

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 07 September 2026 17:46
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 07/09/2026 5:45 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: Woodfield Lodge, Sumners Ponds Chapel Road, Barns Green Horsham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Other - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Dear Ms Johnson, I object to this application. The proposal would erode the rural character of Barns Green, introduce an inappropriate form of development close to historic buildings, and add pressure to infrastructure where important questions remain unresolved. Having reviewed the application material, consultation responses and other representations, I consider that the scheme should be refused for the following reasons. Countryside location and the Neighbourhood Plan:

The application site is identified in the representations as lying outside the existing Built-up Area Boundary and is not allocated for development in the made Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan. Developing this land would extend housing into countryside and undermine the approach to development established through that Plan.

The proposed Local Plan allocations and boundary changes do not settle the acceptability of this application. The changes themselves are disputed, including the justification for reassessing sites previously considered not currently developable.

My objection is that the suitability of this land has not been adequately demonstrated. Increasing housing requirements does not remove the landscape, heritage and infrastructure constraints affecting the site. Any reliance on emerging allocations must be properly justified against the adopted policies and the outstanding objections.

Scale, design and village character:

The application proposes 31 homes against an indicative allocation of 25 in the emerging Local Plan-a 24% increase. Although that figure is not necessarily a fixed limit, the additional development requires convincing justification in a location with these constraints.

I support the design objections set out by Harry Whittaker in his representation dated 4 September 2026. The proposed suburban arrangement does not adequately reflect the groups of buildings, short terraces and defined streets and spaces that give Barns Green its character.

The use of selected local materials does not overcome the shortcomings of the overall layout. The arrangement of houses, roads, parking and frontages would introduce a development that, in my view, is out of keeping with this part of the village.

The countryside setting of Bennetts, Blacksmiths Cottage and the Queen's Head is also an important consideration. The proposal risks harming the relationship between these historic buildings and the open land around them. This is a permanent change to the character of the area.

Unresolved sewage treatment capacity:

The absence of clear confirmation of adequate sewage treatment capacity is a substantial ground of objection.

Southern Water's email dated 20 August 2026 confirms capacity within the local foul sewer network, but also states that testing at Barns Green Wastewater Treatment Works was continuing, with results expected around September. Capacity in the sewer network is not the same as capacity to treat the sewage reaching the works.

The resident-prepared Revision G calculations dated 31 August estimate a peak population of 1,721 and daily flow of 298,283 litres, compared with a stated consented dry-weather flow of 227,000 litres per day. These calculations exclude this application and the separate 68-home proposal, while including assumptions about full tourist occupancy in the local area and Sumners Ponds, infiltration and the proposed transfer from Itchingfield.

These are estimates prepared by a highly respected and knowledgeable resident with relevant expertise. While they are not measured flows or, on their own, proof of a permit breach, they raise significant questions about the capacity available once existing and approved connections are fully used.

The evidence must account for seasonal tourist occupancy, committed development and any transfer from the proposed closure of the Itchingfield Southern Water site. Any necessary improvements must also be shown to be achievable and secured for delivery. The correspondence supplied does not resolve these matters, and approval should not proceed on the strength of sewer-network capacity alone.

Flooding and surface-water drainage:

The Lead Local Flood Authority's response dated 28 August 2026 objects pending further information. It identifies outstanding matters concerning drainage connection levels and the asset owner's agreement to connect to and enlarge a culvert outside the application boundary.

The authority also identifies modelled flood risk on the highway at the proposed access. This raises concerns about safe access during flood events.

These are fundamental questions about whether the drainage and access arrangements will work. Until they are resolved, there is insufficient assurance that the development can be accommodated without increasing flood risk or creating problems elsewhere.

Wildlife, trees and hedgerows:

Place Services' ecological response dated 3 September 2026 raises a temporary holding objection because further information on bats is required before determination. It refers to nine bat species, including Barbastelle, recorded using adjacent site boundary habitats.

The outstanding survey information is necessary to assess the effects of the proposed layout, tree works and lighting. These matters could affect the space needed for habitat protection and the suitability of the design.

The loss or alteration of established hedgerows is a further concern because of their contribution to wildlife movement and rural character. Replacement planting does not immediately replace the function of established habitat.

The application should not be approved before the ecological information needed to assess these effects is available and satisfactory protection has been demonstrated.

Access, infrastructure and cumulative effects:

The Highway Authority has requested further information, including a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and further consideration of pedestrian crossings and connections. Safe access and practical walking routes remain matters requiring resolution, including whether the necessary works can be delivered independently of the neighbouring proposal.

Although the Highway Authority does not raise a network-capacity objection, that does not resolve the outstanding access and pedestrian-safety questions.

The combined effects of existing and committed development must also be considered. Additional pressure on sewage treatment, drainage and local infrastructure, together with construction disturbance and the gradual loss of rural character, cannot be properly understood by looking at each scheme in isolation.

The proposed housing mix and arrangements for delivering affordable homes must be justified against identified local needs. Any infrastructure improvements necessary to support the scheme must have clear and dependable delivery arrangements.

Impact on Sumners Ponds:

I also object to the potential impact on our business at Sumners Ponds. Its rural setting is central to the experience we offer. Further buildings, noise, lighting and construction disturbance could diminish that experience and affect visitors' willingness to return.

We have invested years of work in our lakes and habitats. Any potential effects on their water quality, drainage and wildlife connections require proper assessment. These concerns add to the wider objection to the loss of countryside and the cumulative impact of development around Barns Green.

For these reasons, I ask the Council to refuse the application in its current form. The proposal does not, in my view, provide an acceptable response to its countryside and historic setting, and the supplied consultation responses identify significant matters that remain unresolved.

Yours sincerely,


Local Resident and Director of Sumners Ponds Ltd

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: 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 Chief Executive: Jane Eaton