

Shyngells,
Sandhills Road,
Barns Green,
West Sussex,
RH13 0PU

29th January, 2026

To the Planning Officer, Planning Department, Horsham District Council, Parkside, Chart Way, Horsham, RH12 1RL

Objection submitted by Richard Pope.

Application 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. Flooding – Roadway Surface Water and Other Runoff

The developer's planning submission claims there is no evidence of flooding. This is incorrect.

Serious flooding has occurred in the last few days in and around the proposed development site – A series of ten photos are attached to this objection via e-mail showing significant flooding. Flood water recently entered buildings including the village shop (which is opposite the site) and extending as far as properties in Six Acres Close.

The development site field currently reduces flooding by holding water during periods of rainfall and slowing the runoff flow. Development will significantly hinder this natural ability. The developer's solution will not guarantee protection.

2. The Removal of Ancient Hedges

The developer's plan to remove an ancient hedge for permanent site access, traffic sight lines and road widening destroying established and protected natural habitat damaging thriving wildlife.

During development, a substantial portion of the 100-year-old hedges will be removed for construction traffic.

The hedge acts as a contributor to flood prevention holding soil on the land which would otherwise enter the drains.

3. Harm to Ancient Woodland and Other Habitat Loss

The western site boundary adjoins Ancient Semi Natural Woodland recorded on the Ancient Woodland Inventory as reference ANCWO0122269 as an irreplaceable habitat protected under NPPF paragraph 186(c). No exceptional reasons exist to overrule this. In fact, they support development refusal from habitat loss with inadequate buffer zone, a footpath through the buffer zone, dog walkers, children, and residents inevitably stray beyond the path into the woodland itself causing damage to the habitat.

NPPF paragraph 186(c) protects ancient woodland from deterioration, not just direct loss, so the cumulative indirect effects from 68 homes will cause deterioration of this irreplaceable habitat over time.

4. Discharge of Sewage into Stream from Sewage Works

Documented discharges exist of raw sewage contaminating the local watercourses at times of heavy rainfall. The proposed development will increase this serious issue.

HDC's own committee reports document in 2022 that Barns Green experienced 43 raw sewage overflow events, totaling 411 hours. Local residents confirm discharge of sewage from the treatment works is a regular and continues.

Southern Water's (SW) response makes **no** mention of these overflow events. It also does not say the proposed development's sewage discharge will not add to these events. Can SW cope? Probably not as no suggestion they can.

SW's response only considers the capacity at the connection manhole. It **does not** assess any downstream network capacity or the sewage treatment works.

SW's response is thus very far from the confirming there will not be any problems. It is therefore, an incomplete and mis-leading response.

Furthermore, SW have made serious errors suggesting that they have not really investigated this development in any depth. So how can the report be taken seriously? How accurate are any of their figures?

- Their reference to capacity at manhole reference TQ12265901 is actually one located in Stoke D'abernon in Surrey, not even in this County.
- SW stated in April 2025 that their assessment of the Barns Green sewage treatment works was based on a population of 1,018 with treatment works capacity up to 1,400 people. Calculations today show actual population now are at least 1,390. Any more development will exceed SW's capacity.

SW appear to provide and use incomplete and miss-leading details. In short their output cannot be relied on to be used for any planning considerations.

5. HDC SHELAA Housing Land Report by Parish, December 2018

This is derived from the version of the Site Assessment document and concludes that this site is classed as **unsuitable for development in the SHEELAA**.

- There is a significant issue over the deliverability of this site.
 - The site is subject to an agricultural tenancy, and the tenant (the owner of adjacent land) has made it clear that he will resist any attempt to terminate the tenancy. The Parish Council has no intention of becoming involved in this dispute.

For that reason alone, the site must be considered Unsuitable for Development.

If other considerations were necessary, the factors considered were as follows:

- This is a Greenfield site
- The development, on sloping ground, would be highly visible from the road and other houses
- The site has listed buildings on either side and is near two others.
- The development would out of character with the village
- Vehicle access onto Chapel Road would have a significant effect on traffic congestion and safety.
- The development would harm the rural environment of the parish
- The development is likely to exacerbate surface water runoff onto Chapel Road, and into the village shop
- The housing density is too high for the character of the village
- The development will harm the infrastructure of the village, by causing traffic problems in Chapel Road
- Eastern boundary of the site abuts a tract of Ancient Woodland.
- “It is worthy of note that, in feedback from village residents after the exhibition of possible development sites, the development of this site was almost universally opposed.”

6. Traffic Generation and Parking Impact

- The site access junction is directly opposite the Queens Head pub and the village shop.
- This location is already a known bottleneck for traffic and the parking serving the village shop which will be impacted by the proposed development.

- Including traffic calming measures and pedestrian safety features that will create pinch points and significantly reduce on-road parking.
- Their report states space for 10 cars in commentary but only 9 on the plans. This reduction will adversely affect residents, customers of the pub and shop, and complicate deliveries to both businesses.
- NPPF paragraph 116 requires assessment of 'residual cumulative impacts' on the road network. The developer has only modelled the site access junction dismissing wider impacts as 'negligible'. They ignored new 32 homes at Sumners Fields, the 50+ homes allocated in the Neighborhood Plan, and the combined effect on the Chapel Road/Two Mile Ash Road junction.
- The cumulative traffic impact has been ignored and not assessed.

