

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 June 2026 21:40:00 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0671
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 15/06/2026 9:40 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Off Old Crawley Road Faygate West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline Application for a development of up to 120 dwellings (including 45% affordable) with all matters reserved except for access.
Case Officer:	Sam Whitehouse

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	84 Sycamore Avenue Horsham
----------	----------------------------

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:	Formal objection to proposed residential development I wish to register my strong objection to the proposed residential

development on the agricultural land adjacent to our community. The proposed scheme would result in the irreversible loss of productive farmland currently used for food production. At a time when food security, sustainability, and the protection of agricultural resources are matters of increasing national importance, the permanent conversion of valuable farmland into housing represents a significant and unjustified loss of an important local asset. Once developed, this land can never realistically be returned to agricultural use.

The site also serves as an important ecological habitat supporting a wide range of wildlife, including deer, birds, and other native species. Development would inevitably lead to habitat fragmentation, disturbance, and displacement of wildlife. The resulting loss of biodiversity would be detrimental to the local environment and inconsistent with broader environmental objectives aimed at protecting and enhancing natural habitats.

The transport implications of the proposal are particularly concerning. The development would introduce a substantial number of additional vehicle movements onto a road network that already experiences regular congestion and is widely regarded by local residents as dangerous. Increased traffic volumes would exacerbate existing safety concerns, increase journey times, and place additional strain on infrastructure that is already operating under pressure.

Of particular concern is the fact that the proposed development appears to rely on a single access road. This creates an obvious and significant vulnerability, resulting in a potential choke point for residents, emergency services, delivery vehicles, and refuse collection. The lack of alternative access routes raises serious questions regarding resilience, public safety, and the long-term practicality of the development.

The proposal would also have a detrimental impact on the health and well-being of existing residents. The field currently provides an accessible green space that contributes positively to physical activity, recreation, and mental well-being. Numerous studies have demonstrated the importance of access to open green spaces for public

health. The destruction of this landscape would diminish the quality of life enjoyed by local residents and erode the rural character that attracts people to the area.

Furthermore, the development would significantly impact the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties. Many existing homes currently overlook open countryside and were designed with low boundary treatments on the reasonable expectation of maintaining that outlook. Replacing open fields with residential properties would result in overlooking, loss of privacy, visual intrusion, and a substantial change to the character of the area.

The proposal also raises serious concerns regarding flood risk. Nearby roads are already highly susceptible to flooding during periods of heavy rainfall. Replacing permeable agricultural land with buildings, roads, and other hard surfaces will inevitably increase surface water runoff. There is a legitimate concern that the development could worsen existing flooding problems and place additional burdens on local drainage infrastructure. The displacement of wildlife from the site is also likely to create secondary road safety issues. Local roads already experience frequent collisions involving deer and other animals. Forcing wildlife out of established habitats and into surrounding areas is likely to increase the number of animal-vehicle collisions, creating risks both for motorists and for protected wildlife populations.

In addition, the proposal appears to be unsupported by corresponding improvements to public transport infrastructure. There are no meaningful plans for new rail connections, a train station, or equivalent transport enhancements capable of reducing reliance on private vehicles. As a result, the development risks encouraging car dependency and increasing traffic congestion for both existing and future residents.

Finally, it is disappointing that only a limited proportion of the proposed housing is designated as affordable housing. If the loss of agricultural land, environmental harm, infrastructure pressures, and community impacts are to be justified in the public interest, the development should at the very least deliver a

substantial and meaningful
affordable housing benefit. The current proposal appears to fall
short of that
objective.

For all of the reasons outlined above-including the loss of
productive farmland,
environmental damage, increased traffic congestion, inadequate
access

arrangements, heightened flood risk, harm to wildlife, loss of
green space, reduced

privacy for existing residents, insufficient public transport
provision, and the limited

delivery of affordable housing-I respectfully request that the
application be refused.

The adverse impacts of this proposal significantly outweigh any
claimed benefits and

would result in lasting harm to the local environment,
infrastructure, and community.

In addition I wish to raise a formal objection regarding the
adequacy of the public consultation

process associated with this application. I have received only a
single notification

letter, which was both vague in its content and lacking in any
meaningful detail

concerning the nature, scale, or potential impact of the proposed
development.

Furthermore, this correspondence was received only six days
prior to the deadline for

the submission of representations, which, in my view, does not
provide a reasonable or

sufficient period for affected residents to properly consider the
proposal and

formulate informed responses. Many local residents are elderly
and do not possess

advanced computer literacy skills. The planning documents have
been made available

primarily through an online portal which is neither intuitive nor
user-friendly, creating a

significant barrier to meaningful public participation. Residents
who are unfamiliar

with digital systems may struggle to locate, access, or interpret
the relevant

documentation. In addition, a six-day consultation window fails to
account for the

practical reality that many individuals may be away from their
homes for extended

periods, including holidays, family commitments, or work-related
travel, and may

therefore remain entirely unaware of the proposal until after the
consultation period

has expired. Taken together, these factors give rise to serious
concerns regarding the

fairness, accessibility, and effectiveness of the consultation process, and whether local residents have been afforded a genuine and reasonable opportunity to engage with and comment upon a development that may have a significant and lasting impact upon their community.

Kind regards

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