

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 September 2026 00:22:42 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0933
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 11/09/2026 12:22 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Between Muntham Drive and Smugglers' Lane Chapel Road Barns Green West Sussex
Proposal:	Erection of 31 dwellings with access from Chapel Road including roads, parking and open space.
Case Officer:	Alice Johnson

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	30 Finians Field Barns Green Horsham
----------	--------------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Objection regarding development DC/26/0933 Proposed development of 31 dwellings with vehicular accesses, Land North of Little Slaughterford Chapel Road Barns Green West Sussex 1. Climate, Sustainability and Natural Environment

- It is Part of the woodland priority habitat network on magic maps defra.
- It is an Area under Magic maps Defra for Priority species, including the brown hairstreak butterfly, a farm wildlife package area- for farmland birds to supply areas to provide 'positive impacts for a range of priority farmland birds' (Magic maps).
- Designated by Natural England on the Magic Maps Defra portal as Part of the Habitat Networks (Combined Habitats) (England) to provide areas of land as suitable for enhancing ecological connections and biodiversity, not housing or other urban developments (see below)

"Summary

Habitat Networks (England) is a spatial dataset that describes the geographic extent and location of Habitat Networks for 23 priority habitats based primarily, but not exclusively, on the priority habitat inventory with additional data added in relation to habitat restoration-creation, restorable habitat, plus fragmentation action, and network enhancement and expansion zones. The Habitat Network Maps provide spatial guidance to plan and develop local ecological networks and may be used to help target action to build greater ecological resilience for habitats across England.

The Habitat Network Maps seek to apply the best evidence and principles and to use the best available nationally consistent spatial data. The habitat network maps are developed around 4 distinct habitat components sets and include 3 distinct network zones where action may be undertaken to build greater ecological resilience. The different elements of the maps are described below:

Habitat Components - The location of existing patches of a specific habitat for which the network is developed. This is termed the 'Primary habitat' e.g. lowland meadow. The main baseline data used for this is the Priority Habitat Inventories.

- The location of additional habitat that naturally form mosaics with the primary habitat e.g. habitats that are most likely to form ecological mosaics possibly used by species associated with the primary habitat. This is termed the 'Associated habitat' or 'Other Priority Habitats'. The main baseline data used for this is the Priority Habitat Inventories.

- The locations where habitat creation or restoration is known to occur, this is primarily sites under relevant agri-environment options. This is termed the 'Habitat Restoration-Creation'

- Sites where data suggests small fragments of the primary habitat or degraded habitat exists and where restoration may be possible, this is primarily developed from information held within the current PHI. This is termed the 'Restorable habitat'.

Network Zones

- Land within close proximity to the existing habitat components that are more likely to be suitable for habitat re-creation for the particular habitat. These areas are primarily based on soils but in many cases has been refined by also using other data such as

hydrology, altitude and proximity to the coast. This is termed the 'Network Enhancement Zone 1'.

- Land within close proximity to the existing habitat components that are unlikely to be suitable for habitat re-creation but where other types of habitat may be created or land management may be enhanced including delivery of suitable Green Infrastructure. This is termed the 'Network Enhancement Zone 2'.

- Land within relatively close proximity to the Network Enhancement Zones 1 & 2 that are more likely to be suitable for habitat creation for the particular habitat and identifying possible locations for connecting and linking up networks across a landscape. This is termed the 'Network Expansion Zone'.

Note: For some habitat networks not all of the habitat components or all the action zones are identified either because the data does not exist or the habitat does not lend itself to identifying particular types of action. Further details are outlined in the Habitat Network Mapping Guidance document. The Network boundary is drawn around the 4 habitat components using a variable buffering process with a generalised distance of 500m although 1km was used for Blanket Bog. As the boundary for each habitat network is tightly drawn around the existing patches of habitat this means that at a national scale the habitat network is composed of a series of smaller 'networks' that encapsulates one or more clusters of existing habitat patches. These may be considered as 'network segments'. The Network Expansion Zone has been drawn around these segments to identify areas where additional action may be undertaken to build greater ecological resilience across the wider landscape. Please note the network component 'Fragmentation Action Zone' has not been used in this update.

