
Sent: 06 February 2026 17:14
To: Planning
Subject: Objection - Application DC/25/2057 Land North of Little Slaughterford
Categories: Comments Received

**Address - Camomile Barn, Emms Lane, Brooks Green, West Sussex, RH13
0TR**

6th February 2026

Reasons for comment:

- Design
- Highway Access and Parking
- Loss of General Amenity
- Other
- Overdevelopment
- Trees and Landscaping

Planning Department, Horsham District Council, Parkside, Chart Way, Horsham, RH12 1RL – sent by email

To the Planning Officer,

OBJECTION: Application DC/25/2057 Land North of Little Slaughterford, Chapel Road, Barns Green 68 Dwellings – Miller Homes

As a resident I strongly object to this application for the following reasons.

(1) The proposed development is contrary to the adopted development plan in principle. The site lies outside the defined Built Up Area Boundary, is not allocated for housing, and the proposal conflicts with the settlement strategy and countryside protection approach in the Horsham District Planning Framework.

Most significantly, it conflicts with the Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan, which was made on 8th October 2025 and is therefore the most up to date expression of the development plan for the parish. This Neighbourhood Plan has been examined, endorsed through referendum, and made by Horsham District Council.

Furthermore this application is not meeting proven local housing demand in an appropriate manner, and is a speculative housing development which is not essential to the location, and would urbanise and destroy a rural countryside green field which is in contradiction of the Countryside Policy.

(2) Discharge of Sewage into Stream from Sewage Works which is over the capacity limit stated by Southern Water.

It will exacerbate the already serious issues regarding surface water flooding and the treatment of and pollution by sewage. Already the current overflows from the Barns Green sewage treatment

works are threatening the River Ardur Restoration Project. These seriously damaging overflows will increase if the application is not refused.

- (3) Flooding – Roadway Surface Water and Other Runoff which will increase the regular serious incidents of flooding in this area.
- (4) The proposed road layout for the housing will also jeopardise the viability of the community pub, village shop and post office (especially during the building works). These village facilities are essential to elderly residents due to the limited public transport.
- (5) Additionally the proposed development will also significantly damage the environment in a number of ways, including important habitat loss and harm to ancient woodland.
- (6) The Removal of Ancient Hedges which are such an important wildlife habitat, and help retain surface water runoff.

The HDC Arboriculture Officer states in their consultation response *‘The loss of hedge H1 would, in my opinion, result in significant landscape harm and a noticeable loss of visual amenity to the area. Hedge H1 forms a continuous, mature vegetated boundary along the eastern edge of the site and is an important, long-established landscape feature’*.

- (7) Inadequate Infrastructure including Electricity Supply which is demonstrated by the facts that a generator is needed to supply Sumners Fields.
- (8) Traffic Generation and Parking Impact adjacent to the village shop and the cumulative impact of additional traffic generation on the ‘country lane’ road network.
- (9) Public Transport Limitations and Issues.

The bus services are very limited with only infrequent daily buses.

- (10) Loss of Village Amenity with the field no longer available for community and charity events.
- (11) Village Character, Listed Buildings and Heritage Impact on the area noted in the Neighbourhood Plan as important pastoral fields.
- (12) Loss of Rural Amenity created by the field with animals grazing adjacent to historic buildings.

The HDC conservation Officer stated in their consultation response *‘I do believe there is a visual and functional link between the development site and the neighbouring historic farm houses. And I do believe the rural character of the setting of both these listed buildings will be eroded by the development of this parcel of land’*.

- (13) Over Development, Inappropriate House Design and Density, the house designs are imposingly high and the density is urbanisation.

The HDC Conservation Officer states in their consultation response *‘The design of the individual houses is not inspired or inspirational and follows pedestrian and ubiquitous suburban housing forms. I think we should expect a higher quality of design to reflect the location within the historic core of the village’*.

- (14) Housing Mix and Deliverability Concerns, HDC Housing Officers stated these deliverability concerns in their consultation comments.
- (15) Conflicts with the Countryside Policy, the development site lies outside the Built-up Area Boundary (BUAB) and is defined as 'Countryside' where development should only be permitted if essential.

This is not essential development or appropriate housing.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact a signature.