
From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 30 January 2026 18:37
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 30/01/2026 6:36 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:	Sandhills Sandhills Road Barns Green Horsham West Sussex
----------	--

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 - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I object to this application. The Village People Having arrived in Barns Green (BG) 6 years ago, attracted by the rural location and a grade 2 listed property. I encountered post lockdown, a very diverse and multi layered community with vibrant and inclusive local activities available to all, certainly not a dormitory satellite of unconnected commuters. This can be seen and captured on a single day (the same has happened each year for over 42 years) when 220+ volunteers and the cooperation of the

whole village and support of HDC enable the 4th Best Half Marathon in the UK to be held. (The field identified for unplanned development has for 40 years provided parking and accesses for thousands of participants). Raising money for charities and tens of thousands for local groups each year, which are the true local "Assets of Community Value". Apart from this one-day, what links and serves the diverse elements of BG inhabitants and I believe in planning terms makes BG a "village" are the two Assets of Community Value whose commercial viability is threatened by this development, both during and after planned completion.

Whose plan is it anyway?

Application DC/25/2057 is outside of Horsham's adopted development plan (being previously assessed as an undeliverable site, its recent reclassification is currently obscured, but now the subject of a freedom of information request) and outside the approved Neighborhood development plan, which received 94% approval in a plebiscite. It is well known there are brown field alternatives that are in plan, which could be progressed to meet housing needs. HDC planning dept stated "Housing Officers cannot support this site until reassured can be provided that delivery is possible, and the affordable tenure is reconsidered". The mix of properties and how they are to be made commercially available does not match HDC housing needs plan for the area.

The design and layout of the individual dwellings are not additive to a Sussex village streetscape as would be expected in such a prominent central location, taking on no more than a thin veneer of High Weald design aesthetics. Example such as plot 1 which directly faces the Queens Head has a designed elevation of 8.2m and will dominate the once "rural" view.



It also appears to be outside of all the major infrastructure providers' medium-term plans. Electrical supply is insufficient to service the few occupants of "in plan" Sumners Fields development (34 homes), with 600lt of diesel fumes being released weekly while out of sync plans realign. Resolution timing unknown.

Rainwater plans, Weald clay brings its own challenges and there have been several investments following previous village flooding episodes. The on-field plans look to have taken this into account, downstream though is unclear, as the evaluation referenced the Arun and not the Adur catchment. This is of great concern as the proposed over development at a greater elevation than the village.

Foul waste processing capacity is insufficient for the current village without causing nearly 50 spills a year in the local water course, being upstream from Knepp Rewilding, this should be a concern not to further impact a world leading eco-site. The assessment provided contradicts this view, but is based on a report noting capacity at a grid reference in Stoke D'Abernon. I can only assume that a land speculator from Glasgow and Builder from Edinburgh, lack local knowledge to challenge some advice purchased.

The only plan I can be certain of containing and desiring this development is Miller M2 Ltd (the middleman) financial plan, having speculated £2.7m on a single field which has a farming value circa £200k.

Assets of community value

Beyond the Schools, clubs and societies that provide the pulse to BG village life, there are a hand full of community assets that are available to serve all villagers in a commercial capacity, while supporting clubs / societies and charitable endeavors etc. Thus, reduce the need for car journeys at the same time as enabling a multi layered community to come together. Two of these highly valued community assets, the Shop/Post Office and the Public house, will be directly at risk from the planned disruption (duration will no doubt be dictated finances) and the ultimate development to the extent that they would be no longer commercially viable. We have noted from Sumner Fields (half the size of the development currently proposed by Miller and on a brown field site) that the lapsed building time has more than doubled from the promised disruption time, as the struggling developer matches spending and cash outflow with slowed housing market. The proposed over development will dramatically change the aspect from rural to housing estate, impacting parking, and adding a misplaced road junction directly opposite these two assets, as driven by a financial plan, rather than new resident needs or a community enhancement focus.

