

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 February 2026 12:14:13 UTC+00:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/2057
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 02/02/2026 12:14 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land North of Little Slaughterford Chapel Road Barns Green West Sussex
Proposal:	Proposed development of 68 dwellings with vehicular and pedestrian accesses, public open space, hard and soft landscaping and associated works including supporting foul and surface water drainage works, and works to existing culverted watercourse on site.
Case Officer:	Alice Johnson

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: Chapel House Chapel Road Barns Green, Horsham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Trees and Landscaping

Comments:

I am a long term resident of Barns Green who lives on Chapel Road and has suffered from the inconvenience, heavy lorry traffic and noise for the last three years as a direct result of the Sumners Field development. I strongly object to the further years of disturbance that the proposed development will inevitably bring to the village.

General Comments on the process:

The whole process appears significantly tilted in favour of the developer who is able to pay to produce a significant number of professional consultant reports, in some cases in excess of 250 pages long over months and the local residents have only 21 days to review, understand and comment on what are technical documents. A summary of each (not AI generated) should be offered by the consultants as part of better transparency.

It is also not acceptable that certain statutory consultants such as Southern Water can simply respond that they cannot formally respond until a few days before the closing date. How can I construct a considered response without the key information of the critical area of the ability of the local sewage works to cope which is already has a public record of discharging unacceptable quantities of raw sewage directly into a tributary of the Adur.

Site Selection, options, overdevelopment and Neighbourhood Plan:

The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) produced by the village was finally approved by a 92% majority of the over 500 residents that voted in September 2025. There were significant delays to the referendum imposed by HDC due to water neutrality and the rejection of the HDC district plan by the Inspector.

The sites proposed in the NP were formally assessed by criteria provided to the NP team by HDC. The two highest scoring sites (Sumners Field & Itchingfield School) were included within the NP. 29 sites were offered and assessed and the proposed development (DC/25/2057) was not only clearly assessed as "Not Suitable for Development" it was also voted the least appropriate site for development by the residents.

Despite formal requests from the Parish Council to HDC as to how this site could somehow find itself as the preferred development site in the rejected District Plan, it is still being promoted by HDC as a site for development in the latest draft. The process to arrive at this decision MUST be made transparent and placed in the public domain before the planning committee review DC/25/2057 or the village will take up its threat to take the process to Judicial Review.

In addition, the site is listed within the draft plan by HDC, rejected

by the inspector, as appropriate for the development of 50 units. When Miller Homes addressed the village in August 2025 they proposed 65 units. DC/25/2057 proposes 68 units with an affordable/shared ownership well below the 35% minimum. This must be rejected as it not only does not meet the minimum planning threshold, but also must be considered overdevelopment as it exceeds the HDC planning proposal numbers by 36%.

Although I appreciate comments only referring to DC/25/2057 can be accepted, HDC must take into in its decision that the two sites proposed within the NP are yet to be fully realised. Sumners Field has yet to sell more than 25% of the properties offered and this has significantly extended the disturbance and completion of the site. To date no planning application has been approved for the Itchingfield School site. This either implies the local demand for houses is not there or indeed the pricing of these houses is inflated beyond local means.

Finally in its own response HDC Housing is clear that the mix of houses does not address local needs and is sceptical about the location as being unsustainable due to the lack of public transport.

I am not against further housing when appropriate for the community, however this site is in an inappropriate location and current local demand is demonstrably not there. Barns Green is a rural community and its NP clearly states this. It does not want to become a suburban dormitory town. It does not have the level of infrastructure and transport links to support this. This implies that Miller Homes are progressing the development not to meet local demand but families moving "Down From London"

Layout and Style of the Proposed Development

Barns Green welcomed the addition of 68 units within Ash Miles as recently as 2015/2016. It has integrated well into the village. The design of the houses and layout of the estate fitted well within the rural environment being on the edge of the village.

