangement that is incapable of safely accommodating the scale of development proposed.

The key grounds of objection are set out below.

1. Unsuitable and Unsafe Access Arrangement

The proposed development relies entirely upon The Beeches, a private block paving driveway originally designed to serve only five dwellings. It is not an adopted highway and is wholly unsuitable for the substantial increase in traffic associated with up to nine additional dwellings, together with visitors, deliveries, contractors, refuse vehicles, emergency services, and construction traffic.

The access road suffers from several significant deficiencies:

- The width (currently 4.7m - highway advice 4.8-5.5m is needed for 2 cars to pass slowly) is inadequate for safe two-way vehicle movement in multiple locations. The curve in the road makes it currently completely impossible for 2 cars to pass
- There are no formal passing places.
- Vehicles already regularly block the driveway due to deliveries, contractors, and maintenance works.
- Visibility along sections of the driveway is poor.
- The existing gate system is slow to open and would likely result in vehicles queuing back onto Shoreham Road. (The gate was put in as part of a slowing traffic requirement on original plans)
- There is insufficient turning space for larger vehicles, including refuse lorries (who do not come into the private driveway) and emergency service vehicles.
- The driveway surface is already deteriorating under existing levels of use and is not constructed to accommodate sustained heavy traffic or construction vehicles.
- Existing drainage gullies have already required rebuilding due to wear from current traffic levels.

The intensified use of this substandard private access would materially worsen congestion, create conflict between vehicles and pedestrians, and significantly increase the risk of vehicles reversing onto Shoreham Road, which is a busy and fast-moving route.

The proposal therefore conflicts with:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 110, 111 and 112, which require safe and suitable access for all users.
 - Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) Policy 40 relating to sustainable transport and highway safety.
-

2. Pedestrian Safety and Unsustainable Development

The access road contains no pavement or protected pedestrian route. Residents, including children, elderly occupants, pet owners, and visitors, are required to walk directly on the driveway to reach the public highway and local amenities.

The significant increase in vehicle movements generated by the proposal would materially worsen pedestrian safety and create an unsafe environment immediately outside existing homes, which front doors open directly on the driveway

Furthermore, the site lacks safe pedestrian infrastructure linking it to services, facilities, and public transport, making the proposal heavily reliant on private car use and therefore unsustainable in planning terms.

The proposal is contrary to the sustainable transport objectives of the NPPF and HDPF Policy 40.

3. Overdevelopment and Harm to Character

The proposal represents a clear overdevelopment of the site and is entirely out of keeping with the scale and character of the existing development.

The Beeches currently comprises only five dwellings served by a private driveway within a relatively quiet, low-density residential setting. The addition of up to nine further dwellings would fundamentally alter the density, intensity, and character of the area, resulting in an overly cramped and urbanised form of development unsuited to the existing infrastructure and residential environment.

The proposal would materially erode the established character of the area and conflicts with:

- HDPF Policies 32 and 33 relating to quality of development and residential amenity.
- The design and spatial objectives of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan.

4. Severe Harm to Residential Amenity

The proposal would result in substantial and unacceptable harm

to the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

The site is surrounded on all four sides by existing residential properties, meaning the development would introduce increased:

- vehicle movements
- road noise
- deliveries
- disturbance
- headlight glare
- overlooking
- loss of privacy
- general activity

immediately adjacent to existing homes.

Vehicle headlights would directly affect the front elevations and bedroom windows of neighbouring bungalows, particularly Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 5 The Beeches, especially during winter evenings.

Construction activity would occur only metres from front doors and bedroom windows, causing prolonged disruption through:

- noise
- vibration
- dust
- obstruction
- loss of privacy
- restricted access

The proposal would fundamentally change the quiet residential nature of The Beeches and would amount to harmful over-intensification of activity within close proximity to existing homes.

This conflicts with HDPF Policies 32 and 33.

5. Construction and Infrastructure Impacts

The narrow private driveway is wholly unsuitable for prolonged heavy construction traffic.

There appears to be insufficient room within the site for:

- contractor parking
- material storage
- delivery management
- construction staging

without obstructing the existing access road and materially affecting neighbouring residents.

Given the restricted nature of the site and access arrangements, construction activity would create prolonged and severe disruption for existing occupiers and would likely cause further deterioration to the roadway and associated infrastructure.

6. Drainage, Flooding and Foul Water Capacity

There are already known drainage and infrastructure problems affecting the existing development despite serving only five dwellings.

