

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 15 July 2026 16:46
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application S106/26/0021

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 4:46 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Kilnwood Vale Crawley Road Faygate West Sussex RH12 0AQ
Proposal:	Application for a deed of variation of the legal agreement under DC/15/2813 for the whole of the Kilnwood Vale site for various amendments relating to the delivery of the site. [cr]
Case Officer:	Kate Turner

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	8 Pondtail Walk Horsham
----------	-------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Other
Comments:	Dear Planning Officer, My name is [REDACTED] and I am a homeowner at Kilnwood Vale. I am writing to object to the proposed Deed of Variation submitted by the developer. The Section 106 agreement formed an integral part of the planning permission granted for this development. It was designed to ensure that essential infrastructure and community facilities were delivered alongside new homes, with clearly defined occupation thresholds determining when key facilities should be provided. Residents purchased their homes with the legitimate expectation that these obligations would be honoured. My principal concern is that the developer is now seeking to amend obligations that have already been triggered. The development has already exceeded the agreed occupation thresholds for facilities including the community centre, sports pavilion, drainage infrastructure and public open spaces , yet these remain undelivered. Allowing the developer to

retrospectively postpone these obligations would undermine the commitments made through the planning process and be unfair to residents who relied on those commitments when purchasing their homes.

The consequences of delaying these facilities extend beyond the estate itself. Section 106 ensured that the supporting infrastructure kept pace with the growth of the community itself. Without local facilities, resident must now travel elsewhere increasing congestion on roads while delaying drainage infrastructures increases risk of flooding which is already evident within some parts of the development.

Approving this variation would also establish a dangerous precedent. If developers are permitted to renegotiate legally binding obligations after agreed occupation thresholds have been reached then it weakened the confidence in planning systems and risks encouraging similar requests on future developments within the area. Section 106 agreements only retain their value if the obligations they contain are enforced when they become due.

Residents have fulfilled their part by purchasing and occupying their homes in good faith therefore it is not unreasonable to expect the developer to fulfil the commitments it had made when the planning permission was granted.

For the reasons described above, I respectfully urge Horsham District Council to refuse the proposed Deed of Variation and require the developer to deliver the infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the original Section 106 agreement.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted Signature]

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