

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 28 January 2026 21:13
To: Planning
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 28/01/2026 9:13 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:	1 Muntham Drive Barns Green Horsham, West Sussex
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I am writing to formally object to the proposed housing development (68 dwellings) on land off Chapel Road / north of Little Slaughterford. Having reviewed the application material and the concerns raised in consultee and resident submissions, I believe the application should be refused or, at minimum, not determined until key evidence gaps are addressed. Below are my principal objections , with references to the submitted materials and issues already identified by the community. 1) Development plan conflict and "speculative" nature of the proposal - Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise, and the 2025 IPC Neighbourhood Plan forms part of the

most up-to-date Development Plan and should carry full statutory weight. The application is being presented as a speculative scheme that conflicts with the community led plan and the sites the community has already accepted for growth.

- The cumulative growth already planned/consented includes the recently completed Sumners Fields site (32 homes) and additional Neighbourhood Plan allocations (50+ homes). The addition of a further 68 homes is described as approaching a ~40% increase within a decade, raising clear cumulative impact concerns.

2) Highways, traffic, safety, and parking impacts are likely to be severe

- Evidence presented states the scheme would introduce at least 100+ additional private vehicles and generate around 39 vehicle movements in each peak hour and roughly 350-400 movements per day, all routed through a single access onto Chapel Road. The cumulative effect (including Sumners Fields) increases queuing at pinch points, heightened pedestrian risk near the primary school, reduced network resilience, and impaired emergency access- concluding the residual cumulative impact would be "severe" in NPPF terms and should be refused on highways grounds.

- The laughable Transport plan inadvertently highlights that bus services are already inadequate, meaning car use is the "only realistic choice" for many trips-so any assumed modal shift is unlikely to be deliverable in practice, increasing traffic and emissions.

- Practical on-the-ground constraints are also raised: narrow road conditions, poor sight lines at the only feasible access, and existing peak-time pressures associated with two schools and the playgroup, plus the need to maintain parking availability for the village shop and Queen's Head.

3) Flood risk and surface water runoff concerns are evidenced and disputed by the applicant

- The site is sloping clay-based soil that does not drain easily, with existing heavy-rain runoff already flowing down towards Chapel Lane/Chapel Road with the village shop having suffered flood damage previously. Building on the field is expected to increase flood risk to adjacent housing and listed buildings (including Bennetts, Blacksmith's Cottage, The Queen's Head, and Little Stammerham).

- The field itself is made of Wealden Clay which is not just "clay". It is also silt stone and there are lenses of sandstone and limestone within it that are permeable. The clay also cracks during the summer and those deep cracks remain, holding water allowing infiltration of water to the rocks below. Recent rain shows how this field puddles in certain seasons with run-off into the adjacent road and Smuggles Lane, but this has been denied to occur by the developers.

- As a household built on the same type of Wealden Clay, I can attest to severe cracking in the dry summer months both on the ground and visible around the house, and significant pooling of water in the wetter months. It should be noted that Sumners Ponds actual ponds have never been topped up, they fill from the groundwater up this will prove more than visible if foundations are every laid.

- The application is challenged directly for claiming "no evidence of flooding," which we have stated is incorrect, and that the developer proposed drainage measures will not guarantee resolution of flooding risk (even before climate change impacts are considered).

- The existing role of hedgerows in drainage management has been widely overlooked in the planning application: hedges act as buffers that hold soil on land, reduce runoff, and help prevent sediment entering drains/watercourses. Removal would therefore worsen runoff and flood risk.

4) Wastewater capacity, sewer flooding/overflows, and lack of a robust cumulative assessment

- There have been documented sewage overflow events in Barns Green: 43 overflow events totalling 411 hours in 2022 (over 17 days of raw sewage discharge). This is presented as evidence that the system "already can't cope," raising concern that further connections would exacerbate pollution and overflow risk.

- This very week properties in Smugglers Way suffered issues with sewage coming up through drains as the system could not cope with the volume of rain passing through it and Southern Water yet again had to make remedial fixes.

