

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 31 August 2026 17:29
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0933

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 31/08/2026 5:29 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Between Muntham Drive and Smugglers' Lane Chapel Road Barns Green West Sussex
Proposal:	Erection of 31 dwellings with access from Chapel Road including roads, parking and open space.
Case Officer:	Alice Johnson

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: Applemead, Chapel Road, Barns Green Barns Green Horsham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	I wish to object to this overdevelopment and ask the council to extend the deadline for comments and a decision until ALL statutory bodies have completed due diligence and completed their analysis. How can a decision be made before Southern Water have confirmed that there is adequate capacity in their waste water treatment facility in Barns Green. HDC's planning Officer has already questioned SW on how capacity could be confirmed for this application while testing is still ongoing for the Miller Homes site. Shanly's own ecologists say that further Bat activity surveys are required between April and September with further assessments following completion. The 10th September doesn't give any time for these to be carried out satisfactorily. Environmental Health people want more investigation around the stables area at the top of the

site.

The Biodiversity Statement is incomplete

Surely HDC has time to wait until ALL relevant materials can be scrutinised by themselves and the residents of the Parish.

Our Neighbourhood Plan was Made at the beginning of last year. The HDC Local Plan was thrown out and now HDC are trying to shoehorn more sites into a small village without any consultation with Parish Council or residents.

Whilst we, as a Parish, are not against new houses we are against them being dropped on us in the most unwanted places in the parish.

Both this site and the recently refused DC/25/2057 are over development in this small rural village. We have taken our fair share of new houses in the last 10 years. And they have been on sites we were happy with.

There are so many similarities and my objections to both sites are inevitably going to be similar.

Neighbourhood Plan:

Our initial call for sites for the Neighbourhood Plan identified 29 sites within the Parish which were all looked at with National Guidelines for Suitability, Availability, Achievability/Deliverability, Location/Context: Of the 29 sites reviewed Site number 18 (land north of Smugglers Lane) had the fifth best outcome with approximately 10 in favour and 28 opposing.

It was also deemed undevelopable by our NP and crucially by the HDC plan.

How has this sudden change of policy come about? Why is it now deemed developable?

This parcel of land was, until very recently, outside the BUAB. This has now been moved to accommodate this application and DC/25/2057 at the stroke of a pen from HDC. There was no consultation with the residents or the Parish Council, How is this legal?

The NPPF Paragraph 124 states that "The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

This development fails on Good design - It is an urban set up with box houses behind private lawns, completely out of character with the existing surrounding buildings. There are 3 Grade 2 listed buildings to the east of the site.

Bennetts, is especially close and will sit only a few metres from the nearest house. This house will have little or no foundations. Houses of this period would normally have bricks or stone laid directly into shallow trenches and the weight distribution relies on spreading the load broadly across a wide footprint to keep the weight balanced rather than a large and deep body of concrete below each wall. Because the foundations are so shallow they are very sensitive to major shifts in local clay soils or heavy nearby excavation. This development could materially affect this house and should not be allowed.

Risk of Flooding:

There have been many photos taken by residents over the past years where both the pub and the shop have been flooded. Once the water goes through the shop it goes into their garden and keeps going on to Six Acres Close and then drains down to the junction with the Hordens where two houses are regularly flooded.

Even with the relatively new drains down the hill from Marlands the water races down the hill and is met by water from this field.

Drainage:

There is currently not enough capacity at the Barns Green Waste Water Treatment Works - despite what Southern Water may say. As we all know Water Companies are obliged to connect by law so they will tend to be economical with the truth. Merely quoting a manhole reference and a figure. We have an ex-water company employee who has looked at in depth and has figures to back up the fact that it is already overloaded and this development will only make it worse.

The ground already gets waterlogged in this field in the Autumn and winter and water runs off directly opposite the pub. By concreting over much of the site this will give the water less chance of getting off the site and will inevitably mean water running down the new access road and across into the pub car park, into the pub (a listed building) and Heron's Reach (listed building) attached to the shop, both of which sit below the road level and already experience flooding every year.

Transport/Traffic:

They say that the bus timetable makes it suitable for commuting. I disagree with that statement. Travelling to Horsham for a job would mean leaving BG at 7.00 in the morning and

then catching the 16.35 bus home. For those workers who start and finish early this may be OK but anyone working a traditional 9-5 job will have to wait around for 1 ¾ hours before work and leave half an hour early to be able to commute by bus.

Furthermore, there are NO weekend buses! Not so great for a shopping trip to Horsham.

The offer of a one off [REDACTED] bus or cycle voucher is a sop to Cerberus.

The road where the site is proposed to join is a narrow B road (Chapel Road not Church Lane as noted on some Shanly documents!)). The proposed access to the site would be directly opposite the Queens Head Public House car park and beer garden. The traffic management plan states that there will only be one vehicle movement every 4 minutes at rush hour and that "would be unlikely to be perceptible on the local network". If that vehicle was moving with the rest of the traffic coming in and out of the village that might be the case, but they will be entering the flow of traffic at critical times for the shop next door and with cars going past at an average of 27.1-27.6 (85th percentile) they would need to slow down to let people in or out and cause even more congestion than is currently experienced.

Cars travelling through the village and stopping and leaving the pub and village shop (next door) will be pulling out into traffic from three directions. Four directions if the Miller Homes site goes ahead.

Infrastructure Power & water:

The current development at Sumners Fields, started in the summer of 2024 has only in the last 2 weeks, had power connected to the bulk of the houses. The owners have been on generators whilst the electricity supply is upgraded to cope with these homes. How do the developers expect to get more power for these new houses?

I am very concerned about the lack of joined up thinking with the planning process . We have just had 32 new homes built approximately 100yards away from the site where an application for 68 homes has just been refused. Although the Planning Committee were at pains to point out to Councillors at the open committee meeting that it will be appealed and were 100% sure it will go through on appeal.

Now there is another application for 31 homes next door to that site. That would make 131 new homes in a small village in the past 3 years.

The first one is almost completed, has only just had electricity connected and has towering buildings which don't fit in with any others in the neighbouring buildings. The 68 homes planned are more suited to an urbanisation such as Crawley and do not fit in with the rural scene. They will ruin the aspect and nature of the village forever being opposite 3 listed buildings. Now another 31 homes are proposed to add to that. These too are more akin to a development in a town with houses at the back of large front lawns and are very close to another listed building.

Are HDC looking at these 3 applications in complete isolation for "planning purposes" or are they standing back and considering the impact that a further 99 homes will have on a beautiful village when they are slapped right in the middle?

In isolation all these three sites may look acceptable from a planning standpoint but taken together they represent a huge impact on the character of a small village.

The emerging Local Plan has identified 50 homes for the Miller Homes site and 20 for the Shanly homes site. Why are they now 68 and 31? Who decided that was acceptable?

As stated at the very top. This is over development and I urge the council to refuse the application.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**

