

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 06 April 2026 22:16:19 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0366

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 06/04/2026 10:16 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land North West of Southwater
Proposal:	Outline planning application, with all matters reserved (except for primary access to the highway) for a phased development comprising: the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of up to 1,000 residential dwellings (including affordable housing) (Use Class C3); up to 80 specialist accommodation units (Use Class C2); a mixed-use neighbourhood centre (Use Classes E and F); education facilities (Use Class F1(a)); business and employment floorspace (Use Classes B2, B8 and E(g)); redevelopment of existing agricultural buildings including construction of a building for community use (Use Classes E and F2); improvements to public rights of way; sports pitches; gypsy and traveller pitches/plots; public open space; landscaping, and associated infrastructure
Case Officer:	Matthew Porter

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: Newbuildings Place Dragons Green Road Shipley. Horsham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking

- Other
- Overdevelopment

Comments:

This objection is to the proposed allocation of 'Land North West of Southwater (at least 1,000 homes)' in the Draft Horsham Local Plan 2023-2040, due for consideration at the EIP. This allocation appears to be the same as developer Berkeley Homes' commercial proposal for 1,000 dwellings at Southwater, in all material respects. I attended the public exhibition on this proposal in November 2025 and in pre-emption the developer submitted an outline planning application to HDC earlier this calendar year. The developer avers in its submission that the land has been identified in the draft Local Plan as suitable for development.

The question is 1) whether it passes the sustainability criteria in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); 2) accords with the adopted Southwater Neighbourhood Plan. My objections to the inclusion of this site as an allocation within the local plan are as follows:

a. the allocation would be premature because The infrastructure is not in place to support the development and the provision of this is outside the control of the developer, Horsham DC and the Secretary of state. This is particularly in respect of:

- Connection to the principal highway network, particularly the proposed access onto the Hop Oast roundabout where is it proposed to insert an additional roundabout in close proximity to the existing roundabout and also in close proximity to the small roundabout connecting Worthing Road, Southwater and Blakes Farm Road. Given the additional traffic both from currently consented development and the proposed new development, an additional roundabout in close proximity to the two existing ones and regardless of an additional right turn lane, will cause traffic congestion and dangerous road design.

- Secondary highway access off Two Mile Ash Road; this is already a 'rat run'; insofar as it may be used by traffic generated by the proposed allocation site either to get to the Old Worthing Road via the Boar's Head junction or to Christ's Hospital Station/A264 at Itchingfield, the existing roads are of insufficient capacity and width and Two Mile Ash Road at Tower Hill has neither footways nor space to create them.

- It is well documented that there is insufficient water to serve residents in the water supply zone that includes Southwater; no new interconnector water mains are currently planned and no additional surface or underground potable water storage capacity is expected to be delivered within an acceptable time frame or within the emergent local plan period. Developers may claim that a borehole supply can be provided on or near the site but it is far from clear that such a proposal has been considered in any detail let alone verified. Borehole supplies are not automatically potable without extensive additional treatment and a source that is deliverable, sustainable in quantum and of quality that meets

drinking water standards needs to be verified. Much is made of the ability to reduce demand for potable water by grey water recovery and rainwater harvesting. Both have significant impacts for viability if residential development schemes and cannot simply be assumed to be picked up as a management company obligation. A further piece of speculation is that per capita consumption can be reduced from about 140lit/person/day to 80 l/p/d but this requires the great preponderance of existing consumers to adopt water reduction habits. There is no evidence that HDC or the Developers or the SoS have any ability to impose or indeed any worked up proposals to encourage such habits.

- The sewage treatment capacity has not been verified; of course the sewerage undertaker will say they have capacity because they have a statutory duty to provide (just as they have a statutory duty not to pollute rivers or inshore waters). It is however necessary to be professionally inquisitive as to whether there is a feasibility study worked up by the undertaker which demonstrates the ability and financial capacity to bring onstream the necessary capacity within the plan period. It has been suggested that the proposed allocation site would be connected to the Barns Green STW but this is already operating beyond capacity and it is known that there are unrecorded discharges to a tributary of the River Adur before additional consented housing in Barns Green itself even becomes occupied.

- There is inadequate electrical capacity in the grid. Homes in the locality already suffer numerous unplanned outages. This is part of a national shortcoming the root causes of which cannot be fixed in the plan period.

b. the design concept of the development in this location is defective:

- It would create a second village centre; rather than augmenting, consolidating and enhancing the sense of 'place' and community focus, it will create sociological fragmentation by design. Southwater is near the population number that as a locality within a larger urbanisation, it would have distinct neighbourhood status. The approved neighbourhood plan fostered this aspiration; the proposed allocation site does anything but. It is unacceptable that urban planning of a growing village should be by means of unintegrated 'bolt on' development sites in which the result is reduced social cohesion, no sense of place or belonging and which is little more than a dormitory settlement in which everybody travels some place else for goods, services, employment and so on. thus the effective capacity of Southwater to absorb this development after so many substantial additions to the village, is already compromised.

- Work/life travel patterns have not been considered holistically in the proposed allocation, merely the impact in its own terms (and not cumulatively) as if nothing mattered beyond the developer's own proposal site boundary. This is objectionable in principle and is not addressed by reference to public exhibitions or

consultations. If the Southwater NHP is to be disregarded, then simply filling a resultant void with development unrelated to local needs or the fostering of local community, is in total disregard for the principles of the NPPF and is indeed 'cow-pat' development based on nothing more than a crude impatience to get a site allocation (not necessarily to build houses) regardless of any market, local need or functional relationship with its setting.

- The proposal does not respect or take due account of the need for adjacent open countryside and will make access to this more distant for hundreds of households leading to additional car journeys to walk or exercise dogs.
- There appears to be little more than lip service paid to multi modal travel.
- The location of the proposed school site is clearly intended to make this redundant by design being in the location least likely to be of optimal use for the community of Southwater. In any event the school will never be built unless the site is made over in its entirety to the education authority or a community trust before the first homes on the site are occupied. A new school has been promised before and never delivered and is dependent on education authority capacity and resources which must be verified before any allocation is made.

for these reasons the application should be rejected as it meets neither of the core tests for sustainable development.

Kind regards

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