What's wrong with Barns Green

Sewers overflowing has been mentioned enough, and excessive ground water management during high rainfall.

BG cannot support children's football clubs for lack of a pitch for many years. Near-term BG

Rugby also will be without a pitch, and currently they trek 500m from changing rooms to the ground and remain invisible to the rest of the village. A field close to the centre would solve these needs.

Road safety and traffic is a concern, there is ongoing much appreciated WIP here, but this would need rethinking if the proposal were to be approved out of plan. Approach roads are what you would expect for a 900-year-old village, with national speed limit dropping to 30mph. A daily convoy of taxis to Muntham School and local primary school access creates the local mini rush hour. The daily run of heavily laden trucks to a building site is of concern to all List buildings owners with no foundations, and for parents take primary children to school. Any Public service to reduce car usage remains financially non-viable and unrealistic, therefore retaining community assets that reduce journeys are key.

There are no reliable non-car-based transport options currently available, even the heavily used short route to Christ Hospital station has no safe cycle or footpath route.

Tallest structure in BG is a mobile telecommunications mast that remains unconnected 6+ years to anyone's network, fitted with now defunct Huawei equipment that must be removed from service by 2027 by law, assuming it was ever be commissioned. Will anyone address this?

This Development does nothing to enhance BG, address any of its needs, but it does threaten by mislocating and over development two key community assets viability and the village ability to function as an interconnected community.

Affordability gap & the Middleman

The aim of providing affordable homes and especially 3-4 beds available via the rental market, seem deemed never to be reconciled with small-scale rural developments and high margin driven organisations. Using actual current figures for BG (freely available on Right Move), properties on the Sumners Field development are being marketed even post price reductions from initial offer prices at 18-22% above the average price per sqm of sold and offered for sale equivalent properties in the rest of BG. In short out of reach of most private buyers and not viable for housing associations with the current cost of borrowing and unattractive to the buy-to-let market. Why are prices so high? New build costs validated against lower insurance rebuild costs at the top end of the range for Sussex are circa £3k sqm, while Sumners Fields' prices are £5.6-5.8k per sqm.

Without getting into history, this is a UK market condition, with high returns on capital attracting UK and overseas investors, generally better skilled in financial management than house building.

Miller by name, but not related, were we meant to think otherwise? Miller M2 Ltd is a UK company privately owned by M2 Group Ltd & its hand full of UK directors. While unrelated other than this transaction is Miller Homes Ltd, owned by the US giant Apollo Global Management Inc worth a mere \$76bn.

What is in it for them? M2 Group Ltd, made £32.2m PBT over last 2 reported years with just 10 employees, a very effect organisation where the only added value is flipping farm fields to land with planning consent. Whilst Miller Homes made £300m PBT with 1,123 employees in the same period, where the added value is the building of 7,173 homes.

A £200k farming field with planning permission will be sold circa £10m to the house builder, who based on average gross profit levels will sell onto individual home for collective sum of circa £12.5m adding on average £185k to the price of each property.

This Development does not address housing needs and is part of a cycle where supper normal profits drive commercial organisation to lose focus on effective provision of the most basis of needs. How does HDC plan to influence this cycle to meet housing needs?

If it must go ahead, What should be changed?

M2 Group Ltd have speculated £2.7m it must go ahead.

- Reduced the footprint as it is too large, to Circa 25 homes which directly match the housing needs.
- Move the entrance to opposite the The Hordens and include a mini roundabout for traffic calming.
- Change the design to one that reflects the buildings adjacent.
- Extend the 15m wildlife protection of the historic woodlands to Smugglers' Lane, with no access to either.
- Do not commence till Elec and Sewerage provision is proven to be available
- Compensate both the Queens Head and Shop for lost trade quarterly during construction.
- Enhance the view and amenities from the QH and Shop from what is currently proposed.

Better still, build what's needed by utilising in Plan brown field sites.

I recommend refusing this planning request.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted Signature]

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 Eaton