

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 January 2026 10:54:42 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 29/01/2026 10:54 AM.

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 Old Cottage Worthing Road Dial Post
----------	---

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Other - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	DC/25/2057 - Objection Statement Request: REFUSE or DEFER + RE-CONSULT

I object to this application on the basis that the submission is not transparent, internally consistent, or complete enough to allow the Local Planning Authority (LPA), statutory consultees, or the public to reach an informed decision. The application documents conflict with each other on fundamental parameters (including dwelling numbers, buffer distances, and traffic figures), and key elements are either incomplete, inconsistent, or subject to 'more information' requests from consultees.

This undermines sound planning decision-making and public confidence in the process.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires evidence-led decision-making and that impacts are properly assessed and mitigated. Where the evidence base is contradictory or incomplete, the correct outcome is refusal or, at minimum, deferral until corrected information is published and the public are re-consulted.

Fundamental internal inconsistencies and contradictions (with document references)

Conflicting descriptions of the development (65 dwellings vs 68 dwellings; wrong authority):

- Lighting Assessment (Baseline Survey) describes 'approximately 65 dwellings' and refers to submission to 'West Sussex County Council' (not the Local Planning Authority).
- Lighting Design Report also describes 'approximately 65 dwellings'.
- Planning Statement is expressly for '68 dwellings'.

Why this matters: if baseline assumptions and scope are inconsistent, technical conclusions about impacts and mitigation cannot be relied upon.

Conflicting traffic figures within air quality evidence (formally queried by HDC Environmental Health):

- Environmental Health identifies two different traffic generation figures (341 vs 329) and requests clarification and re-working of damage cost methodology, recommending 'More Information'.

Why this matters: where the Council's own specialist consultee requests corrections, the application is not ready for determination.

Environmental 'mitigation' must not be double-counted

Key point: Environmental mitigation must be additional, real, and

deliverable-not simply a relabelling of measures already required by Building Regulations or baseline expectations.

- HDC Environmental Health state EV charging points (required via Building Regulations) and standard cycle provision are not accepted as additional mitigation.

Objection: the applicant must not be permitted to claim mitigation by double-counting measures that would be required anyway.

Request: require a corrected, itemised and deliverable mitigation package (including costings and delivery mechanism) that provides genuine additional benefit beyond baseline compliance.

Biodiversity Net Gain must be secured for 30 years by a binding delivery mechanism

BNG is not a 'nice intention'; it must be a legally durable outcome.

Objection: any BNG strategy must be secured as a 30-year commitment through a binding delivery mechanism, including: final habitat plan(s), monitoring and reporting schedule, named responsibilities, funding arrangements, and a 30-year Habitat Management and Maintenance Plan capable of enforcement.

Request: refuse or defer unless a decision-ready BNG Delivery Plan is provided, explicitly showing how the 30-year commitment will be secured and enforced.

Culverted watercourse works: insufficient detail to assess flood risk and ecological outcomes locally and downstream

The proposal includes drainage works and works to an existing culverted watercourse. Such works can materially affect flood risk on-site and downstream (blockage risk, exceedance routing, maintenance access), water quality and sediment impacts, and ecological function.

Objection: the submission does not presently provide the transparent detail needed to understand and test the real impacts of altering a culverted system, including downstream consequences.

This concern is heightened because downstream this catchment drains into a nationally and internationally recognised landscape, including one of the world's most high-profile rewilding projects (Knepp). Changes to water flow, silt load, and pollution pathways do not stop at the red line boundary.

Request: defer/refuse unless the application provides: full engineering detail of culvert/watercourse works; exceedance

routing plan and maintenance/access arrangements; construction method controls (silt/debris); and a credible assessment of downstream consequences.

Drainage and saturated local environment: foul capacity may exist, but surface water must be managed sustainably and realistically

Southern Water state there is adequate foul capacity for the development, but also stress that surface water must not be discharged into the foul sewer, and SuDS adoption/maintenance must be secured in perpetuity where not adopted.

Objection: in an area with saturated ground and recurring winter flooding on local roads, the submission must demonstrate that runoff will not increase flood risk locally or downstream-and that maintenance is secured for the long term.

Request: the LPA must ensure: no inappropriate surface water connections; a robust SuDS strategy (including exceedance routing); and a legally enforceable maintenance/adoption mechanism in perpetuity.

Landscape and Visual Impact: summer-only photography risks materially understating winter impacts

The LVIA states photographs were taken in summer conditions when leaf cover provides the greatest screening.

Objection: assessing visibility only at the height of summer risks materially understating year-round impacts. In winter, when leaf cover is lowest, the scheme may be substantially more visible and visual harm more acute.

At best this is a serious oversight; at worst it risks materially understating impacts and misinforming the planning balance.

Request: update the LVIA with winter (leaf-off) verification viewpoints (and verified photomontages where appropriate) and re-consult.

Missing / incomplete documentation prevents an informed decision and fair public scrutiny

The Planning Statement lists a suite of technical documents that must be available for meaningful scrutiny. Where documents are missing, inconsistent, or uploaded late, it prevents informed comment and undermines procedural fairness.

At minimum, the LPA should confirm that the following are publicly

available, final and consistent before any determination:

- Any outstanding or revised Air Quality evidence addressing Environmental Health's 'More Information' request (including corrected trip totals and damage cost workings).
- A final, consistent Lighting Assessment that matches the correct development description and provides lux contours tied to ecological receptors (bats/woodland edge).
- WSCC Highways formal consultation response (and RSA documentation) and LLFA drainage consultation response.
- A decision-ready BNG Delivery Plan secured for 30 years with monitoring and governance.
- Full detail of culvert/watercourse works and downstream impact controls.

Given the above, I request that Horsham District Council:

- 1) REFUSE the application due to inadequate and inconsistent supporting evidence and unresolved consultee concerns; OR
- 2) At the very least, DEFER determination until:
 - all key documents are publicly available, corrected and consistent;
 - outstanding 'More Information' matters are resolved (especially Environmental Health); and
 - a full re-consultation is undertaken so the public have fair time to scrutinise and fact-check the corrected submission.

Closing

Barns Green is not an abstract development site. It is a lived landscape, with real winter flooding, real dark skies, real hedgerows and woodland edges that form part of the village's identity and ecological function.

A scheme of this scale must be judged with full openness and clarity, not on a shifting, contradictory evidence base. Approving an application where core documents conflict on basic facts-and where material assessments are challenged by the Council's own consultees-would not be sound planning.

It would feel like residents are being asked to accept what they are not allowed to properly see, test, or trust.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



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