The success was In part due to the positive engagement process from Berkley Homes as opposed to Miller who attended a public meeting in August and have not engaged with the Village or PC since despite assurances to set up/attend meeting only to go back on their promise each time, as recently as the last PC meeting on 26/01/2026. This is not the level of community engagement that I am sure HDC would expect from a developer.

DC/25/2057 lies on elevated ground in the centre of the village - not on the edge as incorrectly described by Miller Homes in their proposal. The building height is stated in the designs as 7.9-8.4m average well in excess of the UK average of 5.5- 6.5m. This could hardly be described as a discreet design to fit in an elevated, sloping site in a greenfield location bordered by an ancient

woodland, ancient byway (SW), a Sussex Drove way and a rural road through the village. The village housing style is described in another submission as being of "Gentle Density". The Millar proposal appears to be more like suburban plan dropped into a rural village which has the potential to create an enclave that has no tangible connection to the village.

Hedgerow and Environmental Impact

Despite both Ash Miles and Sumners Fields, the last two developments, fronting onto through roads within the village they have managed to retain the roadside rural hedges almost intact. DC/25/2057 is very clear that its road access plan requires the total removal of a 200+ year old hedge. Has no consideration been given to other options such as a mini roundabout/entrance concurrent with the junction of Chapel Road with The Hordens.

My understanding from other resident objections who have researched this that removing the hedge would contravene the Hedgerow Act of 1997. Hedgerows are an integral part of rural village landscapes, which do not use brick walls or wood fences to border open land. This is the preserve of urban and suburban development! The design specifies replacing the hedgerow with a new hedgerow of "native species" implies this is better! We already have a hedgerow consisting of native species that MUST remain.

Objections from other residents have stated clearly with supporting details that the proposed buffer zone to the ancient woodland at the top of the field is planned to be breached by tarmac paths, this contravenes established guidance, if not the law. Finally I object to any close boarded fencing or walls in the design that border the ancient byway of Smugglers Lane. This is an ancient byway and must remain as a wildlife corridor not just along its length but across its length too.

Traffic

The two transport documents total 130 pages. Impossible to read and understand for a layman. Most of the report data (aside from drawings) is based upon standard data formats which may have little or no relevance to the actual site but just cut/paste additions. Much of it based on potential future "modal shifts" and a lot fantasy statements that are not based on a realistic assessment of the situation in a rural village.

The transport plan takes no account of the increased lorry movement during construction or indeed any public consultation on this. Despite this the transport plan (doc 2) was signed off by WSCC Highways on 01/09/2025. Living on Chapel Road we have lived with 3 years of construction of Sumners Pond with zero response from WSCC to ensure that the site traffic in anyway

complies with the agreed traffic plan, despite restrictions on movements before 0800 and after 1700 and indeed during school access times. I have no confidence in the report and ask HDC to question the premise on which it is based before the proposal goes to the planning committee.

The report makes much of "Modal Shifts" in transport needs in the future. This is a rural not suburban setting and these modal shifts are pure fantasy. The report in section 3 makes a big play of the local bus services and in section 3.2 states: "Demonstrates there are opportunities to travel to Horsham, Billingshurst and Storrington on a weekday" and of the fact that Christs Hospital Station is 3.7km.

There are 12 buses to Horsham a week - none on a Saturday or Sunday with only 2 days a week with more than 2 buses. In the opposite direction there are an equivalent number of buses. But only two buses a week (one each on Monday & Thursday) to Billingshurst, location of the nearest doctor's surgery. Nor is there a road side footpath to CH station so access to the station is still predominantly by car.

The plan states that on 39 traffic movements will occur between 0800-0900 despite 68 houses. This implies a lot of unemployment and no children being driven to schools in the district. At 1.7 cars/house in a rural location (116 minimum). Only 1 in 3 will be used at this time of day. Check out how many cars are used each day during this time for Barns Green Primary school as a reality check.