7. Neighborhood Plan

The Barns Green community accepted the Neighborhood Plan process and identified sites where it could be accommodated sustainably. This development is not one of the identified sites and is not meeting proven local housing demand in an appropriate manner, and should be refused.

8. Public Transport Limitations and Issues

The developer's Transport Statement relies on households moving away from private cars. In a rural village with almost non-existent public transport, this is fantasy. EVs are becoming popular for second cars and are seen as reducing carbon emissions thus beneficial to the environment (so desirable to have).

The applicant's own data shows 81% of local residents drive to work and no local station within walking or cycle distance.

There is only a very limited and erratic bus service totally unsuitable for either travelling to work, family shopping and indeed family visits.

Their optimistic assumptions are not credible.

9. Village Character, Listed Buildings and Heritage Impact

The Neighborhood Plan's Landscape Character Assessment describes the fields north and west of the village as 'important small pastoral fields' that provide important green gaps that contribute to a settlement with rural character and provides a transition to the wider countryside.'

The field does this. Developing the site would:

- Destroy this green gap entirely
- This size in this location will seriously harm the setting of listed buildings in close proximity, including Little Slaughterford, Bennetts, Herons Reach and the Queen's Head.
- Detrimentially surround the pub which is a vital community asset with housing.

10. Over Development, Inappropriate House Design and Density

HDC draft Local Plan only allocated this site for 50 homes, but the proposal is proposing 68, a 36% increase with no justification but overdevelopment conflicting with Planning Policy representing a disproportionate increase in the number of dwellings in the Parish, and a density conflicting with neighboring properties.

The development style and building height significantly conflicts with almost all other dwelling in Barns Green and especially those in the immediate vicinity. There are four listed buildings of more than two hundred years old in the immediate vicinity.

12. Loss of Village Amenity

The development field was previously the village green, and is currently used as a village amenity which also hosts the annual Classic Car Show (raising tens of thousands for charity) and Run Barns Green (supporting St Catherine's Hospice). These community and charity support events would be lost forever.

More importantly, the proposed road layout is likely to have a very significant impact on the Queens Head pub and the Village Shop / Post Office's business. This brings into question the business viability of both. This would be a major impact of the Barns Green community.

The loss of a pub and a Village shop is a situation that HDC is strongly opposed to.

13. Loss of Rural Amenity

The proposed housing development will destroy the current Rural Amenity which is created by the field with grazing animals adjacent to historic buildings.

14. Housing Mix and Deliverability Concerns

The consultation response from the Council's Housing Officers dated 15th January 2026 does not support the development for the following significant reasons:

Wrong Housing Mix: The proposed affordable housing is heavily weighted towards 2-bedroom units (76% of provision) but the Housing Register shows that 61% of demand is for 3-4 bedroom family homes (and are households who are waiting three times longer).

HDC Housing Officers express concern that the scheme may not attract Registered Providers due to its small size and rural location.

If the Council's own Housing team do not support this application, how can it be argued that this is a suitable and appropriate development.

15. Inadequate Infrastructure Electricity Supply

The energy statement confirms all 68 houses will use air source heat pumps causing significant electrical load but there is no consultation with UK Power Networks and no assessment of grid capacity. The recent close development with only 32 houses requires a diesel generator as there is no reliable grid supply available. No calculations / solutions appear to support electricity grid supply shortages.

16. Conflicts with the Countryside Policy

As the emerging Horsham District Local Plan (2023–2040) is currently stalled, this application must be judged against the adopted HDPF (2015).

The proposed development site lies outside the Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB) and is defined as Countryside. Policy 26 is explicit: development in the countryside is only permitted if it is "essential" to its location. This speculative housing scheme is not essential; it is a choice to urbanize a greenfield site.

This is a speculative housing scheme and is not essential. To approve it would undermine the plan-led system.

17. Misleading Facts, statements and information.

- **Air Quality Assessment Errors.** The Environmental Health consultation response identifies significant errors in the submitted Air Quality Assessment:
 - Two different traffic figures are used (341 and 329) without explanation
 - The Emissions Factor Toolkit outputs are described as 'inaccurate' – 'too low for NO2 emissions and higher than expected for PM2.5'
 - The damage cost calculations do not follow the correct methodology
- **Flooding.**
 - The Statement that 'there is no evidence of flooding' is incorrect. There is.
- **Water Course and Catchment References.**

- The consultant's flood risk assessment report refers incorrectly to the Arun catchment and not the Adur and Ouse, which questions the whole credibility of this report.
- This means the sewage overflows at the treatment works go into the Knepp rewilding estate and not Southwater as claimed in the report.
- **Location.**
 - The Statement that 'the site is on the outskirts of the village'. This is mis-leading because in reality the site is at the very central community heart of the village.



















