

---

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 04 February 2026 21:44  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application DC/25/2057

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

**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 04/02/2026 9:44 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: | 7 Smugglers Way Barns Green HORSHAM |
|----------|-------------------------------------|

### Comments Details

|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Commenter Type:      | Member of the Public                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Stance:              | Customer objects to the Planning Application                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| Reasons for comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Design</li><li>- Highway Access and Parking</li><li>- Loss of General Amenity</li><li>- Other</li><li>- Overdevelopment</li><li>- Privacy Light and Noise</li><li>- Trees and Landscaping</li></ul>                                                                                                                                                               |
| Comments:            | <p>I am writing to formally object to Application DC/25/2057 for 68 dwellings. This proposal represents a significant departure from the statutory development plan and creates significant risks to local infrastructure, environmental integrity, and the community of Barns Green. My objections are detailed below.</p> <p>1. Fundamental Conflict with the Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan (INP)</p> |

The Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan was "made" on October 8, 2025, following a referendum where 92% of residents voted in its favour.

This plan is the result of years of community-led assessment and explicitly excludes the application site (Site 28) from housing allocations because it was classified as "unsuitable" in the SHELAA due to deliverability and character concerns.

Under NPPF Paragraph 14, communities with a neighbourhood plan less than five years old are protected from speculative developments that conflict with their allocations.

Approving this application would undermine the democratic will of the parish and the integrity of the localist planning system.

## 2. Direct Breach of Statutory Planning Policy

The applicant concedes that the proposal, being situated outside the Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB) and not being essential to a countryside location, sits in direct conflict with Strategic Policies 2, 3, 4, and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF).

Policy 26 explicitly states that development in the countryside should only be permitted if it is essential to its location, a criterion this speculative market housing scheme fails to meet.

## 3. Critical Failures in Wastewater Infrastructure and Public Health

The Barns Green sewage system is in a state of chronic crisis. In 2022, the local sewage treatment works (STW) recorded 43 overflow events, resulting in raw sewage being discharged into local watercourses for a cumulative 411 hours-equivalent to over 17 days of continuous pollution.

Furthermore, the documentation provided by Southern Water is technically invalid. They confirm capacity at manhole reference TQ12265901, which geographical mapping reveals is actually located in Stoke Dabernon, Surrey-approximately 30km from the application site. Their population data is also outdated; they cite a capacity based on a population of 1,018, whereas current electoral and school data suggests the connected population already exceeds 1,390. The addition of 68 homes would push the system significantly beyond its 1,400-person limit, exacerbating environmental pollution.

## 4. Electrical Grid Constraints and Utility Unreliability

The local electrical grid is already incapable of meeting demand. The recently completed Sumners Fields development (32 homes) provides a cautionary precedent: several occupied homes there currently rely on backup diesel generators because the network cannot reliably supply power.

Despite this, Miller Homes proposes 68 all-electric homes using air source heat pumps without conducting a formal grid capacity assessment or consulting UK Power Networks.

## 5. Deterioration of Irreplaceable Habitats: Ancient Woodland

The site adjoins Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (ANCWOO122269), an irreplaceable habitat protected under NPPF Paragraph 186(c).

The proposal violates Natural England's Standing Advice by routing a permanent, surfaced public footpath through the 15-meter buffer zone.

Standing Advice is unequivocal that buffer zones should consist of semi-natural habitats and must not include development features like surfaced paths.

This path will create a "desire line" leading to trampling, pet predation, and light pollution that will inevitably cause habitat deterioration.

## 6. Destruction of Ancient Hedges and Loss of Protected Species Habitat

To facilitate site access, the applicant proposes removing the ancient hedge fronting Chapel Road. This hedge is a vital wildlife corridor and was confirmed to support hazel dormice-a European Protected Species.

Its removal would fragment local biodiversity networks and eliminate a natural buffer that currently prevents soil runoff into local drains.

