

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 02 June 2026 11:40
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DISC/26/0151
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 02/06/2026 11:39 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Birchfield Nursery Kidders Lane Henfield West Sussex BN5 9AB
Proposal:	Application for Approval of Details Reserved by Conditions 3 (Drainage Strategy), 4 (External Materials) and 5 (Ecological Mitigation) to approved application DC/25/1828.
Case Officer:	Nicola Pettifer

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	2 Kidders Cottages Kidders Lane Henfield
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I strongly object to the proposed discharge of Conditions 3 (Drainage Strategy), 4 (External Materials), and 5 (Ecological Mitigation) relating to application DC/25/1828. The submitted details are wholly inadequate, unreliable, and fail to satisfy the requirements of the original planning permission. The application should be refused in full. Condition 3 - Drainage Strategy The drainage strategy is fundamentally flawed and presents clear flood, pollution, and public health risks. The applicant has failed to demonstrate:

- How surface water will be safely managed;
- How flooding will be prevented during heavy rainfall;
- How the drainage system will operate safely over time;
- How foul and commercial wastewater will be legally disposed of.

Kidders Lane has flooded before. Existing drainage problems in the area are already well known. Allowing additional development without a proven and robust drainage solution is reckless and risks worsening flooding for neighbouring properties and the surrounding area. Of particular concern is the apparent proposal to discharge grey water from a café or restaurant into a well or ground infiltration system.

This is completely unacceptable.

Commercial kitchen waste contains fats, oils, grease, food waste, detergents, and chemical cleaning products. Allowing this to enter the ground would create a serious contamination risk to groundwater and surrounding land.

The site would clearly require a properly engineered and legally compliant sewage treatment system capable of handling commercial wastewater. No evidence has been provided that such a system exists, can be installed, or can operate safely on this site.

The absence of a credible foul drainage and sewage treatment solution alone is more than enough reason to refuse discharge of Condition 3.

Condition 4 - External Materials

The proposed external materials are poor quality, inappropriate, and harmful to the character of the area.

The applicant has failed to provide proper samples, detailed specifications, or any convincing justification for the materials proposed.

The condition was imposed to ensure a high-quality development. Instead, the submitted details are vague and unacceptable. Approving them would significantly undermine the visual quality of the site and surrounding area.

Condition 5 - Ecological Mitigation

The ecological mitigation proposals are deeply flawed, unrealistic, and unenforceable.

The applicant has already removed most of the trees on the site, causing significant habitat loss and severely damaging the ecological value of the land. It is unacceptable for the applicant to remove established habitat and then attempt to rely on weak and speculative mitigation measures afterward.

The proposal also attempts to rely on trees to the north of the site for bird boxes and ecological mitigation. Those trees do not belong to the applicant.

The applicant therefore has no legal control over those trees and no ability to guarantee that any mitigation measures will ever be installed, retained, or maintained.

Mitigation measures on land outside the applicant's ownership cannot reasonably be relied upon unless secured by legal agreement. No such agreement has been provided.

The ecological proposals are further undermined by claims relating to hedgehog habitat and mitigation

[REDACTED], making these proposals unrealistic and ecologically questionable.

This is not a credible ecological strategy. It is vague, unsupported, and clearly incapable of delivering the level of mitigation required by the condition.

Conclusion

This application should be refused outright.

The submitted details:

- Fail to provide a lawful or credible drainage strategy;
- Raise serious groundwater contamination and public health concerns;
- Fail to demonstrate any acceptable sewage treatment solution;
- Ignore known flooding issues on Kidders Lane;
- Propose poor and inappropriate external materials;
- Rely on ecological mitigation on land outside the applicant's control;
- Fail to address the major loss of trees and habitat already caused on the site;
- Contain ecological proposals that are unrealistic and unenforceable.

The Local Planning Authority should not approve incomplete, speculative, or unenforceable submissions simply to allow development to proceed.

I respectfully request that the discharge of Conditions 3, 4 and 5 be refused in full.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

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