

To: Planning@horsham.gov.uk – Case Officer: Alice Johnson
Planning Application: DC/25/2057 – Land North of Little Slaughterford
Commenter: [REDACTED]
Address: South Cottage, Chapel Road, Barns Green, RH13 0PR
Phone: [REDACTED]
Date: Thu 05 February 2026
Commenter type: Member of the Public
Stance: Object to the Planning Application

Dear Sir/Madam

I write to object to Planning Application DC/25/2057 Land North of Little Slaughterford, Chapel Road.

Introductory comments

The Parish of Itchingfield is not inherently against development – as evinced by the two developments in Barns Green built in recent years – The Ashmiles, on Two Mile Ash Road; and Sumner’s Fields, on Chapel Road.

Furthermore, Itchingfield Parish took the constructive approach toward development of creating a Neighbourhood Plan, which was made in September 2025, and from which the site of Sumner’s Fields was one allocation – tangible evidence of my assertion above.

However, DC/25/2057 proposes the **wrong** development in the **wrong** place.

Barns Green is a vibrant rural village with a thriving community.

The scale, design, location of the proposed development, and consequences, if the development were permitted, would have grave & irreversible, negative impact, concerning relevant material themes which I elaborate on below.

In doing so, I will focus my own comments and observations on **Design** and **Planning Policy**.

I am mindful that a great many people have submitted objections to DC/25/2057 on a range of other relevant material themes – I share those concerns also, and urge the Planning Officer to read all representations carefully to appreciate the full and detailed range of valid comments.

Before coming to Design and Planning Policy comments, I would like to raise a few significant concerns about the application and supporting documents.

Reliability & Suitability of Supporting Documents as evidence for the Application

In reviewing the Planning Application Documents for Reference Supporting Documents, what I found leads me to question their reliability as a basis on which Horsham District Council Planning Officers may rely to evaluate and determine this Application.

I found errors & inaccuracies in several documents which reveal, variously, instances of inadequate attention to detail, lack of care in compiling the information contained, misunderstanding, and in one case, a disregard of the concept of independent review and approval of a document.

These findings alone are significant cause for concern and call into question the legitimacy of a decision by anyone making a determination which is reliant on review of the documents' contents.

However, it also calls into question the degree of care taken by the Applicant, in reviewing materials they had commissioned to support their application, prior to submitting these documents. Would they take the same approach in building such a development?

I provide below, for the convenience of the Officer/s reviewing the Application, a summary of the issues I have found while reading the Documents. There may be more, buried among the substantial amount of Supporting Document material which has been submitted.

Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Statement 0018-B, REV01, TS Wood Consulting

- i. This 243 page document was marked as having been Prepared, Reviewed and Approved by the same person. For a document of this size and complexity, it is very poor practice not to seek independent review, and approval respectively, by additional people. It seems the consultant has left the Developer the task of making such a review, releasing for comment on 22 September, and subsequently making the first issue on 23 September, one day later.
- ii. 5.12.4 The proposed development falls within the Arun and Western Stream Management Catchment for peak river flow and peak rainfall allowances – Barns Green is outside the Arun and Western Stream Management Catchment, being instead in the catchment to the Adur. This is a fundamental failure of geography, meaning that the document and any conclusions it draws must be regarded as, at best, sloppy, and at worst, potentially deeply misleading. Since the FRA&SWDS is such a key document on which to rely in defence of the application, it must be held to the highest standards of rigour.

WSCC HIGHWAYS RESPONSE

WSCC Highways in their section Accessibility and Travel Plan (TP) open with the following

‘The site is located within 400m of bus stops serving the hourly no 9 service’

No such bus route serves the mentioned bus stop; and of the buses that do, none operate an hourly service; Compass Travel does not even operate a no 9 service in their network.

