
Sent: 17 June 2026 20:30
To: Planning
Subject: DC/25/2057 – Land North of Little Slaughterford

Categories: Comments Received

3 Muntham Drive
Barns Green
West Sussex
RH13 0PT

17 June 2026

Re: Formal Objection to Planning Application [DC/25/2057] – Land North of Little Slaughterford

Dear Planning Officer,

I write to formally and strongly object to the above-referenced planning application. This letter sets out in detail the multiple serious grounds on which this application should be refused. I urge Horsham District Council to reject it in its entirety.

1. Wholly Inadequate Sewage and Wastewater Treatment Capacity

The most critical and overriding ground of objection is the demonstrably inadequate capacity of Barns Green Sewage Works (BGSW). Despite this, Southern Water (SW) have repeatedly provided misleading information to planning authorities, claiming that sufficient capacity exists to accommodate additional flows — regardless of circumstances. This pattern of misrepresentation must be challenged and cannot be allowed to go unchecked.

The following points set out the reality of the situation:

1. We hold documentary evidence, including photographs, confirming that BGSW is already overloaded and regularly overflows into Parsons Brook, causing widespread and serious pollution. The works cannot cope with existing demand.
2. The proposed foul water and sewage from the Miller Homes development would only increase the frequency and severity of these overflows. Yet Southern Water have asserted that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate these new homes. This claim is without credible foundation.
3. Expert calculations have demonstrated that the equipment and tanks at BGSW are insufficient to meet current demand. Critically, Southern Water's assessment of capacity for the Miller Homes development takes no account of already-approved additional sewage flows —

including those from the Park Homes extension above Cross Lane in Brooks Green. Yet Southern Water have again stated there is sufficient capacity.

4. In a further and extraordinary claim, Southern Water have separately stated that BGSW also has sufficient capacity to accept sewage flows from an additional large housing development on land to the north west of Southwater. This claim compounds the concern that SW's assessments bear no relation to engineering reality.
5. Most recently, and most incredulously, Southern Water have stated that BGSW can also accommodate the sewage flows resulting from their own planned closure of the treatment works at Bashurst Hill. This is simply not credible.

Taken together, these statements by Southern Water can only be intended to mislead planning authorities and to allow SW to avoid their statutory obligations to provide adequate sewage treatment capacity. The Council should treat Southern Water's capacity assessments with the utmost scepticism and seek fully independent verification before reaching any decision.

Furthermore, it is now known that Southern Water's latest proposal would redirect additional sewage to BGSW following the planned closure of the Itchingfield facility. This new and significant information has not been adequately assessed as part of this application. Any planning decision made without full consideration of this development would be fundamentally flawed.

I urge the Council to refuse this application, or at minimum defer any decision until an independent and comprehensive assessment of wastewater capacity has been completed and the necessary infrastructure improvements are in place and funded.

2. Traffic, Parking and Highway Safety

The proposed development would result in significant harm to the local highway network and village amenity:

- The loss of suitable parking serving the village shop and public house would cause serious inconvenience to existing users and could threaten the viability of these valued community facilities.
- The proposed access road layout would create a confusing and potentially dangerous junction arrangement that is not appropriate for this rural setting.
- The substantial volume of new traffic generated by the development would congest the narrow country lanes in and around the village, which are wholly unsuited to absorb significant additional vehicle movements.
- Public transport provision in the area is limited, making car dependency near-inevitable for future residents and compounding the highway impact.

3. Flooding and Surface Water Drainage

The development site is already subject to existing flooding issues. The introduction of hard surfaces, roofs, driveways and roads across this greenfield site will significantly increase the speed and volume of surface water runoff, worsening flooding for existing residents and the wider catchment.

4. Loss of Wildlife Habitat and Natural Environment

The development would result in the permanent loss of valuable wildlife habitat, including ancient hedgerows of significant ecological importance. These habitats, once destroyed, cannot be replaced.

The Council should not be persuaded by Miller Homes' recent presentation materials, which have attempted to minimise these impacts with illustrative depictions of 'wildflower meadows'. These are superficial representations that do not reflect the scale of ecological loss that would result from this

development. The Council should require rigorous, independently verified ecological assessments and not rely on the applicant's own promotional materials.

5. Loss of Village Amenity and Community Use

The application site includes land that is currently available for and used by the community for local events and charitable activities. Its loss to residential development would represent a permanent reduction in the amenity available to existing village residents, with no adequate mitigation or replacement proposed.

6. Heritage, Character and Design

The proposed development would cause serious harm to the character and appearance of the village and its setting, including:

- Significant adverse impact on listed buildings and the heritage pastoral landscape that contributes to the distinctive character of this rural village.
- An overdevelopment of the site with house designs that are imposingly tall and a density of development that would urbanise what is currently open countryside.
- House designs that are inappropriate in scale, mass and character for a sensitive rural village setting.

7. Housing Mix, Deliverability and Policy Compliance

Concerns regarding the housing mix and the deliverability of the proposed development have been raised by Horsham District Council's own Housing Officers. These concerns from the Council's professional officers should be given significant weight.

Furthermore, and critically, the development site lies outside the Built-up Area Boundary (BUAB) and is defined as 'Countryside' in the development plan. Council policy is clear that development in the countryside should only be permitted where it is essential. No such case has been made or demonstrated here. This application conflicts directly with established Countryside Policy and should be refused on this basis alone.

Conclusion

This application fails on multiple, independent grounds — each of which alone could justify refusal. Taken together, they present an overwhelming case for rejection. I call upon Horsham District Council to:

- Refuse this application outright; and
- Commission or require an independent assessment of wastewater treatment capacity, informed by all approved and proposed developments in the catchment area, before any further applications in this area are considered.

I trust the Council will give full and proper weight to these objections and act in the interests of the existing community and the local environment.

Yours faithfully,