## 7. Hydrological Misidentification and Increased Flood Risk

The planning submission contains a major hydrological error, incorrectly identifying the site as being within the "Arun catchment" when it drains into the "Adur and Ouse" catchment. This error invalidates the applicant's assessment of downstream impact. Local evidence directly contradicts the claim of "no evidence of flooding"; serious events regularly affect the village shop and properties in Six Acres Close. Developing this 3.2-hectare field-which currently acts as a natural "sponge"-into an impermeable urban landscape will increase the velocity of surface water runoff, placing the village centre at risk of catastrophic flooding.

#### 8. Harm to the River Adur Restoration Project

The site's sewage overflows discharge into Parsons Brook, which flows through the Knepp estate and into the River Adur. This poses a direct threat to the River Adur Restoration Project, a nationally significant initiative involving the Ouse & Adur Rivers Trust and the Environment Agency. Increased nutrient loading and biological pollution from 68 additional homes would significantly degrade the water quality that this project aims to restore.

#### 9. Housing Mix Mismatch and Failure to Meet Local Need

The Council's Housing Officers have stated they cannot support this application because the proposed housing mix does not align with the local Housing Register. While 61% of demand in the parish is for 3-4 bedroom family homes, the applicant's affordable provision is 76% 2-bedroom units. This scheme "would largely eliminate the identified two-bedroom requirement while failing to adequately address the most acute housing needs within the parish".

#### 10. Transportation Realities vs. Sustainable Travel Fantasy

The applicant's Transport Statement relies on a "Vision Scenario" that assumes a major shift away from car usage, despite their own data showing 81% of residents currently drive to work. The actual bus service in Barns Green is insufficient for commuting; there is only a single 07:00 departure on Wednesdays and no service at all during evenings or weekends. This development will inevitably generate over 200 vehicle movements daily on narrow village roads.

#### 11. Poor Architectural Design and Urban Sprawl

Analysis characterizes the scheme as a "second-rate housing scheme" that relies on "detached boxes behind private lawns," failing the National Model Design Code's requirement for "beauty" and "gentle density". Rather than creating a human-scale village street, the proposal creates a "detached, private enclave" that is out of character with the historic core of Barns Green.

#### 12. Distinguishing Legitimate Planning Objection from "NIMBY-ism"

It is important to clarify that this objection is not an act of "NIMBY-ism" or a general opposition to growth. The community of Barns Green has a proven track record of supporting well-designed developments in suitable locations that provide tangible benefits. A prime example is the Ashmiles development (69 homes), which was actively supported by the village. That project was part of a successful agreement that delivered the brand-new, "magnificent" Barns Green Primary School building, ensuring the future of education in our parish. Unlike the current proposal, Ashmiles was properly planned to integrate with the village and provide infrastructure that served the entire community. My current opposition to the Little Slaughterford site is based strictly on its lack of sustainability, its failure to meet identified local housing needs, and the demonstrable harm it poses to our already failing infrastructure and irreplaceable natural habitats.

#### 13. Loss of Community Amenity and Socio-Economic Harm

The field is a central village asset that hosts major charity events, including the Classic Car Show and Run Barns Green, which raise tens of thousands for local causes. Furthermore, the proposed road layout will remove on-street parking essential to the viability of the village shop and the Queen's Head pub. Both businesses have advised that the loss of this parking would make their enterprises unviable, threatening a total loss of services for elderly residents.

#### Conclusion

This application is characterised by technical incompetence-including incorrect postcodes (GU9) in energy assessments and misidentified river catchments-and a flagrant disregard for the made Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan.

Given the infrastructure crisis, the threat to irreplaceable habitats, and the clear policy conflicts, I request that the Planning Committee refuse this application in its entirety.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted Signature]

---

Kind regards

**Telephone:**

**Email:** [planning@horsham.gov.uk](mailto:planning@horsham.gov.uk)



**Horsham  
District  
Council**



---

**Horsham District Council, Alberty House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB**

Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) [www.horsham.gov.uk](http://www.horsham.gov.uk) Chief Executive: Jane Eaton