

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 June 2026 15:50:58 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0671
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 03/06/2026 3:50 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Off Old Crawley Road Faygate West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline Application for a development of up to 120 dwellings (including 45% affordable) with all matters reserved except for access.
Case Officer:	Sam Whitehouse

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	28 Earles Meadow HORSHAM
----------	--------------------------

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 - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I strongly object to this (re-)application, twice previously rejected and with no subsequent mitigation except a smaller - but still substantial - number of houses Destruction of Countryside in an AONB:

- Approval of this proposal would render the designation worthless; in addition, the planned cycleway / pedestrian route to the town centre runs directly through the small TPO/0580 area but this is not identified nor acknowledged by Fairfax's Manchester-based consultants.
- The site sits directly on the (vestiges, sadly) of the Horsham Ring that will be once again devalued as an excellent walking route now Mowbray has sprawled over the northern section. The section is a very well-used natural path across to the woods and would be a huge loss.
- The Ecology Co-Op report paints a very detailed description of the area's natural countryside but Fig 2 is overwhelmingly telling as it shows the very high proportion of 'built-up areas, developed land, sealed surfaces, and building' that will replace the existing fields and pathways and hinder ground drainage. Aside, Fairfax's flyer offered outrageous claims such as 'improved biodiversity ~10% net-gain' and 'landscaping improvements'; over what? Nature itself?
- Finally, the Archaeology South-East report described evidence of Mesolithic, Neolithic and Roman remains in the area that would completely disappear under this development

Flooding:

- Probably the greatest mis-information in the application is regarding flood risk. There are scores of pages describing the geology, groundwater, land topology and 'past history' that come together in the Groundsure / Aqua Terra report to be dismissed as 'negligible' (~page 158). Anyone who has walked along the Old Horsham Rd in the winter knows that it floods almost every year after moderate or heavy rain to such a depth that only Wellington boots (or waders) will suffice. Water pours off the proposed field site - waterfalled this last winter in fact - and the drains and run-off routes are quickly and completely overwhelmed. Although not speaking as a professional, I would be very concerned indeed that with the extra built-up, paved and 'sealed surfaces' described in the above report Figure 2, will cause the cottages close to the entrance to Old Crawley Rd to be inundated. An enormous flood-defence project would be required if it were to happen.
- To emphasise the shallow analysis done in this regard, one of the reports has a photograph of the field's perimeter ditch (glistening with water actually!) in defence of the flood mitigation statements.

Roads & Transport:

- Every single working-day morning there are traffic jams along Crawley Rd up to the Moorhead Roundabout, often tailing back to Shepherds Way. Additionally, there is a continuous flow of traffic coming off the roundabout towards Roffey. This will be exacerbated by increased road use (120 houses = ~250 new
-

cars) and also by the kind practise of 'letting people out' from side roads which would be necessary for new residents to ever escape the development but would doubly increase the congestion.

- There is much talk of a new joined-up cycle / pedestrian route to Littlehaven Station and into the town centre. The former is ~25 minutes walk - over a mile - and the latter verges on a vague expression of improved environmental living style, still far from realisation. The route traces a new paved way through the undergrowth, ditches and TPO just inside Earles Meadow, cutting off the corner, but there is no further detail of changes to the estate's access road and pinch point. Will the access road be widened? Will cycle lanes be painted along its narrow width? Moreover, who will pay: Council Tax payers of Horsham? Fairfax? ANO?

General Comments:

- There are zero community benefits to North Horsham; both GP and Dentist services are stretched beyond breaking point, massively oversubscribed.

- the proposal, although it asserts to the opposite, is addressing an 'unmet need' in Horsham which is already moving up from a pleasant market town to an urban sprawl. Only the Fairfax shareholders - plus a few new residents - will benefit and I submit that a huge number of existing residents will be unhappy.

- Controversially, I would note that Fairfax have purposefully used the designation 'Faygate' - not least in their community flyer - some might say to deflect interest on casual glance. The much trumpeted 'community engagement' in February was transparently set up to gather objection points so that could be pre-addressed in the application proper. Whilst a reasonable business practise, it is not palatable.

Thank you

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