

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 25 May 2026 16:25
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0530

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 25/05/2026 4:24 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land at Hornbrook Farm Brighton Road West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline planning application for up to 180 dwellings, open space and associated works and infrastructure with all matters reserved apart from access.
Case Officer:	Nicola Pettifer

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	4 Ghyll Crescent 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:

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk





Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton

[REDACTED]
Subject: Date: Hornbrook Farm - Revised EIA Objection. DC/26/0530
25 May 2026 at 16:17

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Hornbrook Farm - Revised EIA Objection

I wish to submit a further objection regarding the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) screening decision.

My concern is not simply with the conclusion reached, but with whether sufficient scrutiny has been applied before concluding that a full EIA is unnecessary.

The district is currently dealing with substantial development pressures and multiple major planning applications. In such circumstances there is a risk that developments which appear comparatively modest in scale may be considered in relative terms rather than through a full examination of their individual and cumulative environmental effects.

The screening opinion appears to rely largely on broad statements regarding the nature of the proposal and the suggestion that impacts can be addressed through later reports, surveys and planning conditions. However, I remain concerned that insufficient project-specific reasoning has been provided to explain how potentially significant environmental effects were assessed and confidently excluded.

This concern is particularly relevant given the cumulative development context and the interaction of multiple environmental considerations associated with the Horn Brook corridor, including ecological sensitivity, protected species, historic landscape character and possible archaeological significance.

My concern is not one of impropriety, but whether a potentially justifiable case for requiring Environmental Impact Assessment may have been set aside prematurely before all interacting and cumulative effects had been fully examined.

I therefore respectfully request that the screening decision be reconsidered and that a precautionary approach be applied where uncertainty remains.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

Kind regards