Why is it important that NE publishes this data?

The Habitat Network Maps provide spatial guidance to plan and develop local ecological networks and may be used to help target action to build greater ecological resilience for habitats across England. They are being used within a range of Natural England projects including the Favourable Conservation Status Project and Net Gain and to help identify possible locations for the delivery of the 25YEP target of 500,000 ha of new priority habitat." (Magic maps)

- Designated under the climate change vulnerability buffers for England on Magic maps Defra (see below)

"The National Biodiversity Climate Change Vulnerability Model (NBCCVM) aims to provide a spatially explicit assessment of the relative vulnerability of priority habitats based on established climate change adaptation principles; suite of map-based-GIS outputs at a variety of scales which can be used (in conjunction with other relevant spatial data) to target action to build biodiversity resilience and a flexible, GIS based, decision support tool that allows the user to incorporate locally specific datasets and select how adaptation principles are combined to reflect local circumstances and priorities." (Magic Maps)

The field itself is adjacent to mature woodland edge and hedgerow habitat, and older wood pasture land, with the field itself showing historical and ecological signs of being part of an older grass meadow network that has remained largely untouched due to the presence of significant ant colony mounds. Likely from yellow meadow ants "The yellow meadow ant is known for creating anthills in grassland habitats. It has a close relationship with the chalkhill blue butterfly - protecting the larvae in return for a sugary substance they secrete." (The Wildlife Trust). The ant hills themselves are numerous of a considerable size "testimony to the untouched nature of the land, as these ants only produce mounds in unworked grassland, and of the centuries that the colonies have lived here, as a large ant-hill may only have as a little as a litre of soil added to it each year.

The ant-hills greatly increase the environmental diversity of the grassland, as the mounds have a different soil composition, nutrient and water content to that of the grassland between them and as they also exist at a different temperature to their surrounding land due to their shape and height presenting different aspects to the sun. The result is that they create a secondary habitat within the land, creating 'fields of force' which considerably affects the patterns and behaviour of the plants, animals and micro-organisms in the pasture.

Of particular importance is the soil-heaping which creates permanent patches of bare soil allowing regeneration sites for plants such as the winter annuals and mosses which would normally be absent from the surrounding sward; and that the ants themselves provide important food sources for birds in the winter, such as the Green Woodpecker and BAP priority species the Grey Partridge." (Medieval Park, Haddon Haddon Hall - Yellow Meadow Ants).

The removal of the hedgerows and trees in question is excessive, in part or wholly, and would result in a detrimental, and significant loss of rural village character, visual amenity and further the erosion of the natural environment, undermining the wildlife corridor network of Barns Green, vital for healthy ecosystem functioning, including soil structure, function and water retention. Their removal would have a deleterious impact for a plethora of important wildlife species as it provides wildlife with free-movement across the landscape, provides vital year-round refuge and sequential food resources throughout the year. The hedgerow network supports nationally and locally important species: invertebrates including the brown hairstreak butterfly (Under Section 41 of the NERC Act in England it is a species of principal importance and a Priority Species under the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework), potential arboreal dormouse activity, breeding and roosting bird species, including red listed starlings (for which no ornithological surveys have yet been conducted for the site which are necessary). It is a part of a wider navigational network and foraging area for important bat species, including

nationally important and protected Brown long eared and Barbastelle bats, which are present, as mentioned in the Bat Survey Report for the DC?25/2057 proposal and encountered personally as a bat surveyor around the site in question including other species (serotine, pipistrelle species, myotis species including daubentons and whiskered individuals). Of which all are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981, are both priority Species under the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework and both are also European Protected Species (EPS) under Annex IV of the European Habitats Directive.

Under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 criteria all the hedgerows to be removed in its entirety or parts are considered "Important. It is land used for agricultural purposes (whose definition includes the use for grazing) and lies within a European protected site (Special Area of Conservation- SAC). The hedgerows are also hedgerows/features over 30 years old (see picture 1 below), with Aerial photography Supplied by Natural England, taken by the RAF in 1959 identifying mature hedgerow and tree features. The hedgerow field boundaries are also indicated in map 1 (see below), dating between 1877-1880, the OS map indicates probable cause for "important" hedgerow status under the Hedgerow regulations 1997 and believe its importance both historically and biologically should be considered, and the retainment of these important features, in its entirety, for both landscape character and habitat provisioning should be secured via a hedgerow retention order under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. Especially as the continued expansion of urban areas within the area and nationally continue to exacerbate the decline in the natural environment, with a current estimated loss of 118,00 miles of hedgerows since 1950.

Picture 1. Aerial Photo - raf_58_2862_f43_0067, an enlarged image of the proposed development site taken by the RAF, dated 1959, identifying the existence of the eastern boundary hedgerow (H1) along chapel lane (Original Available at: Aerial Photo | Historic England and https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/archive/collections/aerial-photos/record/raf_58_2862_f43_0067).

Map 1. An 1877-1880 Ordnance Survey map (Original map available at: <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/os-1-to-10560/sussex/024>).

- As a part of The Men's wider SAC (Special Area of Conservation) designation, , due to the presence of vulnerable bat species including barbastelle and Bechstein maternity roosts, the area thus also falls under the South Downs National Park local plan and appropriate habitat assessments undertaken in line with their own stipulations to assess the likely impacts of development on the site. These areas are protected by the Habitats Directive

(EC Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural and Semi-Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora) and the Habitats Regulations (The Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994).

The NPPF also identifies that:

- 194. The following should be given the same protection as habitats sites: a) potential Special Protection Areas and possible Special Areas of Conservation;

- 195. The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), unless an appropriate assessment has concluded that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site.

The Itchingfield Neighborhood plan sentiments regarding biodiversity and urban development highlights that serious consideration need to be given to the viability, efficacy and sustainability of the site. Particularly taking into consideration the current development at Sumners Field where currently only 6 dwellings have been sold, and the future proposal for land south of Smugglers lane to be developed; there is currently an over-application for non-essential development in the village that will permanently have a negative effect upon the historical character of the village, both aesthetically and materially, especially when current services and infrastructure already fail to meet current village needs.

Also, whether the long-term anthropogenic impacts of increased light, noise and air pollution, loss of natural flood defenses in the form of a water retentive field network, along with the encroachment and erosion of the natural environment will have on biodiversity, protected species and important habitats, including hedgerows and ancient woodland areas that naturally occur with increased human activities.

- The Habitats Directive applies a precautionary approach to protected areas and as such plans and projects can only be permitted once it is ascertained that there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of the site(s) in question. Projects may be granted permission if there are no alternatives to them and there are Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest (IROPI), such as large infrastructure development proposals etc. In such cases, compensation would be necessary to ensure the overall integrity of the site network.

The Preliminary ecological appraisal states no bat dwelling features present, but the trees identified for pruning and removal are of adequate maturity to provide suitable potential roosting features (PRF's), as even a 10yr old sycamore (previous experience of finding bats in unexpected places, including a very small buttress wound at the base of a very young tree where 3 Bechstein's were found dwelling) can have a wound or biomechanical feature that provides a PRF.

1.1. Dormice

Due to their protected status and drastic declines, monitoring hazel dormice is important in understanding how anthropogenic influences and environmental changes impact the species, helping inform conservation efforts in a bid to halt further decline. Not only is monitoring important to ascertain presence within a given habitat but also population estimates, it can be extremely difficult to monitor the species due to their nocturnal arboreal behaviour and energy reserving sleep tactics (Bullion and Looser, 2018).

The PEA (preliminary ecological appraisal) uses the survey evidence from DC/25/2057, who's dormouse survey utilising nest tubes (NT) identified no use of nesting tubes by and small mammals or birds from May-September 2025. However, the absence of data does not determine true absence of the species. It is also historical evidenced within the Itchingfield county of dormouse presence, including a recording by a PTES (people's Trust for Endangered Species) dormouse survey volunteer on 05/07/2025 (Record available on the National Biodiversity Atlas website- occurrence record PTES49063). It must also be noted that the Sussex Dormouse Group have been inactive for a number of years, meaning a significant gap in available data regarding the wider Sussex County's Dormouse population numbers, including areas of activity. The use of footprint tunnels alongside the nest tubes would have helped produce a more accurate representation of *Muscardinus avellanarius* use of the hedgerows, also mentioned on their website a useful tool during the survey season, for which they did not utilise.

