

[REDACTED]

Sent: 05 February 2026 16:20
To: Planning
Subject: DC/25/2057

Categories: Comments Received

Dear sirs please accept this email as my objection to the proposed scheme at Land North of Little Slaughterford Chapel Road Barns Green West Sussex

Application Reference:	DC/25/2057
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

[REDACTED]

1 Homestead Cottages, West Chiltington Lane, RH14 9DP.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Commenter type; Member of the Public.

Stance; Object.

Reasons for comment

- Design
- Highway access and Parking
- Loss of General amenity
- Other
- Overdevelopment

Introduction

The development applied for by Miller Homes / M2 Barns Green, is extremely poorly conceived, and contains a great number of flaws in its presentation as demonstrates the level of professional endeavor they have committed to the preparation of this plan.

As much as it should be acknowledged as a preliminary proposal at this stage, Miller

Developments are experienced enough to know that getting the facts right at this stage is as important as delivering such a development to an exacting standard, and paramount to gaining any community support and acceptance. It is evident throughout the details included within the submission that there is little, or no consideration of the overall physical impact on the village or, of the people that will all have to live with the resultant chaos and overcrowding, allowing this development to proceed would result in. The preceding statement not only pertains to the population currently within the village but will necessarily include those who would take ownership of the newly built dwellings.

It is significant to note at this stage, none of the published council related consultation responses actually support the proposal. A lot of the documents highlight mistakes, inconsistencies and contraventions to HDC strategies that are evident within the proposal.

Design

As can be seen upon the Planning portal there are a number of supporting documents and studies (albeit mostly desktop). These documents refer to specific subdivisions within the overall application but could

be classified as differing elements of the design function. Some of these are mandatory in the case of new house building developments and others are evaluative investigations which identify “best options” for such processes that can benefit the development performance in energy generation, house fabric composition , etc.

- a) Millers determined mix of accommodation to be included in the development.
 - Since scheme conception, Miller has changed the mix of houses and flats to assumedly most suit their marketing and project marginal return needs. The submitted proposal was reviewed by HDC – Planning Department on 15-01-26 and published that they cannot support the scheme as
 - 1. The proposed housing mix does not align with HDC needs for required housing and also
 - 2. That the affordable housing element is insufficient and subsequently likely to be unattractive to the AH registered providers (those that would buy / rent the units to distribute to those in need). They have also explicitly commented on the possible perception that Barns Green would be a less attractive location to the Affordable Housing community in any event.
- b) Emergency and Waste services access needs.

- It is acknowledged that Millers have submitted a Swept Road Analysis (SRA), in support of intended road width proposals. This inclusion of up to date software in an attempt to demonstrate compliance and suitability of the designed access ways is welcome. The flaw in the analysis however is that these surveys can be carried out on a WITH CAR or WITHOUT CAR basis. The national criteria for minor road widths (non A, residential road), is 4.8 to 5.5 meters which the presented analysis by Millers' consultant I-Transport has included. This is a two car passing scenario and does not allow for Parked Cars. The scenario may work for residents and visitors willing to wait for an opportunity to come around a car parked in the road, but a different situation must be considered for waste collection and emergency vehicles. It is important to introduce at this point average car widths vary from 1.7m small family model to 2m SUV. Fire tenders require a minimum of 3.7m of clear accessway as a legal rule, (discussions with the developer may result in a slightly more lenient allowance, but unlikely). A waste collection vehicle is on average 2.6m wide, (add wing mirrors), and needs to work around the proposed site. In order to ensure that service and emergency vehicle needs are provided the development roads will require restrictive parking control. We do not believe that the allocated number of spaces on the site are near adequate and the potential residents will be forced onto the main village carriageway. This will be further discussed in a subsequent section below.

Highway Access and Parking

- The visiting and throughput traffic in Barns Green is generally constant and steady, but it *peaks* relatively highly at the expected times of the day with people going to work, coming into the village to drop their kids off to primary school and the influx of taxis the special needs attendees to the village based Muntham school. Turn this around at the end of the day and that volume is repeated. This does not account for daily household visits to community functions held in the village on a very regular basis. Available on street parking currently is available for residents opposite Sumners Ponds, Customers for the village shop and post office, the Queens Head Pub and for residents to the North of that, past the road junction of Muntham Lane and Two Mile Ash Road. The matrix, given the above inputs and with the existing road layout works extremely well with villagers mindful and courteous of the physical situation in the specific vicinity of the shop and pub.

