

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 March 2026 16:33:16 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0366
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 26/03/2026 3:33 PM.

Application Summary

Address: Land North West of Southwater

Proposal: Outline planning application, with all matters reserved (except for primary access to the high-way) for a phased development comprising: the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of up to 1,000 residential dwellings (including affordable housing) (Use Class C3); up to 80 specialist accommodation units (Use Class C2); a mixed-use neighbourhood centre (Use Classes E and F); education facilities (Use Class F1(a)); business and employment floorspace (Use Classes B2, B8 and E(g)); redevelopment of existing agricultural buildings including construction of a building for community use (Use Classes E and F2); improvements to public rights of way; sports pitches; gypsy and traveller pitches/plots; public open space; landscaping, and associated infrastructure

Case Officer: Matthew Porter

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 47 Smuggler's Way Barns Green Horsham

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

- Other
- Overdevelopment

Comments:

I strongly object to this planning application based on the following points:

1. Inadequacy of Foul Drainage and Sewage Infrastructure.

The proposal to connect 1,000 additional dwellings to the Barns Green Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) is fundamentally flawed. This would require a substantial amount of large scale civil engineering to install this correctly at a huge cost to not only the installers, but more importantly to the environment it will destroy. Capacity Errors: Southern Water's assertion of capacity (July 2022) is factually outdated and does not reflect current operational realities.

Environmental Harm: Frequent unpermitted storm overflows into local watercourses already occur. Adding further load will inevitably increase the frequency of raw sewage discharges, violating the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that new development should not contribute to water pollution.

Inaccuracy of Data: The applicant has failed to provide a robust "Impact Assessment" that accounts for the cumulative effect of recent developments in the Southwater/Barns Green cluster.

2. Water Neutrality and Scarcity

Southwater sits within a Water Scarcity Area as designated by the Environment Agency.

Sustainability Gap: Following the extreme drought of 2025, it is evident that the local aquifer and supply network cannot sustain a development of this magnitude.

Unrealistic Mitigation: The water usage forecasts for this site rely on "best-case scenario" conservation levels that are rarely met in practice.

Legal Precedent: Under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations, the council must be certain that the development will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of protected sites (like the Arun Valley) due to water abstraction.

3. Impact on Local Character and "Village Feel"

Southwater has already undergone significant expansion. A further 1,000 homes risks turning a settled village into a fragmented urban sprawl.

Scale and Density: The proposed density is out of step with the existing semi-rural character of West Sussex.

Loss of Strategic Gap: This development further erodes the green space that prevents Southwater from merging into neighboring hamlets, destroying the distinct identity of the village.

4. Highways and Transport Safety

Cumulative Traffic Impact: The A24 and local feeder roads (such as Worthing Road) are already at a breaking point during peak hours. The transport assessment provided by the developer likely underestimates the "real-world" trip generation of 1,000 households.

Pedestrian Safety: Increased heavy goods vehicle (HGV) traffic during the lengthy construction phase poses a direct risk to

children attending local primary schools.

5. Pressure on Social Infrastructure

Healthcare and Education: Local GP surgeries and schools are already over-subscribed. There is no evidence in the application that the proposed Section 106 contributions will result in a timely expansion of these services to meet the new demand.

Dental Access: In line with the current crisis in NHS dentistry across West Sussex, this development will leave 2,500+ new residents without any local access to essential healthcare.

6. Loss of Biodiversity and Natural Capital

Ancient Hedgerows: The site likely contains established wildlife corridors. The proposed "Biodiversity Net Gain" (BNG) calculations are often theoretical and do not compensate for the immediate loss of habitat for local species (bats, Great Crested Newts, and nesting birds).

I cannot stress to you enough just how much I object to this planning proposal. It is fundamentally flawed at least, and should never be allowed to go ahead, ever.

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