

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 16 May 2026 09:42:40 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
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 16/05/2026 9:42 AM.

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: Old Byre, Hornbrook Farm Brighton Road 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 - Overdevelopment
Comments:	I am writing to OBJECT to the Outline Planning Application to build 180 dwellings on the 3 green fields at Hornbrook Farm, Horsham. Ref: DC/26/0530. I am aware that for the last 20 years, the landowners have sought permission to build dwellings on the fields, but at every

subsequent LDP, it has been refused and noted as "Not Currently Developable". As no infrastructure or any alterations have been carried out since, it is confusing why it is still being considered for housing. Local residents are confused as to why we have to regularly object to the development on the site, when nothing is different to change opinions - and then this time dwellings increase from 100 to 180!

This proposed development at Hornbrook Farm is immediately compromised by not conforming to the National Planning Policy Framework in regard to:

"NPPF Paragraph 96 - Promoting healthy and safe communities - promoting social interaction", "anticipating and addressing possible threats and hazards". The three Hornbrook Farm fields are completely isolated from other neighbourhoods. The Horn Brook watercourse prevents any access northwards from the site. The local schools are north of the site. The only links by walking, cycling or driving are via the busy A281 Brighton Road which is a single carriageway with just one narrow 1.25m pavement on the far side of the road. The pavement is barely adequate now, and is dangerous when passing other pedestrians. The only pedestrian route to schools, other neighbourhoods and the town centre would require crossing this busy road twice. Surface water drainage is inadequate now and only on the south side. There are no street lights as it is a rural area. Whilst Doomsday Lane would inevitably be used by vehicles as a 'cut thru' by new residents, particularly for the school runs, it is too narrow and without pavements to safely walk down. The Lane abuts the AONB and is woefully overused by vehicles now considering its width restriction.

NPPF Paragraph 102 - appropriate and proportionate steps that can be taken to reduce vulnerability. The safety of children and other vulnerable users in proximity to open water, railways and other potential hazards should be considered in planning and assessing proposals for development". I would conclude that the only two route options possibly create potential dangers of Doomsday Lane usage by pedestrians - and the use of the narrow (1.25m wide) pavement along Brighton Road, not in any way would be "reducing vulnerability and considering "the safety of children". Other than the two roads mentioned, the site is isolated.

NPPF Paragraph 117 - Promoting sustainable transport - give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas". And (B) ... address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport. And (C) ... create places that are safe, secure and attractive - which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles," Pedestrian and cycle access is extremely limited in the roads outside of the development and doesn't adhere to NPPF guidelines. As a consequence of the existing road network, the only pedestrian and school children's route to schools is using the existing very

narrow (1.25m wide) lone pavement on the south side of the A281 Brighton Road. It would require school children to cross this already busy A road twice to walk to school. Road drainage is already inadequate and in wet conditions, vehicles create spray over the pavement. Cyclists could use Doomsday Lane, but this lane is a busy 'rat run' by vehicles, has a width restriction (2m), - and a cycle lane would be impossible. There are no pavements in Doomsday Lane or street lights - school children could be tempted to walk the Lane as an obvious short cut to and fro school. This would be a serious hazard. Due to the potential dangers and inconvenient pedestrian routes, this development would inevitably become car dependent which again reinforces the fact that this development is not conforming to the NPPF and therefore should be refused approval.

Horsham District Council supports the protection of local Green Spaces and the protection of green gaps. This development would extend the urban boundary to abut the High Weald AONB and also removes current agricultural land usage of the three fields.

Department for Transport guidance recommends a minimum pavement width of 2.0 metres on busy roads, such as A-roads, to allow two wheelchairs to pass, though 1.5m sometimes used for short, restricted sections. The A281 Brighton Road from this proposed development towards the town centre and schools access is mainly just 1.25m wide, with no grass verge between kerb and the pavement. This is well below DOT guidance now, so is not fit for purpose if 180 dwellings are approved.

The south eastern corner of Horsham is the most unsuitable location for a development of this size. The road network is limited with poor interconnection to major trunk roads, such as the A24 (on the western side of town) and the A264 (on northern side of town). To join these major roads from the development location requires the use of minor residential roads with busy parking that are already barely fit for purpose as practical routes for traffic. The building of 180 dwellings would mean around 300+ vehicles exiting and entering the just one site access onto the busy A281 Brighton Road daily. This would seriously increase air pollution and local traffic congestion in an area of Horsham with already inadequate infrastructure. This inevitably would result in embarrassment to Horsham's traffic strategy in the town centre.

There seems to be no provision for a wildlife corridor across the fields. There is clear evidence, including photographs, of wild deer and foxes crossing the site as they have always done, I suspect for centuries. They roam freely from St Leonards Forest through the fields to Chesworth, Sedgwick and beyond. Instead, there appears to be a walkway (with no attempt to link either end to the official Horsham Riverside Walk) with an adjacent children LEAP area. Clearly not conducive to provide safe and effective wildlife

movement.

I have provided photographs in support of my objections separately, emailed to the Case Officer.

I urge Horsham District Council to completely refuse this Application on the grounds listed above and also based on previous LDP decisions for the same three fields.

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