Nest tubes (NT) are not normally used by breeding individuals and not best suited to long-term population monitoring like nest boxes (NB), but are considered a valuable tool for short-term surveys to assess presence/absence on a site (Bright et al, 2006; Chanin and Gubert, 2011; Combe, 2018; Lang et al, 2018). Though finding dormice is not always plain sailing as they do not always occupy the NB and TB provided, there can be periods where activity is virtually absent (Bullion and Looser, 2018; Melcore et al, 2020). Availability of suitable shrub habitat can provide natural nesting sites, while temperatures reaching and exceeding 30oC during hotter summer months over the past decade could be raising internal box temperatures to intolerable ranges for the species (Bright et al, 2006; Chanin and Gubert, 2011; Juskaitis, 2014; Morris, 2004; Panchetti et al, 2004; Walhovd and Jensen, 1976).

Chanin and Wood (2003) further confirmed the extent to which both devices can fail to provide confirmation of presence; they discovered dormice were going undetected during the entire survey season, even though they were known to be present on study sites that yielded a negative presence for the year (Chanin and Wood, 2003; Bullion et al, 2021). Indicating that it does not necessarily mean a site is absent of dormice and more than one season utilising other survey methods should be required to aid

confirmation of dormouse presence/absence (Chanin and Wood, 2003; Chanin and Gubert, 2011; Bullion et al, 2021).

This is particularly important, as nest tubes are frequently employed to detect absence or presence of dormice for consultancy and development purposes, being a cheap and easy approach to surveying (Chanin and Gubert, 2011; Bright et al, 2006), if a true presence/absence cannot be guaranteed through nest tube use (Bullion et al, 2021; Chanin and Wood, 2003), other methods need to be deployed alongside or alternatives developed to discern true presence/absence of *Muscardinus avellanarius* on any given site.

Pilot studies (Bullion and Looser, 2018; Bullion et al, 2018) tested the efficacy of tunnels against boxes and tubes during a controlled study in Suffolk, with 50 tunnels, 50 boxes and 50 tubes deployed at each of the 12 locations for the survey season between April and November (Bullion and Looser, 2018; Bullion et al, 2018). The pilot study displayed the effectiveness of Foot print tunnels (FPT) for dormouse detection during a single survey season; FPT had a detection rate of 28% between April-November, Nest Boxes detection rate was 2% and Nest Tube rate was 3% (Bullion et al, 2018; Bullion and Looser, 2018). This resulted in FPT having a 97.5% chance of detecting dormice during a 3-month period between May and October with 50 tunnels, even if they are living at low densities (Bullion et al, 2018; Bullion and Looser, 2019). While Melcore et al (2020) FPT study also supports this devices' out performance of both nest boxes and nest tubes after proving to be the only method to successfully detect dormice (Buchner et al, 2023; Hunt, 2023; Melcore et al, 2020).

There is no certainty that absence of evidence in tubes and boxes is an absence of dormice in that habitat, but to achieve 95% probability of detection with NT and NB, ideally 50 devices are required per site to be surveyed over several months and it can take weeks or months before they are used (Chanin and Wood, 2003; Chanin and Gubert, 2011; Priestley et al, 2021). Nest tube detection success is also tied to population densities, low density sites potentially have a 78% chance of success, indicating a higher chance of failure in detecting dormice, even though they may be present, as already identified by Melcore et al (2020) and Chanin and Woods (2003); whereas FPT still have a 95% probability of detection even when species are living at low densities (Bullion et al, 2018; Bullion et al, 2021; Chanin and Wood, 2003; Chanin and Gubert, 2011; Priestley et al, 2021).

1.2. Edna and pond surveys

The GCN (Great Crested Newt) sampling done, again not by themselves but by DC/25/2057 ecology report, from small a single small pond located to the north west of the field provided no positive eDNA samples. It is worth noting that this pond is drained routinely by the fisheries to relocate young fish stocks. It should also be noted that around the easement of Betty's lake are 2 permanent wildlife ponds that have not been surveyed or sampled, along with a third located within the woodland

surrounding Betty's lake (Picture 3). Due to their closer proximity to the field south of Smuggler's lane, further ecological surveying is required to rule out the potential for deleterious effects upon local populations of protected amphibian species.