Inclusion of this fantasy bus route, at a dreamed-off frequency, creates an altogether more rosy Impression of the public transport connectivity of Barns Green to Horsham and other areas for those without access to a car. The bus services that *are* routed through Barns Green make bus travel Impractical as a sustained method of travel for work for most people.

The above renders the factual basis of this response suspect – how do we know that, for example, the traffic flow information cited in the Network Capacity section is correct. The

number of AM & PM peak hours vehicular trips, for example, seems very low by comparison to the number of cars and commute traffic we might expect a site of this size and composition to generate. Are WSCC looking at the correct dataset? This then brings into question any conclusions which draw from modelling where these figures are part of the input assumptions.

SOUTHERN WATER RESPONSE

Southern Water have referred to the wrong manhole in relation to their section Sufficient capacity Foul.

"For the above development at manhole reference TQ12265901."

This OS reference relates to a location in Stoke D'Abernon, near Leatherhead. This location is nearly 27 miles away. We cannot rely on any conclusions that SW present in their response document, since that would reference a completely different flow regime

Energy Statement

5.5 Wind Power - "Results for postcode "GU9"

Barns Green, RH13 is the correct postcode outward section.

Another instance where, if we see one such error, what confidence can we have in the thorough and diligent gathering and interpretation of information

Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal: DD715LVIA, REV A

This document references 'Chapel Road in West Barnes [sic]' on page 2. West Barnes, near Wimbledon in London, is around 30 miles from Barn Green.

On the same page, it references '**urban** drainage systems'. Barns Green is a rural village, so hardly suitable for urban drainage systems.

These errors are further examples of reports being compiled without thorough checking of the contents. Such fundamental errors should have been picked up, as this document does have a checker independent of the writer. What does this say about the trust we can place in the presented technical information, if simple and obvious points are missed at review?

Design

The claim by Miller Homes on **page 4** of their **Design and Access Statement** is of a vision “to create a place which is sensitive to its landscape setting and which will create an attractive residential environment where people will aspire to live”.

The building density of the proposed development is 35.9 dph. Compare this with Sumner’s Fields, on land at its closest point about 70 metres to the South of the site of DC/25/2057, and the nearest neighbouring recent development in Barns Green, which has a dwelling density of 16.8 dwellings per hectare. So DC/25/2057 conceives a site at a density of twice that which was considered acceptable in a development a stones throw away. In fact, a density of 39.9 dph is aggressive, even by the density rates of typical of nearby *urban* centres. Barns Green is set in a *rural* Parish.

The site of DC/25/2057 is a green field, which lies outwith the Built-Up Area Boundary in Barns Green. Its immediate neighbouring properties are Bennetts to the North, Blacksmith’s Cottage to the North East, The Queen’s Head Public House, Heron’s Reach and Barn’s Green Village Store and Post Office to the East, and to the South, Little Slaughterford. These are, variously, historic and/or listed buildings, including examples of Sussex vernacular. The housing stock envisioned in DC/25/2057 makes no effort to reference these design cues, preferring a generic build mix which could be found in any urban development.

Altogether, the Design of DC/25/2057 is wholly unsuitable, both in terms of location, scale (density and building dimension) and character. This Application proposes a development which lifted from the interior of Crawley, and dropped into a field in Barns Green. For all the above reasons, it would absolutely not be ‘sensitive to its landscape setting’.

Planning policy

In September 2025, the Itchingfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan was put to Referendum. The Referendum result saw more than 92% of the vote cast **in favour** of the proposed Neighbourhood Plan. The Plan was duly made, and therefore has legal status in considerations relating to relevant Planning Applications.

The site proposed in DC/25/2057 falls foul of **Policy 1** of the Itchingfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan – Green Infrastructure conservation, failing to propose measure to conserve, maintain or enhance the green infrastructure, make provision to produce additional green infrastructure, or seek to improve access for pedestrian and cyclists through green infrastructure linkages.

