

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 09 September 2026 20:49
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0933

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 09/09/2026 8:49 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Between Muntham Drive and Smugglers' Lane Chapel Road Barns Green West Sussex
Proposal:	Erection of 31 dwellings with access from Chapel Road including roads, parking and open space.
Case Officer:	Alice Johnson

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 2 Muntham Drive Barns Green Horsham

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 - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Objection to planning application DC/26/0933 Land between Muntham Drive and Smugglers' Lane, Chapel Road, Barns Green From: [REDACTED], 2 Muntham Drive, Barns Green, RH13 0PT I object to this application. I live at 2 Muntham Drive, next to the field the developer wants to build on. My first two points are about things I see from my own house, and I would ask the Council to give them weight for that reason.

1. Our front garden already floods

Whenever we get heavy or sustained rain, water collects on our front garden at 2 Muntham Drive and sits there. It does not run off and it takes a long time to soak away. It happens every time the rain is heavy enough, and it has been happening more often over the years we have lived here. The ground here drains badly and the existing surface water system clearly has no spare capacity for what already lands on it.

The field next to us is open grazed pasture. At the moment it takes a great deal of rain into the ground. The application would cover much of it with roofs, roads, driveways and hard standing, and would put a new hard-surfaced access onto Chapel Road at a spot where flooding has already been photographed.

Rain that currently soaks into that field will instead run off it. The ground downhill of the site includes our property. The drainage scheme put forward with this application is modelled. The water on my garden is something I can walk out and look at, and it is there now, without any of this development. A general assurance that the scheme will manage run-off does not reassure me.

Has the drainage assessment been checked against the flooding that already occurs on Muntham Drive and at the proposed access point, or only against theoretical greenfield run-off rates? If it has only been checked against the theory, it does not describe how this site actually behaves and should not be relied on.

2. Traffic, and in particular the Muntham School taxis

The transport assessment does not describe the traffic I see every day from my house.

Muntham School generates a large daily flow of taxis. They come in during the morning and go out again in the afternoon, one after another, on the same roads at the same times every school day. This is contracted, twice-daily traffic, and it runs on top of the ordinary residential traffic, farm vehicles and commuters cutting through. Those two windows are exactly the times a development of 31 houses would be generating its own trips.

The application adds an estimated 90 further vehicle movements a day, through a new access at a narrow point on Chapel Road where visibility is restricted. At school run times the road already needs drivers to pull in and wait for each other. Putting a new junction into that is a real safety risk for pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and children.

Did the transport assessment count the Muntham School taxi movements? If the baseline traffic survey missed them, or was carried out in the school holidays, the baseline is wrong and so is everything built on it.

This application also has to be looked at together with the neighbouring Miller Homes proposal and the other development coming forward. Each scheme on its own might look manageable. Put them together, as the Council must, and the effect on the village roads would be severe.

3. The Neighbourhood Plan and Policy 26

The Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan (2025) has been made and the Council has confirmed it carries full weight as part of the development plan. It does not allocate this site. The site is outside the Built-up Area Boundary and is countryside for the purposes of Policy 26 of the Local Plan, and the proposal does not meet that policy. Granting permission on an unallocated countryside site so soon after the community finished its plan would make a nonsense of the process residents were asked to take part in.

4. Too many houses, and poor design

The draft Local Plan indicates 25 homes for this site. The applicant wants 31, a 24% increase, with no justification offered. The house designs are generic suburban types and do not meet

the Policy 34 requirement to reinforce the special character of the setting.

5. Infrastructure

Southern Water has not confirmed there is wastewater capacity, and capacity is clearly inadequate as things stand. The electricity network is under strain: homes at the recently built Sumners Fields ran on temporary generators for months. Public transport is infrequent and unreliable, so every household here would depend on the car, adding to the traffic problems in point 2.

6. Heritage and the rural setting

Bennetts, a Grade II listed building close to the site, has no foundations and is at risk of structural damage from construction vibration and from changes to ground and drainage conditions. That risk ties directly to the flooding I describe in point 1. The scheme would also harm the settings of Blacksmith's Cottage, the Queen's Head and other listed buildings. The Neighbourhood Plan's Landscape Character Assessment describes the fields north and west of the village as "important small pastoral fields". This is one of them, and once it is built on it is gone.

7. The housing does not match local need

72% of the affordable units are one and two bedroom, while the Housing Register shows 61% of demand is for three and four bedroom family homes. No registered provider has been secured to deliver or manage the affordable housing. Meanwhile Sumners Fields nearby has unsold homes and construction has stalled. This does not answer a local need.

Conclusion

I object because of what I already see at my own property when it rains and on the road outside when the school taxis come through, both of which this development would make worse, and because the proposal conflicts with the made Neighbourhood Plan and with Local Plan Policies 26 and 34. I ask the Council to refuse permission.

[REDACTED]
2 Muntham Drive
Barns Green
RH13 0PT

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**



Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB

Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton