

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 24 January 2026 15:38:34 UTC+00:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/2057
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 24/01/2026 3:38 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land North of Little Slaughterford Chapel Road Barns Green West Sussex
Proposal:	Proposed development of 68 dwellings with vehicular and pedestrian accesses, public open space, hard and soft landscaping and associated works including supporting foul and surface water drainage works, and works to existing culverted watercourse on site.
Case Officer:	Alice Johnson

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: The Walled House Plumtree Cross Lane Itchingfield

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design- Highway Access and Parking- Loss of General Amenity- Other- Overdevelopment- Privacy Light and Noise- Trees and Landscaping

Comments:

Reason 1: Harm to Ancient Woodland (NPPF Paragraph 186(c))

The proposed development would result in the deterioration of an area of Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland, an irreplaceable habitat, through the provision of an inadequate buffer zone, the introduction of a permanent public footpath within that buffer, and the cumulative indirect impacts arising from increased recreational pressure, lighting, pollution, domestic pets, and altered surface water drainage.

No wholly exceptional reasons have been demonstrated to justify such harm, nor has a suitable compensation strategy been provided. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 186(c) of the National Planning Policy Framework, which affords strong protection to ancient woodland from both loss and deterioration.

Reason 2: Flood Risk and Surface Water Management

The application fails to accurately acknowledge or assess existing surface water flooding affecting the site and surrounding area. Insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would not increase surface water runoff or exacerbate flooding elsewhere, particularly given the site's topography and known drainage constraints.

The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraphs 159 and 167 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which require development to be directed away from areas at risk of flooding and to ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere.

Reason 3: Inadequate Foul Drainage Infrastructure

The application fails to demonstrate that sufficient foul drainage and sewage treatment capacity exists to accommodate the development without worsening existing pollution of local watercourses. Documented sewage overflow events affecting the area have not been adequately addressed, and no assessment of downstream network or treatment works capacity has been provided.

The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraphs 8 and 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which require development to be supported by appropriate infrastructure and to prevent pollution of the natural environment.

Reason 4: Highway Safety and Cumulative Traffic Impact

The submitted Transport Assessment fails to assess the residual cumulative impacts of the development on the wider highway

network, including the effects of nearby committed and allocated development. Insufficient justification has been provided to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in unacceptable impacts on highway safety, parking provision, or the operation of nearby junctions.

The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason 5: Unsustainable Location and Reliance on Private Car Use

The development is located in a rural settlement with extremely limited public transport provision. The Transport Statement relies on unrealistic assumptions of modal shift that are not supported by local evidence. As a result, the development would be highly car-dependent and would fail to promote sustainable transport choices.

The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraphs 108 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason 6: Inadequate Infrastructure Provision

The application fails to demonstrate that adequate electricity network capacity exists to support the proposed development, particularly given the reliance on air source heat pumps for all dwellings. No consultation with the electricity network operator has been provided, and concerns remain regarding the capacity of local education infrastructure.

The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraphs 8 and 34 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason 7: Harm to Character, Landscape, and Heritage Assets

The proposed development would result in the loss of an important pastoral field that forms a key green gap between the village and open countryside, eroding the rural character of the area. The scale and siting of the development would also cause harm to the setting of nearby listed buildings and heritage assets and would adversely affect the character and appearance of the village.

The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraphs 131, 135, and 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason 8: Loss of Community and Rural Amenity

The development would result in the permanent loss of land that is used for valued community and charitable events, leading to a significant reduction in village amenity and social value.

The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to protect valued community facilities and spaces.

Reason 9: Overdevelopment

The proposal seeks to deliver 68 dwellings on a site identified for approximately 50 dwellings, representing an unjustified increase in density that is out of character with surrounding development and disproportionate to the scale of the settlement.

The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason 10: Failure to Meet Identified Housing Need

The proposed housing mix does not reflect identified local housing needs, particularly the demand for larger family homes, and raises concerns regarding deliverability of on-site affordable housing provision. This is contrary to the advice of the Council's Housing Officers.

The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Overall Conclusion

The proposed development would result in unacceptable environmental harm, infrastructure inadequacy, unsustainable travel patterns, and harm to the character and amenity of the area. Taken cumulatively, these impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme.

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 E
aton