

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 September 2026 18:46
To: Planning; Alice.Johnson
Subject: Objections to DC/26/0933 - Land between Muntham Drive and Smugglers' Lane Chapel Road, Barns Green - Shanly Homes

Categories: Comments Received

Address - Camomile Barn, Emms Lane, Brooks Green, West Sussex, RH13 OTR

Reasons for comment: - Highways Access and Parking, Design, Overdevelopment, and Other

Planning Department, Horsham District Council, Parkside, Chart Way, Horsham, RH12 1RL – sent **by email to** planning@horsham.gov.uk

To the Planning Officer,

Application DC/26/0933 Land between Muntham Drive and Smugglers' Lane Chapel Road, Barns Green – Shanly Homes

I object to this application for the following reasons.

(1) Conflict with the Neighbourhood Plan

The Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan (2025) which is a made plan endorsed by HDC, who stated that it *'carries full weight as part of the development plan for this part of the district'*, categorised this site as 'undevelopable'.

Additionally both the current (made) Horsham District Planning Framework and SHELAA concluded the site was 'undevelopable'.

A number of policy elements in these respective documents are relevant to this application and support refusal.

Furthermore, public response to the site when it was proposed in the Call for Sites for the Neighbourhood Plan was overwhelmingly negative.

(2) Over Development

Even the draft HDC Local Plan only allocated this site for 25 homes. The applicant is proposing 31 which is a 24% increase with no justification.

Consequently 31 homes would represent clear overdevelopment.

This development will conflict with Planning Policy, representing a disproportionate increase in the number of dwellings in the Parish, at a density which is out of alignment with neighbouring properties.

(3) Conflicts with the Countryside Policy (BUAB)

The proposed development site lies outside the Built-up Area Boundary (BUAB) and is defined as 'Countryside'. Policy 26 in the HDC Local Plan states explicitly that development in the countryside should only be permitted if it is essential to its location.

The proposed development site is a speculative housing scheme which lies in countryside outside the Built-up Area Boundary, and is not essential.

(4) Traffic Generation, Parking Impact and Traffic Conflicts

The proposed site and its proposed access are positioned near the Queens Head pub and the village shop, and more concerning adjacent to a new proposed access for a further housing estate. This location is already a known bottleneck for traffic and the new access will cause congestion and increase the risk of accidents.

This development will generate over 90 vehicle movements per day and will create dangerous 'blind-spots' cause serious traffic conflicts.

If the adjacent housing estate development is approved in the future this will create a disastrous traffic situation.

Parking serving the village shop which will be severely impacted by the proposed development.

The generation of the additional traffic movements will overload the roads in the area which are only country lanes.

NPPF paragraph 116 requires assessment of 'residual cumulative impacts' on the road network, and these cumulative traffic impacts must be assessed and critically considered including the 32 new homes at Sumners Fields which will generate over 90 vehicle movements per day.

Yours faithfully,

Home –

Mobile –