

---

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 02 February 2026 16:10  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application DC/25/2057

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**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 4:09 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: | 22, Carters Way Wisborough Green Billingshurst |
|----------|------------------------------------------------|

### Comments Details

|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Commenter Type:      | Member of the Public                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Stance:              | Customer objects to the Planning Application                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Reasons for comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Design</li><li>- Highway Access and Parking</li><li>- Loss of General Amenity</li><li>- Other</li><li>- Overdevelopment</li><li>- Privacy Light and Noise</li><li>- Trees and Landscaping</li></ul> |
| Comments:            | <div>██████████</div> <div>22 Carters Way<br/>Wisborough Green<br/>West Sussex<br/>RH14 0BY</div> <div>1ST February 2026</div>                                                                                                              |

Planning Department  
Horsham District Council  
Parkside, Chart Way  
Horsham RH12 1RL  
(Sent by email via Planning Portal)

Dear Planning Officer,

OBJECTION: DC/25/2057 - Land North of Little Slaughterford, Chapel Road, Barns Green (68 dwellings) - Miller Homes

I object to this application for the following reasons.

1) Traffic, parking and cumulative impacts

The site access is opposite the Queen's Head pub and the village shop at an existing bottleneck. Proposed traffic calming/pedestrian measures create pinch points and reduce on-street parking. The transport documents are inconsistent (10 spaces described but 9 shown). Reduced parking would harm residents, the pub and shop, and complicate deliveries. Since 2020, staff numbers at Muntham House School have risen from 95 to 144-a 50% increase over six years-while pupil numbers have grown from 91 to 142, also a 50% rise. Over the past 9-10 years, pupil numbers have more than doubled. This expansion has generated a substantial increase in daily vehicle movements, as the majority of the 144 staff travel by car twice daily, alongside the 142 pupils who typically arrive via taxis or parents' cars. Because all pupils have EHCPs and many travel long distances, most are entitled to taxi transport, resulting in a particularly high concentration of traffic at school start and finish times. The worst congestion occurs between 8:00-9:00am, when up to 280 vehicles enter the area within a short window, and again between 3:00-4:00pm during afternoon pickup. These intensive peaks now create severe bottlenecks through the village, impacting road safety, causing frequent standstills, and significantly affecting the quality of life for residents and village life.

More importantly, the submission fails to assess residual cumulative impacts (NPPF paragraph 116). It models only the site access junction and dismisses wider impacts as negligible, ignoring committed and planned growth (including Sumners Fields and Neighbourhood Plan allocations) and impacts at the Chapel Road/Two Mile Ash Road junction.

2) Loss of ancient hedge

The proposal removes the ancient hedge at the site frontage to achieve visibility splays and road widening. This would destroy established habitat and a valued landscape feature. It also contributes to flood management by holding soil and reducing sediment entering drains. Without removing it, safe access appears difficult, which further highlights the unsuitability of this location.

3) Sewage capacity and pollution

There are already documented discharges of raw sewage into local watercourses during heavy rainfall, and this development would increase flows and worsen pollution. In 2022, Barns Green reportedly experienced 43 sewage overflow events totalling 411 hours (over 17 days). Monitoring by residents indicates this remains a continuing problem. Southern Water's response does not address these overflow events, downstream network capacity, or the ability of the treatment works to cope.

Southern Water's information also appears unreliable. For example, the stated "manhole reference TQ12265901" is in Stoke D'Abernon, Surrey, not Barns Green. In April 2025, Southern Water indicated the treatment works assessment was based on a population of 1,018 with capacity up to 1,400; however, the current population is estimated at at least 1,390, and this proposal would push it beyond 1,500. The existing overflow evidence already indicates insufficient capacity.

4) Flooding and surface water runoff

The application states there is no evidence of flooding, which is incorrect. Serious flooding has occurred repeatedly, with water flowing down the hill and entering buildings (including the village shop opposite the site) and affecting a wide area, including Six Acres Close. The field

currently helps hold and slow runoff. Replacing it with roads, paving and roofs will increase both runoff volume and speed. Proposed drainage measures cannot guarantee resolution of this risk, especially given climate change.

5) Harm to ancient woodland and habitat (irreplaceable habitat)

The west boundary adjoins Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (AWI reference ANCWOO122269), an irreplaceable habitat protected by NPPF paragraph 186(c), which states development causing loss or deterioration should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and an adequate compensation strategy. No exceptional reasons exist here, and the proposal would cause deterioration through indirect effects.