The foul drainage pumps serving The Beeches required replacement after only approximately five years of operation, indicating the current system is already under strain. The pumps are expensive to replace and maintain, and the existing infrastructure was never designed to accommodate development at the scale now proposed.

The area also experiences existing flooding issues, including:

- flooding in New Hall Lane
- flooding affecting gardens along Shoreham Road

There are significant concerns that the proposal would increase:

- foul water loading
- surface water runoff
- groundwater displacement
- pressure on existing drainage systems

particularly given the introduction of additional hardstanding and impermeable surfaces.

The soakaway position near neighbouring properties further raises concerns regarding runoff and flood risk impacts.

The proposal conflicts with:

- HDPF Policy 38
- NPPF paragraph 167

A full independent drainage and flood risk assessment should be required before any determination is made.

7. Parking, Servicing and Waste Collection Concerns

There are currently no designated visitor parking spaces within

the existing development.

Additional dwellings would inevitably increase parking demand and lead to overspill parking along the already narrow private driveway, worsening congestion and increasing safety risks for both pedestrians and vehicles.

Waste and recycling storage also presents a significant concern. The existing five dwellings already generate substantial numbers of bins during collection periods (up to 15). The addition of up to nine further dwellings would create unacceptable pressure on the limited frontage area and could obstruct:

- pedestrian movement
- vehicle access
- emergency vehicles
- refuse collection operations

There are also concerns regarding the ability of refuse vehicles to safely access and manoeuvre within the site plus the weight of these vehicles would damage the private driveway. The proposal therefore conflicts with HDPF Policy 33.

8. Legal and Estate Management Concerns

The Beeches operates under existing private management arrangements, including responsibilities relating to:

- Estate Rent Charges
- maintenance liabilities
- shared infrastructure
- rights of access

The application fails to properly address the legal implications of intensifying use of the private driveway or explain how maintenance, liability, and future management responsibilities would be resolved.

There are also concerns regarding whether sufficient legal rights exist to support the level of intensified use proposed.

These omissions further undermine the deliverability and practicality of the scheme.

9. Concerns Regarding Deliverability and Developer Capability

Residents have legitimate concerns regarding the financial capability and delivery record of the developer, particularly given

the lengthy period taken to complete the existing bungalows and concerns regarding the financial position of the associated companies.

There is a genuine risk of:

- incomplete construction
- prolonged disruption
- stalled development
- deterioration of site conditions

which is a material consideration relevant to deliverability and the overall planning balance.

10. Inaccuracies and Omissions in Submitted Information

Residents have identified multiple inaccuracies, omissions, and inconsistencies within the submitted plans and supporting documentation.

This raises serious concerns regarding:

- the reliability of the submitted material
- the applicant's understanding of the site constraints
- the adequacy of the supporting assessments

The application therefore lacks sufficient reliable information for proper determination.

11. Ecology, Wildlife and Environmental Harm

The site and surrounding gardens support a variety of wildlife habitats, including protected species such as bats, together with owls, nightingales, and red kites.

The proposal risks:

- habitat loss
- disturbance to protected species
- biodiversity reduction
- increased light pollution

Additional external lighting associated with roads, parking areas, and dwellings would further harm local wildlife and negatively affect the character of the area and neighbouring residents.

The proposal conflicts with:

- HDPF Policy 31
- NPPF Chapter 15

A full ecological assessment and bat survey should be completed before any determination is made.

12. Conflict with the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan

The proposal conflicts with the spatial strategy of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan because:

- the site lies outside the Built-Up Area Boundary
- the site is not allocated for development
- the proposal represents unsustainable expansion into an inappropriate location

This conflict with the adopted Neighbourhood Plan weighs heavily against the proposal and constitutes a significant ground for refusal.

13. Previous Representations Regarding the Land

When existing residents purchased their homes, the surrounding land was represented as agricultural land unsuitable for development. While this may not itself preclude development, it raises legitimate concerns regarding the suitability, sustainability, and long-term appropriateness of residential expansion on the site.

Conclusion

For all of the reasons set out above, the proposal would result in:

- unsafe and unsuitable access
- severe harm to residential amenity
- unacceptable pressure on drainage and infrastructure
- increased flood risk
- inadequate servicing and parking arrangements
- environmental and ecological harm
- conflict with local and national planning policy
- overdevelopment of the site
- unacceptable intensification of a private residential driveway

The application fails to demonstrate that the site can safely or sustainably accommodate the proposed development.

I therefore respectfully request that Horsham District Council
REFUSE this Permission in Principle application.

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