Infrastructure - Electricity, Sewage and Southern Water Response,

Amongst the local residents are many comments on the inability of the BG Sewage Works to cope with its current capacity, let alone the extra dwelling this development would inevitably bring. I do not propose to repeat them but confirm I strongly object to DC/25/2057 being placed before the planning committee for decision before this critical issue is resolved. This MUST include written assurances from Southern Water and a costed plan for action. Not a wishy washy response that says we will resolve the problem - They have not resolved the current problem in the last 10 years, why can we expect the future to be any different?

Many of the resident responses you have received make reference to a letter one local resident received in response to questions to Southern Water in April 2025. I was that resident. To support their assertions I have sent you by email attachment the original letter. I request that this is added to my objection.

The Southern Water response is yet another example of desk date being asserted as correct and no real understanding of the

actual situation. HDC MUST review these documents in detail and challenge assumptions, such as number of dwellings which is fundamentally incorrect, not just tick a box to say the developer has submitted the right paperwork, never mind the actual content.

I will not repeat the numerous comments made on the ability of the local electrical network to cope with increased demand. Right now the residents of Sumners Fields have been living for months connected to a diesel generator and cannot utilize either the pre-installed solar panels or electric car charging points as these cannot be used whilst not connected to a mains supply. This is due to the local power network being unable to cope without further investment in infrastructure. I cannot located any information within the data provided that assures me the situation for DC/25/2057 will see any change despite additional houses.

Factual Errors and Consequent Validation

Many other residents have already brought to your attention the high number of factual errors and wrong assumptions within the many so called professional and statutory body responses. All of which MUST be withdrawn and resubmitted, allowing residents time to read and respond before DC/25/2057 is placed onto the Planning Committee agenda. Below I list a few as examples.

Flood Risk Assessment Report (TS Wood Consulting)

This report states on Page 27 in para 5.12.4: The proposed development falls within the Arun and Western Streams Management Catchment for peak river flow and peak rainfall allowance.

Much of the report is based on this erroneous assumption as the development falls within the Adur and Ouse Catchment.

Energy & Design Report - Energy Statement (Matthew Hurd)

The entire report has as an embedded heading: "Waverley Lane, Farnham" which would imply this was a cut/paste from a previous report not a local assessment. This is substantiated by the reference in paragraph 5.5: Wind Power where it refers to the post code: GU9. This is the general postcode for Farnham, Surrey.

Southern Water Second Response 22/01/2026

This letter contains minimum information and the maximum of suggestions that everything is someone else's responsibility. This MUST be rejected by HDC as a totally inadequate response. Their lack of commitment or interest is demonstrated in the paragraph headed Sufficient Capacity - Foul which refers only to a single manhole having adequate capacity. This assumption is incorrect as the grid reference quoted: TQ12265901 is in Stoke D'Abernon, again in Surrey. Once again this implies a cut/paste latter rather than a serious response.

As a resident and local Council Tax payer I am concerned about

the way in which this date is being reviewed. HDC Note on the planning portal that the report was received on 10/12/2025. The pop up box over the "green tick" on this date states: We have received the application and are checking things such as: Has the application form been completed correctly? Has the right fee been paid? Have all the required plans and documents been submitted? Are they correct?

From the many errors being picked up and reported by residents everything was NOT correct so why has HDC proceeded to validate the submission? In addition, The submission was validated by HDC on 23/12/2025, allocated to a planning officer and an acknowledgement letter sent to SRL Consulting (Millar Homes), with NO request for an Environmental Assessment. Why is this the case when you are developing on a greenfield site? Is this only required for Brownfield development.

For the above reasons I strongly object to DC/25/2057. Given the number of errors and inconsistencies I believe the application should be withdrawn and resubmitted once the correct information is available. Finally on the portal it states the decision is delegated. I find this unacceptable for any greenfield development especially one of such local sensitivity as can be supported by such a strong local response.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton