

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 February 2026 14:31:27 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 01/02/2026 2:31 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: 36 The Hordens 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 - Overdevelopment
Comments:	I am writing to strongly object to this Planning Application. I would be grateful if this letter could be placed before the Planning Committee in full. I have lived in Barns Green village for 15 years

and have lived in the local area for most of my 50 years, having grown up in Wisborough Green and attended the Weald School in Billingshurst. I have seen what the over development permitted by Horsham District Council has done to ruin the local villages, in particular Billingshurst and Southwater, which are now unrecognisable as countryside locations.

I am not going to object on emotional grounds as I am sure those pleas will be ignored, despite the overwhelming response from the whole village in objection to this unthinkable proposal to rip the heart out of our village. It is adding insult to injury that the applicant's DAS front page shows the lovely green field they plan to destroy with this application!

These are the overwhelming reasons that HDC Planners and Planning Committee should reject this application:

The Neighbourhood Plan

We are a reasonable community and we understand there are targets to locate new homes in the village, which is why we all spent a lot of time and effort putting together the Neighbourhood Plan, identifying suitable sites, voting on them and then formally approving the plan by referendum on 4 Sept 2025. I was personally a volunteer, recruited by the Parish Council, to help with this assessment. This plan reasonably set out where the community felt appropriate development could take place, namely Sumners and the old school at Itchingfield. This was not a NIMBY response, this was a sensible and considered plan which SHOULD be taken into account. IF it is not taken into account then the democratic process is fundamentally flawed and I am sure will be reflected in the next chance we have to visit the ballot boxes, the Planning Committee should take note.

The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 14 exists precisely to protect communities in this situation. It states that where a neighbourhood plan is less than five years old and allocates sites to meet housing need, the adverse impact of conflicting development "is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits."

The Government's own Planning and Infrastructure Bill guidance (September 2025) states that decisions about what to build and where "should be shaped by local communities."

Are Horsham Planners and Councillors prepared to allow this application, that ignores this principle?

Horsham District Planning Framework and Local Plan

At paragraph 7.5 of the Applicant's Planning Statement, they state "Being set outside of the built-up area boundary and not essential to this countryside location, the proposal would be in conflict with

policies 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the HDPF." If this does not comply with the adopted Local Plan it should be rejected, just because Horsham lacks a five-year housing land supply, does not mean any part of the greenbelt should be up for grabs.

This site is a "housing development outside settlement boundaries on an unallocated site", therefore Sussex North Water Certification Scheme (SNWCS) certification isn't available, water neutrality cannot be achieved, and the application fails this simple test. We have heard for years that planning in Horsham District has been halted or slowed due to water neutrality, why should this be any different?

Overdevelopment of Barns Green

In the last 10 years, we have seen two significant housing developments at Ashmiles (67 homes) and Sumners (32 homes) increasing the village total of Barns Green addressed properties from 475 to 574 (credit Neighbourhood Plan), that is an increase of 21% in properties for this tiny village. These proposals for a further 68 homes in the centre of the village will add a further 12% more properties. If the further 50+ homes allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan are also added that would mean an increase of over 45% in just over 10 years! Even HDC can see that is not sustainable by the village amenities and services. At least the Ashmiles came with the benefit of the new school, these new developments are just about profiting from our green fields.

Services and Infrastructure

Linked to the above, HDC committee reports already document we have serious sewage problems, I also understand the electricity network cannot cope either, apparently the recent Sumners Fields development requires a backup diesel generator because the local network cannot reliably supply those homes. That was from adding just 32 homes! An additional 68 homes with Air Source Heat Pumps using electricity rather than gas or oil to heat their homes will need twice as many noisy fossil fuelled generators!

No more homes, even those in the Neighbourhood Plan should be added without updating of the services in this village.

Transport

The Transport consultant who prepared the Transport Statement has clearly never lived in the countryside and definitely never commuted from a village like Barns Green. The Transport Statement relies heavily on a "Vision Scenario" assuming a shift away from private cars. The applicant's data shows over 80% of local residents drive to work and the DAS confirms 173 parking spaces are proposed, that is 2.5 cars per home! So what is

changing to the public transport network that we don't know about that will allow this shift, are we getting more buses or maybe our own train station in Barns Green?