Picture 3. Taken from the eDNS report, identifies the only 2 ponds found by the consultancy, where only one was sampled. The addition of the light blue dots signifies pond habitat areas that have not yet been surveyed but require surveying for GCN (great Crested Newts).

1.3. Lighting

In line with ecological advice, a lighting plan needs to be agreed upon, prior to any consent to prevent the disturbance to nocturnal wildlife, mainly the bat species foraging and commuting within and around the location. This is extremely important as light pollution can have a detrimental impact on numerous bat species, particularly barbastelles, brown long eared and other myotis species (e.g. daubentons), as identified in the Bat Report. These species are specifically adapted to perform natural behaviours in darker environments, avoiding light sources when foraging and navigating the landscape, and emerging when it is full dark. Current survey and mitigation guidelines, and peer reviewed studies outline the negative impacts that light pollution has upon bat populations.

A full bat, dormouse, great crested newt and ornithology report is required, along with full habitat surveys are basic requirements avoid unlawful disturbance to bats and other priority species, while simultaneously protecting the natural environment from unnecessary urban sprawl/development. The unnecessary removal and pruning of trees can be mitigated by actually providing adequate planning to avoid negatively impacting the rural character and ancient woodland aspects of the village.

2. Overdevelopment and Loss of Amenity:

The proposed development by Miller Homes at Land at Smugglers' Lane, Barns Green, Horsham, signifies an increasing strain upon rural settings to provide unsustainable long-term development and urban sprawl in a countryside setting with limited resources and services. This strain increases pressures upon socio-economic benefits provided by healthy, functioning ecosystems, biodiversity, and soil structures (including water retention and the dampening effects local field systems have upon increasing flood risks; which are set to increase with threat of increasing global warming and climate change issues causing more frequent storm events and intense weather patterns).

- Climate change poses a significant threat to ecological resources (Kumar, 2021; Sandifer and Scott, 2021), in the form of terrestrial and aquatic temperature rises, droughts, flood events, extreme weather and storm events, biodiversity losses, impoverished resources including food and fresh water security (the ability to access and afford safe, nutritious foodstuffs), (Sinay and Carter, 2020; Kumar, 2021; Sandifer and Scott, 2021; C40 Cities, 2018).

- Urban Development on its own creates 70% of the globe's greenhouse emissions, directly contributing to climate change, these Regeneration, expansion and development of cities/urban areas directly affects global biodiversity and natural resources, profoundly causing >80% of natural habitat losses at local scales, with 30,393 species threatened over the next 30 years (Simkin et al, 2022; Chen et al, 2020; Kumar, 2021; Sandifer and Scott, 2021; Africa et al, 2019; Chen et al, 2020; Zhang, 2021).

- Human activities further pollute air, soil and watercourses, for example, waste/sewage management issues contaminate UK waters by 35% and 18% is run-off from cities and roads, negatively impacting natural resources as increased pollution means greater contamination of natural food stocks and drinking water (Institute of Fisheries Management, 2022; Stallard, 2022).

- In Wales and England 38% of edible fish stock health checks fail through diseases caused by water pollutants (Institute of Fisheries Management, 2022).

- Most UK households use 140 litres of water a day but with current climate changes, development and population increases, demand is increasing, not forgetting the demand that the natural environment and biodiversity requires (Institute of Fisheries Management, 2022; Stallard, 2022; Envirotech Online, 2021; Kumar, 2021; Sandifer and Scott, 2021).

The development will further the stresses upon local habitats and ecosystem functioning, resulting in greater footfall patterns along local footpaths, byways and bridleways contributing to erosion and loss of important soils and flora compositions that are characteristic to the rural and ancient woodland character of the area. Further pressures will stem from habitat fragmentation and deterioration through continued development and lack of conservation management practices.

- There are many facets contributing to biodiversity losses (Keil et al, 2015), major influences affecting biodiversity and ecosystem health are habitat loss and fragmentation (Keil et al, 2015; Wilson et al, 2015). There seems to be evidence of delayed time responses or effects between landscape changes and changes in community compositions of birds, and mammals (Semper-Pascual et al, 2021).

