

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 June 2026 09:27:28 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 04/06/2026 9:27 AM.

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: 19 Trinity Fields Horsham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Planning Objection - Lower Beeding Parish Council (Horsham District), West Sussex Re: Planning Application DC/26/0640 To: Horsham District Council

I live at number 19 Trinity Fields and I object to this application on the grounds of significant amenity harm, highway safety risks, environmental impacts, and clear conflict with the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Residential Amenity - Overlooking, Loss of Privacy & Overbearing Impact

The proposal is contrary to:

- HDPF Policy 32 - The Quality of New Development
- HDPF Policy 33 - Development Principles
- Regulation 19 Local Plan Policy DG3 - Residential Amenity

The development introduces direct overlooking into neighbouring habitable rooms and private gardens, breaching the district's expected separation distances and eroding the reasonable expectation of privacy.

The height, massing and proximity of the structure create an overbearing and oppressive form, resulting in:

- Loss of privacy
- Loss of outlook
- Unacceptable sense of enclosure

This is inconsistent with NPPF Paragraph 130(f), which requires development to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Highway Safety, Access Constraints & Parking Deficiency

The proposal is inconsistent with:

- HDPF Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
- HDPF Policy 41 - Parking
- Regulation 19 Local Plan Policy STT1 - Transport and Access

Lower Beeding's road network is rural, narrow and already constrained. The proposal introduces:

- Unsafe access arrangements with inadequate visibility splays
- Insufficient on site parking, leading to displaced on street parking
- Restricted access for emergency vehicles
- Traffic intensification on roads not designed for additional vehicle movements

Under NPPF Paragraph 111, development must be refused where it results in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Environmental Impacts - Flood Risk, Habitat Loss, Noise & Light Pollution

The proposal conflicts with:

- HDPF Policy 24 - Environmental Protection
- HDPF Policy 25 - The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
- HDPF Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
- Regulation 19 Local Plan Policy NEB1 - Biodiversity Net Gain
- Regulation 19 Local Plan Policy FRD1 - Flood Risk & Drainage

Key concerns include:

- Surface water flood risk with no robust SuDS strategy
 - Loss of vegetation and wildlife habitat, contrary to biodiversity net gain requirements
-

- Noise and light pollution affecting residential amenity and wildlife
 - Failure to assess cumulative environmental impacts
- This is inconsistent with NPPF Paragraphs 152-158 (flood risk) and Paragraph 180 (biodiversity protection).

Failure of Sustainable Development Test

The proposal fails multiple Local Plan policies, including:

- HDPF 32 & 33 - design quality and amenity protection
- HDPF 40 & 41 - transport and parking
- HDPF 24, 25, 31 - environmental protection and biodiversity
- Regulation 19 Policies DG1, DG3, STT1, NEB1, FRD1 - design, amenity, transport, biodiversity and drainage

It also fails the NPPF's three pillars of sustainable development:

- Social - harms residential amenity
- Environmental - increases flood risk and reduces biodiversity
- Economic - creates highway safety risks and infrastructure pressure

To summarise, the proposal results in:

- Unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy
- Overbearing massing and overshadowing
- Highway safety risks and inadequate parking
- Environmental harm and unmanaged flood risk
- Clear conflict with the Horsham District Planning Framework and the NPPF

There are no material considerations that outweigh these harms. The application should therefore be refused.

Kind Regards

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**