The DAS states "The traffic impacts of the proposed development on the wider highway network have been assessed, and it has been concluded that the proposed development will not lead to a significant increase in vehicle movements during peak travel periods and therefore not have a material impact on the local highway network." It is madness to suggest people in this village will not use cars and will therefore not add to the traffic load on our roads and create more accidents, I will get onto the crazy decision to locate access opposite the shop later!

Having lived in Barns Green for 15 years and commuted regularly to London via Christ's Hospital station which is 3.7km away, I can confirm that there is no bus service that would allow me to avoid using my car and it is too far to walk or cycle in a suit!

The Transport Statement should be ignored and I hope WSCC Highways have done a proper assessment of this rather than just relying on this unrealistic and biased report.

Highways and Access

The current status of parking outside of the shop and pub is dangerous (made worse during the current building works to the rear of the shop for just 1 house!). When exiting The Hordens towards the shop the parked cars/vans/lorries, that regularly park there, obscure the visibility splay meaning you have to pull out not knowing if there is another vehicle coming. This will not be improved by the proposals submitted as they still show parked cars along this section of road. During the construction of any new homes the parking required by contractors will only make this 10 times worse, do not pretend they will all come by bus or train or bicycle! Adding a further adopted road joining chapel lane directly opposite the shop will surely make this worse.

I have reviewed the swept path analysis completed for Fire Engines and Bin Lorries, they have completely ignored the fact that there WILL be cars or even lorries (delivering to the shop) parked directly opposite the junction, the swept path analysis shows no parking opposite. If there were vehicles parked there then they would be hit by either Fire Engine or Bin Lorry.

Assuming the same entry point is proposed for the construction phase then you will have the same problem with any large deliveries or concrete trucks, an entry point opposite the shop seems like asking for problems.

Flood Risk

The reports suggest that there is no flood risk, however we all

know that Chapel Road floods regularly from surface water coming down from Itchingfield, this is either because the drains are not up to the job, not maintained or other reason, just because there is no river does not mean it won't flood.

Heritage

The fields proposed to be built over by the applicant "provide important green gaps that contribute to a settlement with rural character and provides a transition to the wider countryside." Not only would it destroy this greenbelt buffer it could harm the setting of the Listed Buildings on Chapel Road. The applicant's own Heritage Statement notes "The run of historic dwellings along Chapel Road also illustrates the function of the building serving a historically small, rural community." This is a SMALL, RURAL COMMUNITY! It should stay that way.

Specifically in relation to Blacksmith's Cottage, the Heritage Statement states "The proposed development includes the removal of the existing hedgerow, a new access into the Site and the provision of soft landscaping and planting to the eastern part of the Site. This will largely retain the rural setting and context that this part of the Site provides. The wider development will not be appreciable from the listed building and, while it will change an element of its wider rural setting, this will not diminish the ability to appreciate the historic interest of the listed building."

I completely disagree that removing the hedge and building 68 homes on the field will retain the rural setting! These reports should be produced by independent heritage consultants not by the applicant.

In relation to the Queen's Head Pub, the Heritage statement does confirm that this will result in harm but dismisses it as less than substantial. I don't think this should be a matter of opinion or on a scale, there is no doubt the Pub's listed setting will be harmed substantially but this development. "The alteration in longer distance views will, however slightly diminish the rural context within which the building is appreciated which makes some contribution to its historic interest."

Finally in relation to Heron's Reach (the Village Shop), the report is more critical of the development proposals "The proposals will alter the setting of the listed building to the west, with the new dwellings and landscaping visible from the listed building, while return views will also be changed. This will slightly diminish the ability to appreciate the building's architectural interest and simple vernacular form, while also eroding one element of its rural setting."

If these historic buildings are not protected by their listing then what is the point? Historic England should object to this

development in the strongest terms or their existence/effectiveness should be questioned.

Conclusion

I am surprised that any Pre-Application discussions with HDC Planners did not put these developers off submitting an application, but they were clearly given enough comfort that they would be considered.

This application should be rejected on the points noted above and points made by others who have objected on mass.

As I said, we are a reasonable community who through development of the Neighbourhood Plan, accepted that we need to provide more homes and carefully considered where these should be located. This site was deemed unsuitable and should be deemed unsuitable by HDC too.

This site is unsuitable for development and even if it were part of the Neighbourhood Plan, the complete disregard of the heritage setting of Chapel Road by the applicants and the fantasy that we are all walking, cycling or taking the non-existent bus to go about our daily business, shows you that this is an ill-conceived development proposal and should be rejected.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**

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