The potential impact of the soon to be completed 32 houses in Sumners Ponds will need to be fed into the performance calculation, that figure is not currently known with only a 22% uptake of that development ownership.

- Millers consultant I-Transport has carried out a summary of the available public transport available through the village and the submitted timetable demonstrates what can only be described as a typical village service of a couple of buses per day a few days a week (excluding weekends). The resultant Miller prescribed strategy is predictably cycling and walking to the local facilities. These facilities are shop, pub, café and the social club, all within 600m. The inclusion of such an approach is unequivocally to demonstrate that the occupying families and couples of the new houses do not need any more car transport than what has been assessed within the application. An example of whatever clause Miller includes into their T&Cs to assure this, would be welcome.
- I believe that there are three primary drivers that will determine outside "this development", (Chapel Road) parking. These are as follows,
 1. The gross underestimation of the vehicles that any new owners and renters shall require to afford their mobilisation in and out of the village to "be about their necessary daily businesses".

2. Supplementing the above comments on SRA delivery, the need for the developer to introduce total, or severely reduced, parking restrictions within the access roads around the development to assure the legal access requirements of emergency vehicles.
3. There is no meaningful Analysis carried out on the overall impact of the development's resident demographic over a period of time. Families moving into the area now will change the whole metric over ensuing years and the projected provision for transport needs and demand should be incorporated into this present and developing plan. Not building in any contingency will result in chaos in the near future.

Loss of General Amenity

- Every village has its heart and Barns Green does not differ from that fact at all. The real situation is that amid the neighboring communities Barns Green is synonymous with camaraderie, sporting participation, generous charity organisation events and the obvious contributions to local charities as a result.

A village also renowned for the annual county famous Run Barns green event and it's charity fund raising classic and vintage car show.

What we are specifically concerned with in this instance, is the total elimination of an aspect of village life which inspires our community involvement, sense of beneficial purpose, joint contribution and the sense of satisfaction the entire village gets from our positive involvement in the delivery of those achievements.

There simply is not an alternative location for the people of Barns Green to come together on these occasions to generate and offer this annual beneficial contribution to the Horsham divisions of Saint Catharine's and other charities. This is a totally lost opportunity for both the charities and the community.

Removing the opportunity for the villagers and indeed those who visit these two main events can also be a serious deterrent to potential residents wanting to come to Barns Green in the first instance.

Other Issues

Education

School capacity

With development comes families and a need for ensuring that the right facilities are provided. Miller Developments have not analysed the potential increase in facilities that would be required for the influx of children who would need to attend both primary and secondary education. If found that current capacity of these facilities is insufficient are they prepared to fund expansion and possibly new establishments as a part of their plan? They would also need to include transportation of students to educational facilities into their overall traffic analysis.

Medical facilities

- Local medical providers are already under pressure. The impact of sizeable developments such as the one applied for need to consider what impact the needs of their clients will have on the existing communities in and around their scheme.

Sewage and run off water management.

- Sewage treatment and the local management of this is severely under pressure in Barns Green and Itchingfield. The system we rely upon is already expected to cope with more housing than it is designed for. Flooding potential is always adversely affected by taking away the natural elements that control it. Even with this field untouched the risk of flooding locally is always high. Upsetting the Eco balance by giving the field away to housing will not only add to the areas ability to cope with the current levels of water but actually add to the problem.

Over development, and conclusion

- Expansion of the village is an accepted necessity for both new and old villagers. Since the 1940s the village has subjected itself to a willing expansion in terms of housing needs (post war re-establishment), and more recently, general needs within the working community for homes). Great consideration has been given over the past years by the village community (included in this statement is the input of the most recently completed developments in the geographical area).
- Resulting from its completion in 2016 The Ashmiles development added 67 new dwellings to the village. Currently ongoing the Sumners Ponds development will add a further 32 homes. In the Barns Green and Itchingfield Neighborhood plan the old school has been designated as an accepted site for a further 22 homes. The neighborhood plan is the result of a number of years village members discussing and considering what is best for the village and the parish. It was completed and has been adopted by HDC in 2025. The plan which sets out the future of the immediate area until 2031 overwhelmingly rejected the development of this old village green into further unnecessary homes. The planners who are holding the upcoming consultation should uphold the current plan and deny the application in the knowledge that the village does not need this level of overdevelopment.

Yours Sincerely

