

[REDACTED]

Sent: 02 February 2026 22:15
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.

Neighbourhood & Local Plan:

The Horsham District Council Local Plan from 2015-2031 has this site as undevelopable as does the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (December 2018)

The latest Horsham District Local Plan has not been made and has been thrown out (for different reasons)

Our Neighbourhood Plan is Made and should legally be given considerable weight.

In that plan the site in question was the least popular of all 28 sites which were submitted. We also came to the conclusion it was undevelopable using the same criteria used Nationwide.

We know we need to take some more houses and our NP has several sites which would be much better suited to develop.

The site in question is directly opposite the Queens Head pub and our local village shop which are just 2 of 5 Grade II listed buildings which virtually surround the site.

Flood Risk:

The Flood Risk assessment submitted has a glaring error which should be rectified prior to any decision being made. The document assumes that any surface water from the field will drain and make its way into the River Arun. The document states that "The proposed development falls within the Arun and Western Stream Management Catchment for peak river flow and peak rainfall allowances". This is incorrect and so should make this document null and void until it has been re submitted with the correct river identified and the calculations re-worked. This document has also been

Prepared and reviewed AND approved by the same man!

The document also states that there is "anecdotal" evidence of flooding. Only last week there was a river running down the hill meeting with water from the site. A quick check on the Government Flood Risk Page today (2nd February) has 2 flood risk alerts at the postcode area with the line "some flooding is possible" That is NOT anecdotal.

We have seen an increase in flooding in the past 10 years. The water runs down the hill from Sandhills Road and meets with water from the proposed site. It then goes into the shop and out through their back garden and into houses on Six Acre Close and then down on the junction of Six Acres Close with

The Hordens. Where houses have been flooded recently. Any further development can only increase the risk.

Sewage:

The local sewage treatment plant has seen 84 releases into the river system since June 2024 and there is one ongoing one which started on 30th January and has been going on for well over 90 hours (at the time of writing) In the last 6 months there has been overflowing for over 17 days in total 415 hours! How can Southern Water say that there is sufficient capacity in the system when this is happening so often?

I also note an error in Southern Water's response that they quote a manhole cover with a grid reference which actually points to an area in Stoke D'Abernon, Surrey.

Once again this response should be questioned and the correct details submitted with the necessary re calculations based on the actual site.

Traffic:

Chapel Road is a small country lane. The road is set to be widened in front of the shop but this will only relieve the pressure on the road for this stretch (about 100 yards) the rest of the road is too narrow for the existing amount of traffic. Verges are constantly being run over and where the brook passes under the road is even smaller with brick wall edges.

The shop has people stopping all day from 7am until 8pm most days. They park in front of the shop and pull in and out of traffic which has increased in the past 10 years due to the Ashmiles and Sumners Fields developments. I note there will be designated parking bays but they still need to pull out into the traffic and the entrance to the new site is directly opposite so they will be entering the carriageway having to look in three directions.

Removal of Ancient Hedgerow:

The application proposes to remove the hedgerow along Chapel Road and replace with a new hedge to allow for the road to be widened. This hedgerow is classed as an Ancient Hedgerow and as such should be protected. Hedges perform important functions such as acting as buffers to hold soil and reducing surface water run off. Hedges are part of the rural countryside and ancient hedges are things of real beauty. Removing it will lead to more flooding, less wildlife and to say that the new hedge will be at "target condition" in 12 years! How can you replace a hedgerow that has been there for hundreds of years in 12? It just isn't possible.

Local Infrastructure:

The latest development of 32 houses 100 yards away from the proposed site still has no electricity. There are currently 7 homes occupied and they are ALL running on generators. There seems to be no information regarding the power situation within the response. Have Scottish & Southern Electricity been alerted and have they confirmed that there is sufficient power without upgrading any more transformers?

The Travel Plan Statement says "there are opportunities to travel to local centres on weekdays" There are 2 buses on a Monday, 4 on a Tuesday, 1 on a Wednesday, 4 on Thursday and 1 on Friday. There are NO buses at the weekend. To live in the village you NEED a car.

Most families will have 2 cars and those with older children living at home potentially 3 or 4. The Bus service is just not sufficient. People want to get to larger towns or out of town shops like Tesco's by themselves at their own pace and at the weekend too.

The Houses:

The current average height of houses in the UK is 5.5m – 6.5m The developer intends to build houses which start at 7.9m and reach a staggering 8.4m. This is completely out of step, not only with the UK

trend, but with the surrounding houses (mainly Grade II listed within sight) and is effectively a suburban layout which is just not acceptable to residents in the village.

The developers originally claimed they would be offering 35% affordable homes when we held our Village meeting last year. They were only proposing 65 homes then which equates to (23.8 houses). It is now 68 and the number has gone down to 27.9% (19 houses) This falls well short and does not take into account the higher need for affordable homes in rural areas. Also how do we know they will keep to this? The current SIGMA homes development changed their criteria to make all the homes “shared ownership” because they couldn’t get a housing association to buy them.

In Summary:

The village accepts that it needs to take on more houses to fulfil the National Plan but we do NOT need or want them in the centre of a picturesque village with listed buildings all around. We identified other mutually acceptable sites in our NP. There are factual errors in at least 3 documents which should have been picked up by HDC and should not have been allowed as submissions. These alone should mean that the Consultation period which is due to end on 6th February should be extended as it is impossible to fully pass an application when documents are wrong and need to be re submitted.

This development is in the wrong place and I object strongly.

Yours Sincerely

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.