- Habitat loss has been shown to increase biodiversity losses, along with species functional diversity when habitats perish

inwards, from their edges (Keil et al, 2015).

- It is this habitat loss that has the most consistent negative impact upon biodiversity, directly impacting species abundance, diversity and distribution, while indirectly causing population declines (Jackson and Fahrig, 2013; Donovan and Flather, 2002; Rogan and Lecher Jr, 2018).

These actions directly impact human endeavours to live sustainable lifestyles, or to live less impactful on the environment and live within our means, by contributing to environmental hazards of air and water pollution, flooding, biodiversity losses, and increasing temperatures which reduce available resources (Yang et al, 2021; Brunner, 2012; Chen et al, 2020). Resulting in deleterious effects upon human wellbeing, mental and physical health and reducing access and availability of green spaces (Barton et al, 2017; Yang et al, 2021).

- In England and Wales, Green space in urban areas have been neglected for many years (Chapman, 2022), but NEF (New Economics Foundation) analysis has revealed a greater systemic problem regarding the lack of green space provisioning within the UK planning system, with recent developments having 40% less greenspace than neighbourhoods built in the late 19th-early 20th Century (Chapman, 2022).

Regarding the application, there are a number of inconsistencies, the proposed development does not enhance the cultural or heritage value of the area, nor does it support or enhance services. It effectively creates an isolated community more akin to urban town settlements and whose development process poses a significant threat to the heart of the village community, heavily populated by heritage assets in the form of cottages, forge, village pub and a very necessary village shop and post office, both of which are currently thriving. The encroachment of development not only poses a risk to the structural aspects of the heritage building, but also the viability of continuing business:

- The disturbance of construction traffic and increased parking pressures from the development process will inherently impact the ability of routine deliveries, passing trade and local community use of these current services, bringing into serious question their ability to continue trading under such conditions. Ultimately detracting from and damaging the appeal and, currently, thriving community and economic prospects of the village.

The ineffectiveness of modern development and construction companies to organise and maintain a sustainable development are evidenced within the village at the current Sumners Field site. There have been issues regarding the lack and inability provide sufficient green infrastructure, particularly in keeping with a rural setting.

HDC should ideally be taking into account and supporting the

development of brown field sites, as already identified in the adopted Neighbourhood plan and which have already occurred at Sumners fields, and identifying further such sites that don't require the development of agricultural and other green space, and the deleterious effects that accompany such development.

Infrastructure and services

Concerning is the ability of local infrastructure and services to accommodate further development. The proposal would place additional demand on schools, healthcare, roads, drainage, utilities and other local services. It is not sufficient to consider the infrastructure requirements of 31 homes in isolation when the surrounding area is simultaneously subject to substantial additional development. Wastewater Treatment Capacity The Parish Council has serious concerns regarding the capacity of the Barns Green wastewater treatment infrastructure to accommodate the additional demand that would arise from the proposed development.

The proposal for 31 additional dwellings would place further pressure on the existing wastewater network and treatment facilities serving the area. There are already concerns regarding the capacity of the Barns Green Wastewater Treatment Works and considers that these must be fully investigated before any further residential development is permitted. It would be inappropriate for planning permission to be granted on the assumption that sufficient wastewater capacity will become available at a later date, particularly where there is evidence of existing pressure on the system. Existing Surface Water and Flooding - Smugglers Lane/Chapel Road.

There needs to be attention drawn to existing localised flooding and surface-water problem associated with the field, Smugglers Lane and Chapel Road. During periods of significant rainfall, surface water currently runs from the field towards Smugglers Lane, resulting in water accumulating on the road and subsequently affecting the area around the Queen's Head Pub. This is an existing problem which is experienced by local residents and road users and should not be overlooked when assessing the drainage implications of the proposed development. There are concerns that developing this greenfield site, together with the associated roads, driveways, roofs and other impermeable surfaces, could alter existing drainage patterns and increase the volume and rate of surface-water runoff reaching Smugglers Lane which will make an already dire situation, significantly worse.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



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