

[REDACTED]
Sent: 06 February 2026 17:59
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; Alice.Johnson [REDACTED]

Subject: Planning Application DC/25/2057 Location: Land North of Little Slaughterford, Chapel Road, Barns Green

West Sussex County Council Highways Authority County Hall Chichester West Sussex PO19 1RQ

By email to [REDACTED]

Dear Mr Jamie Brown

CHALLENGE TO HIGHWAYS CONSULTATION RESPONSE Application DC/25/2057 – Chapel Road, Barns Green

I am writing as a resident of Barns Green to raise serious concerns about the West Sussex County Council Highways consultation response dated 30 January 2026 regarding the above planning application.

I believe the assessment contains significant factual inaccuracies and omissions that should be corrected before this response is relied upon by the Local Planning Authority.

1. BUS SERVICE – FACTUALLY INCORRECT CLAIM

Your response states:

"The site is located within 400m of bus stops serving the hourly no 9 service which provides onward connections to destinations such as Storrington, Horsham and Christ's Hospital."

This statement is factually incorrect. The No.9 bus service is NOT hourly. As a resident who has lived here for 16 years, I can confirm the actual timetable is:

Day Number of Buses Notes

Monday 4 First ~07:00, last return ~16:35

Tuesday 8 First ~07:00, last return ~16:35

Wednesday 2 Only 07:00 and 16:57 – effectively useless

Thursday 8 First ~07:00, last return ~16:35

Friday 4 First ~07:00, last return ~16:35

Saturday 0 No service

Sunday 0 No service

Evenings 0 No service after ~16:35 any day

This is not an "hourly service." On Wednesdays, there are only two buses the entire day. There is no evening service any day of the week and no weekend service at all.

The applicant's Transport Assessment appears to have misrepresented the bus service, and this inaccuracy has been carried into your consultation response without verification.

I request that you issue a corrected response acknowledging the actual bus service frequency.

2. CUMULATIVE TRAFFIC IMPACT NOT ASSESSED

NPPF paragraph 116 requires assessment of "the potential cumulative impacts of development" on the road network.

Your response assesses:

- The site access junction
- The immediate Chapel Road junction

It does not assess cumulative impact from:
Development Homes Status
Sumners Field 32 Recently completed
Neighbourhood Plan allocations 50+ In adopted plan
This application 68 Under consideration
TOTAL 150+ Combined impact not assessed

Chapel Road is a rural lane through a small village. Adding 150+ homes over a short period will have a materially greater impact than each development assessed in isolation.

I request that cumulative impact is properly assessed as required by NPPF paragraph 116.

3. RESIDENT CONCERNS DISMISSED WITHOUT RESPONSE

Your response states:

"We are aware that there has been concern representations from amongst local residents... we do not consider there is any requirement for the applicant to provide further justification."

This dismisses legitimate concerns without explaining what assessment was undertaken or how specific issues were considered. Residents have raised detailed concerns about:

- Bottleneck at pub/shop junction – Already difficult to navigate at busy times
- Loss of parking – Threatens viability of Queen's Head pub and village shop
- Highway Code compliance – At least two parking spaces shown appear to violate the 10m junction rule
- Alternative junction design – Mini roundabout at Hordens would be safer and retain parking

These are material highway safety concerns that deserve substantive response, not blanket dismissal.

4. MODAL SHIFT ASSUMPTIONS ARE FANTASY

The applicant's Transport Assessment relies on a "Vision Scenario" assuming significant modal shift away from private cars. In a village where:

- The bus service is effectively non-existent (2 buses on Wednesdays)
- There is no evening or weekend public transport
- 81% of residents drive to work (applicant's own data)
- Christ's Hospital station is 3.7km away (too far to walk/cycle regularly)

...the assumption that residents will shift to sustainable modes is unrealistic. Virtually every household will need at least one car, most will need two.

Your assessment appears to have accepted the applicant's optimistic projections without critical scrutiny.

5. REQUEST FOR REVISED RESPONSE

I formally request that WSCC Highways:

1. Issues a corrected response acknowledging the actual bus service frequency (NOT hourly)
2. Assesses cumulative traffic impact from Sumners Field, Neighbourhood Plan allocations, and this application combined
3. Provides substantive response to the specific resident concerns about the pub/shop junction, parking, and alternative junction designs
4. Reconsiders the "no objection" in light of the above

If you are not willing to revise your response, please confirm in writing:

- Why the incorrect bus service claim does not affect your assessment
- Why cumulative impact assessment is not required
- What consideration was given to the specific resident concerns

CONCLUSION

I am not suggesting the Highways Authority acted improperly. However, your response contains a factual error

regarding bus services that could mislead the Planning Committee, and it fails to assess cumulative traffic impact as required by national policy.

I request a response at your earliest convenience, and ideally before Horsham District Council determines this application.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.