- The applicant's foul drainage strategy and/or the relevant response only addresses the immediate connection point (including a specific manhole reference that is factually incorrect highlighting a manhole in Stoke D'Abernon, Surrey TQ12265901 is in the Southern Water response document.) and does not provide evidence on downstream network capacity or

cumulative impacts (including Sumners Fields and other allocated sites). The lack of accuracy in Southern Waters report in even getting the grid reference in the correct county casts doubt on the whole report!

- Wider environmental concerns linked to these overflows, including acknowledgement by Southern Water of current sewage overflows into local rivers are already threatening river restoration efforts further downstream and at Knepp. These would undoubtedly worsen if the development proceeds.
- Similar inaccuracies relate to the Flood Risk Assessment item 5.12.4 which states "The proposed development falls within the Arun and Western Stream Management Catchment for peak river flow and peak rainfall allowances" this is incorrect it should be the Adur and Ouse catchment". The Adur is key as it encompasses eight Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), designated because of their ecological or geological importance. The Adur Estuary SSSI is of particular significance due to its saltmarsh habitat.
- With these inaccuracies both from Southern Water & the Flood Risk Assessment no further discussion should be held on this development until these unbelievable errors are corrected and the true facts presented

5) Irreplaceable habitats: ancient hedgerow removal, ancient woodland impacts, and inadequate buffer/footpath proposals

- The proposal relies on removal of an ancient "important" hedgerow along the site edge (Chapel Road) to enable access/sight lines and possible road widening, which would destroy established habitat and remove a key landscape feature that contributes to rural character and ecology.
- The site also adjoins ancient semi-natural woodland, and submissions argue the proposal conflicts with national policy protection for irreplaceable habitats and that the proposed 15m buffer is inadequate given sensitive species presence (including dormice), drainage sensitivities, and increased recreational pressure.
- A particularly concern is the proposed routing of a footpath through the buffer zone, which is said to create a "desire line" leading to regular incursion into ancient woodland (including by dogs and children), with predictable indirect deterioration effects (trampling, pets predation/disturbance, lighting and pollution, and hydrological changes).

6) Deliverability, housing mix, and credibility/accuracy concerns in submitted information

- The submissions note that the Council's Housing Officers (15 January 2026) do not support the development as presented and require reassurance on delivery and reconsideration of affordable tenure.
- HDC also challenged the housing mix: objections state the affordable housing offer is heavily weighted to 2-bedroom units (76%), while the Housing Register indicates 61% of demand is for 3-4 bedroom family homes, with families waiting significantly longer-suggesting the scheme is not aligned with the stated need.
- The key technical documents contain inaccuracies or inconsistencies-most notably Environmental Health identifying "significant errors" in the Air Quality Assessment (including inconsistent traffic figures and incorrect damage cost calculations), and that "more information" is required.
- In addition, there are electricity infrastructure constraints: The Energy Statement confirms all 68 homes will rely on air source heat pumps (a significant electrical load), yet no grid capacity assessment or consultation with UK Power Networks is evidenced; It should be noted that nearby homes requiring a backup diesel generator due to local network reliability concerns.

7) Social Impact

- The loss of this field would result in the loss of the village's key charity events; the Vintage Car Rally which is held every August in that field raising money for St Catherine's Hospice, and also Run Barns Green which uses the field for parking on race day in September. [REDACTED] and unless they can find an alternate field within walking distance the event would not be logistically possible to put on.

Given the above, I respectfully request that the Council either:

1. Refuses the application due to Development Plan conflict and the scale of adverse impacts (highways, flooding, wastewater, and irreplaceable habitats), and/or
2. At minimum, defers determination until the outstanding evidence gaps and community requests are fully addressed-particularly around air quality errors, wastewater network capacity (including cumulative assessment), and electricity network capacity.

It should be noted that as a household we do not oppose development, we support it in the areas identified in the Neighbourhood Plan but the plan for this land off Chapel Road would fundamentally change the whole village with little benefit (if any) being brought to the community. Historic woodlands and hedges would be destroyed never to return and a green buffer from the village would be lost. I don't want to be someone who has to explain to my grandchildren "Why is it called Barns Green when it isn't green!"

[REDACTED]

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