It also impinges on **Policy 5** – Protection of Green Infrastructure, among which provisions requiring a development to ‘protect and enhance the green infrastructure and valued landscape features’ including ‘3. Hedgerows;’ and ‘4. Copses and woods, ancient woodlands and veteran trees;’.

What the application would succeed in doing, if granted, would be to significantly reduce an extant area of greenfield; to rip out an ancient and ‘important’ hedgerow, currently teeming with life and doing very nicely – which the proposed new-planted ‘replacement’ cannot, by definition, rival in terms of diversity and maturity; and to increase not only the ratio of built-on land to greenfield, but also, of road to greenfield in the village.

And to the rear of the site, the ancient woodland is granted the bare legal minimum margin from the edge of the development. It is difficult to imagine that the imposition of such a huge development, including the disturbance of ground during the building process, will have no ill effects on the groundwater and soil conditions in which the nearby trees’ root systems are established.

The proposal described in DC/25/2057 fails the required tests of Policy 1 and Policy 5, and pays lipservice to attempts at mitigation.

Policy 12 of the Itchingfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan – Design Parameters, requires 10 characteristics which, complied with, would mean that a proposal satisfies this Policy.

I have illustrated in the previous section (Design) how the site described in DC/25/2057 violates most of these provisions.

To enumerate, as briefly as possible, the provisions include (abbreviated): 1 (design and layout); 2 (contribute positively / sense of place); 3 (respect character and scale of surrounding buildings); 4 (protect open spaces ... that contribute to the character of the area); 5 (protect the identity and character of Barns Green and Itchingfield); 6 (do not cause harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents – privacy, outlook, *inter alia*); 7 (safe, accessible and well connected environments); 8 (protect existing landscape features and contribute to Green Infrastructure network); 10 (positively respond to the local vernacular of the parish).

The site proposed in DC/25/2057 contravenes **Aim 10** of the Itchingfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan – ‘Increase of traffic, for which significant increases in traffic movements which have a disproportionately adverse effect on the Parish as a whole or the locality surrounding the development’.

For a development of 68 dwellings of this character, it would be reasonable to factor as a minimum, somewhere between 68 & 136 vehicles making egress from or ingress to the site over the morning and evening commute periods. This, by itself, will be a significant increase to vehicle volume during the peak activity times. However, it is compounded by the location of the site entrance, directly opposite the Village Shop. Parking is already nose to tail at busy times, constricting the road, and through-traffic,

using Chapel Road as part of a cut-through between Horsham and villages to the South and West of Barns Green, and commute traffic of pre-existing developments East of Chapel Road) when combined with peak time residential traffic from/for DC/25/2057, would increase both congestion and road safety exposure enormously.

The location is a bad choice to site a junction in anticipation of the known and projected traffic loads. The siting would lead to increase in risk and severity of accidents and resulting degree of injury or worse.

With all the above points in mind then, it is no surprise that, although the field that the Application refers to was put forward by the then owner during the Neighbourhood Plan Call for Sites, it was assessed using the same criteria which all the other proposed sites were subject to, and on the basis of that, was not allocated. Indeed, the public response during Consultation on the Call for Sites candidates stage of the Neighbourhood Plan evoked the same widespread opposition for this site that it does among the Community.

I observe that **Policy 10 – Old School site, Itchingfield**, a site allocated in the Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan with the idea of accommodating around 20 dwellings, has not been taken on by a developer. Having had 2 significant developments in the Barns Green village area in recent years, and with the Policy 10 site allocated and available, to allow DC/15/2057 would violate Policy 10 by preferring another (unallocated) site.

In summary, regarding Planning Policy, It is important to note that the Itchingfield Parish Neighbourhood Plan is 'in general conformance' with the provisions of the Current Local Plan (the Horsham District Planning Framework), having been written with periodic discussion with HDC during the process.

Thank you for your kind attention.

I urge Horsham District Council to **reject** DC/25/2057 Land North of Little Slaughterford, Chapel Road

Regards

