

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 30 May 2026 09:00
To: Planning
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 30/05/2026 8:59 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 Sandygate Lane HORSHAM

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking
Comments:	Dear Sir / Madam I write as the owner of Sandygate to object to the proposed creation of a new vehicular access to serve the proposed residential development at Cedar Cottage, Sandygate Lane. The application proposes a development of 24 new dwellings with a new vehicular and pedestrian access from Sandygate Lane. The Design and Access Statement describes the proposed vehicular access as a simple priority T-junction off Sandygate Lane, located slightly to the east of the existing driveway, with a 5.5m carriageway and 2.0m footways on either side. The same document identifies maintaining access into the adjacent property of Sandygate as a key site constraint. My objection is that the proposed access would materially and adversely affect my property and the safe use of the existing access to Sandygate. The current access arrangement serves a private residential property. Introducing a new access arrangement to serve 24 dwellings

would fundamentally alter the character, intensity and safety of movements at this point on Sandygate Lane. It would create a significant increase in turning movements, stopping, waiting and emerging vehicles immediately adjacent to, or directly affecting, the established access to Sandygate.

There is a clear highway safety concern. Two vehicular access arrangements operating in such close proximity would create avoidable conflict between vehicles entering and leaving Sandygate, vehicles entering and leaving the proposed development, and vehicles travelling along Sandygate Lane. This is particularly concerning because Sandygate Lane is not a quiet estate road; recorded 85th percentile speeds referred to by West Sussex County Council are 33.7mph westbound and 44mph eastbound, requiring substantial visibility splays. The Highway Authority's pre-application response also notes that the proposed access is close to the approved access for The Gallops, with the two access points only approximately 27 metres apart centreline to centreline. In my view, the cumulative effect of these adjoining or closely spaced vehicular access points would create an unacceptable risk of driver confusion, turning conflicts and highway danger.

I am also concerned that the applicant's Transport Statement prepared by Glanville states that the existing hedge needs to be cut back in order to achieve the required visibility splays. That hedge is on private land and no permission has been obtained from me as the relevant landowner to cut it back, remove it, reduce it, or secure its future maintenance. This is a fundamental issue, if the required visibility splays depend on works to third-party private land which the applicant does not control, then the proposed access cannot be considered safe or deliverable.

Visibility splays are not merely a matter of drawing lines on a plan. They must be capable of being lawfully achieved and permanently maintained. If the hedge cannot be cut back, or if it later regrows, the necessary sight lines would not be available to drivers emerging from the proposed access or using the existing access to Sandygate. That would increase the risk of conflict with passing traffic on Sandygate Lane, particularly given the recorded vehicle speeds and the proximity of other access points.

The application documents also acknowledge that the access arrangements affect Sandygate. West Sussex County Council expressly refers to the proposed access being shared with the existing residential property "Sandygate" and states that any future submission should provide details of how access will be managed during construction through a Construction Management Plan. That confirms that the proposal has a direct operational impact on Sandygate and that the access arrangements are sensitive, not straightforward.

For these reasons, I object to the proposed access on the grounds that it would materially affect the safe and convenient use of my property, intensify vehicle movements at an already constrained point on Sandygate Lane, create highway safety risks through adjoining or closely spaced vehicular accesses, and rely on visibility splays which appear to require works to private land where no permission or legal control has been demonstrated.

I respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority refuses the application unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate that the access can be safely delivered without prejudicing the existing access to Sandygate, that all required visibility splays can be achieved entirely within land under the applicant's control or secured by binding agreement, and that the Highway Authority is satisfied that the cumulative effect of the nearby accesses would not give rise to unacceptable highway danger.

Yours faithfully



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 Eaton