

[REDACTED]

Sent: 03 February 2026 20:03
To: Planning
Subject: DC/25/2057 Land North of Little Slaughterford,
Categories: Comments Received

OBJECTION: DC/25/2057 Land North of Little Slaughterford, Chapel Road, Barns Green. Horsham

[REDACTED]
Address: Applemead, Chapel Road, Barns Green, Horsham RH13 0PR
Commentator Type: Neighbour
Stance: **OBJECT**

Dear Sir/Madam,

I object to this application for the following reasons.

The Neighbourhood & Local Plan:

The Horsham District Council Local Plan (2015–2031) identifies this site as undevelopable, a position reinforced by the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (December 2018). The most recent draft Horsham District Local Plan has not been adopted and has been set aside for unrelated reasons, meaning it carries no weight.

By contrast, our Neighbourhood Plan is formally Made and must, by law, be given significant weight in planning decisions. Within that plan, this site was the least supported of all 28 sites assessed. Using the same nationally applied criteria, we also concluded that it was undevelopable. While we fully acknowledge the need to accommodate additional housing, our Neighbourhood Plan identifies several alternative sites that are far more suitable.

The proposed site sits directly opposite the Queens Head pub and the village shop — just two of the five Grade II listed buildings that effectively surround it. Developing here would place new housing in the most historically sensitive part of the village, contrary to both local evidence and established planning policy.

Flood Risk:

The submitted Flood Risk Assessment contains a significant error that must be corrected before any decision is taken. It incorrectly assumes that all surface water from the field drains into the River Arun. The report states that *“The proposed development falls within the Arun and Western Stream Management Catchment for peak river flow and peak rainfall allowances.”* This is wrong, and as such the assessment should be considered invalid until it

is resubmitted with the correct watercourse identified and all calculations revised accordingly. It is also concerning that the document was prepared, reviewed, and approved by the same individual.

The document also claims that there is merely “anecdotal” evidence of flooding. This is simply untrue. Only last week, water was running down the hill and merging with runoff from the site, effectively forming a stream. A check of the Government Flood Risk page today (2nd February) shows two active flood alerts for the postcode area, explicitly stating that “some flooding is possible.” That is not anecdotal — it is documented, current evidence. Flooding in this area has increased noticeably over the past decade. Water flows downhill from Sandhills Road, combines with runoff from the proposed development site, and then enters the shop before passing through its back garden into properties on Six Acre Close. It continues downhill to the junction of Six Acre Close and The Hordens, where homes have recently experienced flooding. Any additional development on this site can only heighten that risk.

Sewage:

The local sewage treatment works has recorded 84 discharges into the river system since June 2024, with one current overflow that began on 30th January and has continued for more than 90 hours at the time of writing. Over the past six months alone, the plant has been overflowing for a combined total of more than 17 days — 415 hours. It is therefore difficult to understand how Southern Water can claim that the system has sufficient capacity when such incidents occur with this frequency.

There is also a clear error in Southern Water’s submission: the manhole cover they reference is given a grid location that actually corresponds to a site in Stoke D’Abernon, Surrey. This mistake further undermines the reliability of their assessment. Their response should be challenged, and accurate site-specific information must be provided so that the necessary calculations can be redone correctly.

Traffic:

Chapel Road is a narrow rural lane, and although a short section in front of the shop is due to be widened, this will only ease pressure for roughly 100 yards. The remainder of the road is already too narrow for current traffic levels. Vehicles regularly mount and damage the verges, and the point where the brook passes beneath the road is even tighter, constrained by brick wall edges.

The shop attracts a steady flow of vehicles from early morning until the evening, with people stopping between 7am and 8pm most days. Cars park directly outside and continually pull in and out of the traffic stream, which has already increased significantly over the past decade due to the Ashmiles and Sumners Fields developments. Although the proposal includes designated parking bays, vehicles will still need to re-enter the road. The entrance to the new site sits directly opposite these bays, meaning drivers will have to check traffic from three directions before pulling out — a clear safety concern on an already constrained road.

Removal of Ancient Hedgerow:

The application proposes removing the hedgerow along Chapel Road to allow for road widening, replacing it with a newly planted hedge. However, this existing hedgerow is classified as an Ancient Hedgerow and should therefore be protected. Such hedges play a vital role in the landscape: they stabilise soil, reduce surface water run-off, and provide essential habitat and connectivity for wildlife. They are also an integral part of the rural character of the area, and ancient hedgerows in particular are irreplaceable features of genuine ecological and historical value.

Removing this hedge will inevitably increase flood risk, diminish biodiversity, and erode the rural setting. The suggestion that a newly planted hedge will reach “target condition” in 12 years is unrealistic. A hedge that has developed over centuries cannot be replicated in a decade. The ecological, structural, and cultural value of an ancient hedgerow simply cannot be replaced.

Local Infrastructure:

The development of 32 houses located just 100 yards from the proposed site still has no electricity connection. Of the seven homes currently occupied, every one of them is running on generators. Yet the application contains no meaningful information about the power supply situation. It is unclear whether Scottish & Southern Electricity have even been consulted, let alone confirmed that the existing network has sufficient capacity without requiring further transformer upgrades. This omission is significant and needs to be addressed.

The Travel Plan Statement also claims that “there are opportunities to travel to local centres on weekdays.” In reality, the bus service is extremely limited: two buses on Monday, four on Tuesday, one on Wednesday, four on Thursday, and one on Friday — and none at all at the weekend. Living in the village effectively requires access to a car. Most households will have at least two vehicles, and families with older children may have three or four. The current bus service is simply not adequate to support the level of development proposed. Residents need to be able to reach larger towns and essential services, including supermarkets such as Tesco, independently, reliably, and at weekends — something the existing public transport provision cannot provide.

The Houses:

The average height of houses in the UK is typically between 5.5m and 6.5m. In contrast, the developer is proposing properties starting at 7.9m and rising to an excessive 8.4m. This is entirely out of keeping not only with national norms but also with the surrounding properties, many of which are Grade II listed and within direct view of the site. The scale and massing proposed resemble a suburban estate rather than a development appropriate for a rural village, and residents should not be expected to accept such an incompatible design.

The developer also originally stated at last year’s village meeting that 35% of the homes would be affordable. At that time, the proposal was for 65 dwellings, equating to around 23–24 affordable units. The scheme has since increased to 68 homes, yet the affordable provision has dropped to just 27.9% — only 19 units. This is a significant reduction and fails to reflect the greater need for affordable housing in rural communities. There is also no guarantee that even this reduced figure will be delivered. The recent SIGMA Homes development is a clear example: the tenure mix was altered to “shared ownership” after they were unable to secure a housing association partner. This raises legitimate concerns about whether the promised affordable housing on this site will materialise as claimed.

In Summary:

The village recognises its responsibility to accommodate additional housing in line with the National Plan. However, this does

not mean placing a new development in the heart of a picturesque village surrounded by listed buildings. Our Neighbourhood Plan identified alternative sites that were mutually acceptable and far more appropriate.

There are factual errors across at least three of the submitted documents — errors that should have been identified by HDC before being accepted. These inaccuracies alone justify extending the consultation period beyond 6th February, as it is not possible to properly assess an application when key documents are incorrect and require resubmission.

This proposal is fundamentally in the wrong location, and I strongly object to it.

Yours Sincerely

A solid black rectangular box used to redact a signature.