

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 06 June 2026 18:14:42 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 06/06/2026 6:14 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:	Red House Manor Lane Horsham
----------	------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Other - Overdevelopment - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I wish to object to this application. I appreciate that Horsham needs new housing and I understand the pressure the Council is under to identify additional housing sites. However, having reviewed the application documents, supporting reports and consultation responses submitted to date, I

am concerned that a number of key issues remain unresolved and that the Council is being asked to determine the application before sufficient information is available on several important matters.

My objection is not based on opposition to housing in principle, but on concern that a development of up to 180 dwellings has not yet been shown to be acceptable on this site.

Active Travel, Pedestrian Safety and Doomsday Lane

One of my biggest concerns is the reliance on Doomsday Lane as a pedestrian and cycle connection.

Anyone familiar with the area knows that Doomsday Lane is a narrow rural lane with a steep gradient and no footway. Whilst the application promotes this route as part of its sustainable transport strategy, West Sussex County Council acknowledges that no footway can be provided and that pedestrians cannot realistically be prevented from using it.

I am concerned that residents, including children, will inevitably use this route despite the lack of dedicated pedestrian infrastructure. This does not appear to provide the safe and attractive walking and cycling connections expected by national planning policy and the requirements of draft allocation HOR1.

I am also concerned that the proposed signalised crossing and relocated bus stop on the A281 are not yet fully resolved. West Sussex County Council has requested further work and an updated Road Safety Audit. Until these matters have been addressed, I do not believe it can be concluded that the development provides safe and effective access for pedestrians and cyclists.

Reliance on an Unadopted Local Plan Allocation

The applicant places significant reliance on draft allocation HOR1 within the emerging Horsham Local Plan.

However, the new Local Plan has not been adopted and the examination process was suspended following concerns raised by the Planning Inspector regarding legal compliance and soundness. Whilst the allocation may carry some weight, I do not believe it should be treated as justification for approving development where important concerns remain unresolved.

Furthermore, if the applicant wishes to rely on HOR1 to support the principle of development, it is reasonable to expect the proposal to clearly demonstrate compliance with the allocation's requirements. At present, I do not believe this has been achieved, particularly in relation to active travel, pedestrian connectivity, landscape impact, green infrastructure and the protection of

mature trees and hedgerows.

Biodiversity and Veteran Trees

I am also concerned by the comments made by the Council's own ecology and arboricultural specialists.

The Ecology Officer has requested amendments and further information regarding the Biodiversity Net Gain calculations, including the treatment of the veteran oak tree identified as T56 and the loss of significant lengths of hedgerow.

The Arboricultural Officer confirms that T56 is a veteran tree and also identifies several other mature oak trees with significant veteran characteristics. The consultation response specifically notes that residential development will inevitably place additional pressures on these trees through increased human activity, recreation and future management requirements.

These trees are among the most important landscape features on the site and form part of the character of the area. I am not convinced that the outline proposals provide sufficient confidence that they can be successfully protected in the long term.

Foul Drainage Capacity Remains Unresolved

I am concerned that Southern Water has stated that it cannot currently undertake a capacity assessment because the necessary foul drainage and connection details have not yet been provided.

For a development of this size, it seems premature to grant permission before there is certainty regarding whether the existing network has sufficient capacity or whether significant upgrades will be required.

This is not simply a technical detail but an important infrastructure issue that should be understood before planning permission is granted.

Loss of Greenfield Land and Urbanisation of the Area

The proposal would result in the development of more than 9 hectares of greenfield land on the edge of Horsham.

This land currently forms part of the open countryside between Horsham and Mannings Heath and contributes to the rural character of the area. The development would introduce a large housing estate, roads, lighting, parking areas and associated infrastructure into what is currently an undeveloped landscape.

Whilst I recognise that housing development has to take place

somewhere, I believe the loss of this open land and the resulting urbanisation of the area should be given significant weight, particularly given the site's proximity to the High Weald National Landscape and its role as part of the transition between Horsham and the surrounding countryside.

Conclusion

I do not believe this application is ready to be approved in its current form. Too many important matters remain unresolved for a development of this scale.

In particular, I do not believe the applicant has yet demonstrated:

- * Safe and attractive pedestrian and cycle connections.
- * Compliance with the key requirements of draft allocation HOR1.
- * That Biodiversity Net Gain has been accurately assessed.
- * That veteran trees and important landscape features can be adequately protected.
- * That sufficient foul drainage capacity exists.
- * That the landscape and countryside impacts have been properly addressed.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that planning permission is refused. At the very least, I believe determination should be deferred until these significant outstanding issues have been fully resolved.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**

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 E aton