

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 July 2026 12:19:39 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0928
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 15/07/2026 12:19 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Lock House Lock Partridge Green West Sussex RH13 8EG
Proposal:	Erection of a car port, leisure suite and padel court. Conversion of the tank room into a holiday let. (Listed Building Consent).
Case Officer:	Daniel Holmes

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 1 Gatehouse Lodge Lock Estate, Lock Lane Partridge Green

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
Comments:	I wish to object to the above application. Whilst I acknowledge the effort that has been made to design the proposed structures sympathetically, I consider that the proposal conflicts with several policies of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF), particularly Policy 26 (Countryside Protection), because it fails to properly assess the cumulative

impact of ongoing development and intensification across the Lock House estate.

1. Conflict with HDPF Policy 26 - Failure to Assess Cumulative Impact

Policy 26 requires development in the countryside to avoid leading, either individually or cumulatively, to a significant increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside.

The applicant has assessed the current proposal largely in isolation. However, the application forms part of a wider pattern of recent development at Lock House which includes:

- Conversion of Lock House into three dwellings.
- Conversion of the existing garage/flat into an additional dwelling.
- Permission for two holiday-let units.
- The current proposal for a further large holiday-let unit.
- A new leisure complex incorporating a gym, sauna, games facilities, swimming pool area and padel court.

Whilst each application may appear modest when considered separately (aside the 8 bedroom super cottage holiday let currently under planning consideration which could never be considered modest), Policy 26 specifically requires an assessment of cumulative effects. No meaningful assessment has been provided of the combined impact of all approved and proposed residential, tourism and leisure uses operating together on the estate.

The key planning question is not whether each proposal individually appears acceptable, but whether the cumulative effect of multiple permissions has fundamentally altered the character and activity levels associated with this rural location.

I do not believe this assessment has been undertaken.

2. Material Intensification of Countryside Activity

The Planning Statement describes a tourism-led diversification strategy intended to attract visitors and enhance the site's visitor offer. The proposal includes facilities specifically designed to attract tourism and leisure users including:

- Holiday accommodation.
- Swimming pool facilities.
- Gym and wellness facilities.
- Games facilities.
- Padel court.

The applicant relies heavily on tourism demand for "super cottages", group accommodation and recreation-led visitor experiences. This demonstrates that the proposal is intended to increase visitor activity on the site rather than merely provide

facilities ancillary to a private dwelling(s).

The application contains no robust assessment of:

- Visitor numbers.
- Frequency of occupation.
- Staff requirements.
- Servicing arrangements.
- Contractor visits.
- Deliveries.
- Changeover day activity.
- Cumulative traffic generated by all holiday accommodation across the estate.

Consequently, there is insufficient evidence to conclude that the proposal would not lead to a significant increase in countryside activity contrary to Policy 26.

3. Failure to Demonstrate the Development is Essential to its Countryside Location

Policy 26 requires development in the countryside to be essential to its countryside location.

The application states that guests would enjoy the countryside, nearby footpaths and local attractions. However, this does not of itself demonstrate that:

- Additional holiday accommodation is essential in this location.
- A leisure suite is essential in this location.
- A padel court is essential in this location.

The submission provides little evidence explaining why these facilities must be located in open countryside rather than within existing settlements or within less sensitive locations.

I therefore do not consider that the application adequately satisfies the Policy 26 test.

4. Conflict with HDPF Policy 33 - Activity and Amenity Impacts

Policy 33 requires consideration of impacts arising from the nature and intensity of use, not simply building appearance.

The proposal introduces additional visitor accommodation together with recreation facilities intended to increase visitor attraction and site usage. This creates potential for:

- Increased vehicle movements.
- Arrival and departure activity.
- Servicing and maintenance visits.
- Noise associated with leisure activities.
- Extended periods of outdoor occupation.

The Planning Statement concludes that there would be no amenity impacts but does not provide any detailed assessment of

these operational effects.

5. Conflict with HDPF Policy 41 - Parking and Servicing

The application asserts that the site has adequate parking and access arrangements and includes the provision of a car port for three vehicles. However, no detailed analysis has been provided.

There appears to be no assessment of cumulative parking demand generated by:

- Existing dwellings.
- Previously approved holiday accommodation.
- The additional holiday-let unit.
- Leisure facility users.
- Maintenance contractors.
- Cleaning services.
- Deliveries and servicing vehicles.

Without such assessment, the application fails to convincingly demonstrate compliance with Policy 41.

6. Flood Risk and Safe Access

I am also concerned that insufficient information has been provided regarding safe access and egress during flood events. Previous representations have identified concerns regarding flooding on Lock Lane and reliance upon alternative access routes which is not legally secured. Policy 38 requires developments to be safe for their lifetime, including consideration of access during flood events.

The submitted documents do not appear to provide a detailed assessment of these matters and fails to provide evidence that safe egress to the North and West in the event of a flood in Flood Zone 3 is legally secured.

Conclusion

The principal concern is not the appearance of the proposed buildings but the failure to assess the cumulative operational effects arising from the continuing intensification of development at Lock House.

The application has not demonstrated that the combined impact of multiple new dwellings, multiple holiday accommodation units and extensive leisure facilities would avoid a significant increase in activity within the countryside, as expressly required by Policy 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework.

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



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