

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 17 February 2026 23:50:26 UTC+00:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0084
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 17/02/2026 11:50 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Barnards Nursery Rock Road Washington West Sussex
Proposal:	Permission in Principle for the demolition of existing structures/buildings and erection of 1no. dwelling.
Case Officer:	Daniel Holmes

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Highfield Rock Road Pulborough
----------	--------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Dear Planning Officer, Re: Planning Application DC/26/0084 - Permission in Principle for demolition of existing structures and erection of 1 dwelling at Barnards Nursery, Rock Road, Washington, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 3BH

I am writing as a local resident to object to this Permission in Principle application.

I appreciate that Barnards has existing lawful dwellings and buildings, and these have long formed part of the local area. However, this application seeks to introduce an additional, separate dwelling beyond what has historically existed on the site. To me, this feels like a clear expansion of residential development, rather than simply maintaining what is already there. Because of this, I understand it must be considered as new residential development in the countryside, where planning policies are designed to be especially protective.

I understand that Permission in Principle is about deciding whether housing is acceptable at this location at all. In this case, I believe there are several important reasons why it is not.

Countryside location

The site sits outside the defined built-up area boundary for Washington. These boundaries exist for an important reason, to protect the countryside and preserve the character and separation of rural communities like ours.

From what I understand, Horsham District Planning Framework Policy 26 only allows development in the countryside where there is a clear justification or essential need. I cannot see how the addition of a new market dwelling in this location meets those criteria. The fact that there are already houses here does not mean it is appropriate for further expansion. Gradually adding more dwellings risks changing the character of the area and undermining the purpose of these boundaries.

I also understand that national planning policy (Paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework) seeks to avoid isolated homes in the countryside unless there are exceptional circumstances, and I am not aware of any such circumstances in this case.

Highway safety and access

Rock Road is a fast rural road with a 50 mph speed limit, and visibility is already limited due to bends and the nearby summit. As someone familiar with this road, I know how challenging it can be to safely enter and exit properties along it.

Adding another dwelling would inevitably increase vehicle movements onto this stretch of road, where safety is already a concern.

There are also no pavements, no street lighting, and no safe walking routes connecting the site to Washington village or nearby services. This means future occupants would have no choice but to rely entirely on cars. This does not feel like a safe or sustainable location for further residential development.

Landscape character and setting

This area forms part of the open countryside and contributes to the wider rural setting of the South Downs National Park, which is nationally recognised for its natural beauty.

One of the things that makes this area special is its rural and undeveloped character. Adding further residential development, along with associated lighting, parking, and activity, would

gradually erode this character and introduce a more suburban feel. Once these changes happen, they cannot easily be reversed. I understand that planning policies, including Horsham District Planning Framework Policy 32, are intended to ensure development respects the character of its surroundings. In my view, this proposal does not achieve that.

Impact on privacy, rural tranquillity, and existing landscape
Another important concern is the impact on privacy and the quiet rural character of the area. This part of Rock Road has always had a peaceful and open countryside feel. Introducing an additional dwelling would bring increased activity, vehicle movements, lighting, and domestic noise, which would inevitably change the character of the site and its surroundings.

The introduction of additional residential lighting in what is currently a relatively dark rural area would also affect the natural environment and the sense of tranquillity that is characteristic of this countryside setting.

I am also concerned about the impact on existing trees and vegetation. Mature trees and established planting contribute significantly to the character of the site and provide important screening, habitat, and visual amenity. Any loss of trees or reduction in natural screening would further erode the rural character and openness of the area, and replacement planting cannot fully compensate for the loss of mature landscape features.

Cumulative impact

These cumulative changes would urbanise the site and diminish the qualities that make this area distinctive. While this application is for one dwelling, it represents a further intensification of development at the site beyond what historically existed. These incremental additions may seem small individually, but over time they can significantly change the character of an area.

Allowing this could set a precedent for further expansion, making it increasingly difficult to protect the countryside in future.

Sustainability

The site is not within safe walking distance of shops, schools, or public transport, and there is no safe pedestrian infrastructure linking it to Washington village. This makes it an inherently car-dependent location, which I understand is not consistent with the broader goals of sustainable development.

Conclusion

For these reasons, I believe this proposal conflicts with local and national planning policies and would have a harmful impact on the safety, character, and sustainability of this rural area. I respectfully ask Horsham District Council to refuse Permission in Principle for this application.

Yours faithfully,

18/02/2026

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