

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 June 2026 16:35:21 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0640
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 4:35 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Cedar Cottage Sandygate Lane Lower Beeding West Sussex RH13 6LR
Proposal:	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 24no. dwellings including the creation of a new access from Sandygate Lane with associated works.
Case Officer:	Alice Johnson

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 18 Trinity Fields Lower Beeding 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 - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	This representation is an "object". Non-Consultation re loss of amenity

This representation is made by the Resident's Association for Trinity Fields in Lower Beeding (the "Residents' Association"), the organisation representing 35 households immediately adjoining the proposed development site. This representation therefore reflects the views of a large number of households, many of whom have made their own representations.

In addition to representing the residents' views, as an organisation the Residents Association is concerned (in relation to the reliability of the application as a whole and any statements therein) that the application omits to mention that it did not contact this body in consultation. Whilst this inevitably appears to be due to the fact that the reaction would be negative, it is misleading not to mention the lack of consultation, a situation remedied by the local community, individual representations, and then this representation on their behalf.

There is a significant loss of privacy for homes previously overlooking fields.

Neighbourhood plan

We note the extensive attempts to argue that the Neighbourhood Plan ("NP") should be disregarded. As others have stated, residents are not intrinsically against development, as evidenced by the NP supporting several significant developments but are concerned that the strongly held community vision that the NP itself actually REPRESENTS (regardless of current pauses due to changes of political control) should be ignored, with serious negative effects on community cohesion in a small village.

The NP actually strongly resisted this development following a 4 YEAR proposal / exhibition / consultation process.

Rural / settlement areas

The application admits that the development is on "undeveloped land" and is outside of the existing settlement area. Priority should be given to development that is not on self-admitted "undeveloped land" as this is obviously a finite resource in a rural area. Further, the reason that planning frameworks include the concept of settlement areas is to prevent linear sprawl. If being "adjacent to" a settlement area is a precedent for acceptance, significant planning control is lost.

Planning guidelines

As we understand it there is a presumption AGAINST infilling of gardens in planning decisions. Not only is this development doing so, but it does so involving the demolition of a perfectly serviceable house built in the past 20 years, and that the current applicant lobbied for using entirely different justifications.

Scale of objections v no positive representations.

We are concerned that there are ZERO representations in support from the community.

We further object to the proposal given that several of the statutory consultations are "do not currently support". We are particularly concerned that - in those circumstances - there may be a temptation to approve "with conditions". This is manifestly a weaker response than rejection due to the same issues.

Social / affordable housing

We note the fact that the development does not meet these guides, from the council report. once again, we strongly object to an approval with conditions, as opposed to rejection and resubmission. In the unlikely event of an approval with conditions, we specifically request an explanation of why the planning authority favoured that rather than a rejection, as the position is clearly weaker and there is no apparent downside for the planning authority for the correct / robust approach.

Traffic

We note the comment in relation to incidents, and would suggest that note be taken of the speeding incidents north of the Plough junction during a period of Sunday morning police enforcement during the spring.

We note - from the highways report - the speeds of traffic outside the proposed development. This report is comprehensively flawed in that it was conducted under speed limits which have since been lowered. What the report therefore is actually confirming is that there would be a new housing development entrance on a road where this is currently significant breaking of speed laws in excess of 10%!

We are concerned that the result of the development would mean 4 junctions on to Sandygate Lane (Trinity Fields, Church Farm development, the Gallops and the Application) within approx 100/150 m of each AND the junction with the Plough, and invite a "real world" site visit by the Planning Authority to meet with residents and see the real world effects at peak danger times during the day.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**

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