Key issues include:

- Inadequate buffer: Only a 15m buffer is proposed (the minimum in Standing Advice), but a larger buffer is needed because dormice are present (confirmed in the applicant's 2025 Dormouse Survey), recreational pressure will increase substantially (68 homes ≈ 156+ residents plus visitors/pets), and the site's clay and drainage constraints risk altering woodland hydrology.
- Footpath within the buffer: A permanent surfaced public footpath is proposed through the buffer as a main pedestrian route to the bridleway network. Standing Advice states buffer zones should be semi-natural habitat and that development (including gardens) should not be approved within them. A maintained footpath serving daily use is not semi-natural and will encourage encroachment into the woodland.
- Indirect impacts: Increased disturbance, trampling, pets, lighting/air pollution and altered drainage from 68 homes will cumulatively degrade the woodland edge over time-i.e., "deterioration" under NPPF 186(c).

6) Infrastructure constraints (electricity and schools)

All 68 homes are proposed with air source heat pumps, yet there is no evidence of consultation with UK Power Networks or a grid capacity assessment. Recent local development (Sumners Fields, 32 homes) reportedly required a backup diesel generator due to supply reliability concerns, raising serious doubt about capacity for an additional 68 electrically heated homes.

7) Public transport limitations

The Transport Statement relies on an unrealistic "Vision Scenario" of modal shift. In a rural village with very limited services, this is not credible: the applicant's own data shows 81% of residents drive to work; Christ's Hospital station is 3.7km away; bus provision is minimal (no evening services, no weekend services, and only two buses on Wednesdays).

8) Loss of village amenity and community assets

The field was formerly the village green and is used for community events including the Classic Car Show (raising significant funds for charity) and Run Barns Green (supporting St Catherine's Hospice). These would be lost. The access road and parking changes also risk making the Queen's Head and the village shop/post office unviable; both businesses have stated on-street parking is essential. Losing these would be a major community and amenity harm, particularly for elderly residents given limited public transport.

9) Village character, heritage and landscape harm

The Neighbourhood Plan Landscape Character Assessment identifies fields north and west of the village as important pastoral fields forming green gaps that maintain rural character and transition to countryside. This site performs that role. Development here would remove the green gap, harm the setting of nearby listed buildings (including Little Slaughterford, Bennetts, Herons Reach and the Queen's Head), and effectively surround a key community asset (the pub) with housing. It would also destroy rural amenity currently provided by grazing land adjacent to historic buildings.

10) Overdevelopment, design and density

Even the draft HDC Local Plan allocated this site for 50 homes; the application seeks 68 (36% more) with no justification. This is overdevelopment, representing a disproportionate increase in parish housing at a density and height that are out of keeping with neighbouring development and rural character, contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan.

11) Housing mix and deliverability concerns

The Council's Housing Officers (15 January 2026) do not support the scheme. The affordable mix is heavily weighted to 2-bed units (76%), while the Housing Register indicates strongest demand is for 3-4 bed family homes (61%), with longer waiting times. They also raise deliverability concerns, including risk that no Registered Provider will take the units and that a commuted sum may later be sought instead of on-site provision. If the scheme does not meet identified need, the applicant's primary justification is undermined.

12) Conflict with countryside policy and inaccuracies in submissions

The site lies outside the BUAB in designated Countryside. Policy 26 of the HDC Local Plan permits countryside development only where essential to its location; this is a speculative scheme and not essential.

In addition, several parts of the submission appear inaccurate or misleading, including:

- Southern Water's narrow and flawed capacity response and serious factual errors.
- Environmental Health identifying significant errors in the Air Quality Assessment (inconsistent traffic figures, inaccurate EFT outputs, and incorrect damage cost methodology).
- The incorrect statement that there is no flooding evidence.
- Flood risk reporting that references the wrong catchment (Arun rather than Adur/Ouse), raising credibility concerns, including where sewage overflows discharge.
- The claim the site is "on the outskirts of the village" when it is central to the community.

Conclusion

I recognise the need for housing delivery, and Barns Green has accepted growth through the Neighbourhood Plan with sites identified as more sustainable. This application is not one of those sites, does not meet proven local housing need appropriately, and conflicts with countryside policy. It would also cause significant environmental harm (including to ancient woodland), worsen flooding and sewage pollution, and threaten key community assets (pub, shop and post office).

The proposed development is situated in the busiest and most constrained part of the village, yet the planning documents inaccurately describe it as being located "on the outskirts." Placing additional housing and traffic-generating activity in this central pressure point will have a significant and negative impact on the character of the village. Introducing further development into this hotspot will intensify traffic bottlenecks, increase noise and air pollution, and fundamentally alter the rural feel of the area. The claim that the site sits on the periphery does not reflect the lived experience of residents who see daily how overstretched this section of the village already is. It is therefore essential that the Council reconsider the suitability of this location and fully assess the cumulative impact on the village's character, safety, and infrastructure.

For these reasons, the application should be refused. I would be grateful if the full contents of this objection are placed before the Planning Committee.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted Signature]

---

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: [planning@horsham.gov.uk](mailto:planning@horsham.gov.uk)



**Horsham  
District  
Council**

