

ITCHINGFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

www.itchingfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk

Date: 5th February 2026

Horsham District Council
Albery House
Springfield Road
Horsham
West Sussex
RH12 2GB

Dear Planning Team

Following the Extraordinary Itchingfield Parish Council Meeting on 4th February 2026, Itchingfield Parish Council (IPC) provides its response to planning application DC/25/2057 which is currently being considered by Horsham District Council.

This representation firstly addresses the status of the recently made Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan, the principle of development and the proposal's failure to comply in principle with the adopted development plan. Thereafter the representation provides comments in respect of site-specific matters covering issues including flooding, drainage, highways and design.

In constructing this response IPC has taken into consideration both planning consultancy advice and the wide range of objections lodged by residents of the Parish. IPC endorses the high level of local concern to the proposed development.

For the avoidance of doubt, **the Parish Council strongly objects** to the proposed development and requests that Horsham District Council (HDC) refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in this letter.

Given the short timeframe allowed for this consultation period IPC has had limited opportunity to engage with expert advice; IPC reserves the option to provide further comments and/or provide further expert based input beyond the expiry of the statutory consultation period.

The development plan

The UK planning system is plan-led. In England and Wales, section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications "*must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise*". In determining applications under section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, decision-makers must have regard to the provisions of the development plan and to any other material considerations.

The development plan is therefore the primary starting point for decision-making. Where a policy contained in one development plan document conflicts with a policy in another development plan document, section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the conflict to be resolved in favour of the policy contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published. In this case, the development plan comprises:

1. Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan (2024 – 2031) (INP)
2. Horsham District Planning Framework (2015-2031) (HDPF)
3. West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (2018)

National policy sits alongside the development plan as a material consideration. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) restates the statutory position, confirming that planning law requires applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Material considerations include national policy, and may include the evidential and technical assessments submitted with an application (for example highways, flood risk and ecology), consultee responses, and any emerging policies (and the weight afforded such policies, which may depend on their stage of preparation and the extent of unresolved objections).

In practice, this means the decision-maker must identify the relevant development plan policies, assess whether the proposal complies with them, and then carry out a transparent planning balance that explains what weight has been given to any other material considerations and why.

Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan (INP)

The Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan was made on 8th October 2025. At the point it was made it became part of the statutory Development Plan for the purposes of section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Notably the 8th October was just 32 days before the subject application was submitted, and 45 days before the application was validated by HDC Examination of the INP was conducted in 2021, and the Independent Examiner's Report was published in June 2021. The Examiner's Report made several recommendations for amendments to the INP to be made prior to any referendum, and progression of the INP to a referendum was further delayed by additional amendments necessitated by Natural England's Position Statement regarding water neutrality. Paragraph 3.2 of HDC's Final Decision Statement, 8th Nov 2024 explains how the water neutrality issue and the Habitat Regulations 2017 affected the capability of the INP to satisfy the Basic Conditions for neighbourhood plans set by legislation.

HDC's 'Final Decision Statement, in respect of the INP was issued by HDC on 8th November 2024. The Decision Statement confirms that – following the examination of the INP and receipt of the Examiner's Report – HDC was required by the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations to determine *"action to take in response to the recommendations of an Examiner following the formal examination"*. The Decision Statement confirms that, as at 8th November 2024 (some 3+ years after receipt of the Examiner's Report), the INP (as modified) complied with the legal requirements and could proceed to referendum.

The INP referendum was subsequently held on 4th September 2025, and the INP was duly made on 8th October 2025.

HDC's Adoption Statement, issued on 9th October 2025, outlines the statutory duty on HDC in the preparation of neighbourhood plans. Publication of the Adoption Statement followed consideration of the INP by Horsham Council's Cabinet on 8th Oct 2025. The officer report to the Cabinet refers to the legal obligation on the Council to "make" the neighbourhood plan providing it is satisfied that "Basic Conditions" relating to the preparation of the plan have been met. Those 'basic conditions' include that it has been prepared in accordance with the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

We are not aware of any legal challenge to the decision of HDC to make the INP.

Accordingly, as a 'made' plan, the INP is fully, legitimately and legally part of the Development Plan and – as a matter of fact (including in the context of s38 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act) – it is the last document to become part of the Development Plan.

The foreword to the Neighbourhood Plan confirms that the purpose of the INP is to set out how the parish will develop over the period until 2031, and how it will contribute to the housing build required by central government.

In scope, the INP is not limited to housing. It addresses where development should go, what kind of homes are needed and how development should be designed, while also covering wider land use matters including the environment and heritage, community infrastructure, water neutrality, the local economy and transport. It includes monitoring and review provisions, policy maps, and an accompanying evidence base that informs the vision, objectives and policies.

The INP provides policy support for a wide range of development, including housing, where it is within the identified Built Up Area Boundary. On housing, the INP expects a minimum of 61 new dwellings in the parish over the plan period, with circa 32 dwellings at Sumners Ponds, circa 20 dwellings at the Old School site, and the remaining 9 units anticipated as windfall within the Built Up Area Boundary (Policy 11), with in principle support for additional 'windfall' dwellings within the built up area boundary.

It is noted, and HDC will appreciate, that the site under consideration in this planning application was considered as part of the preparation work and evidence base informing the IDP and was deemed the least suitable site for development in the INP based upon scoring criteria supplied by HDC.

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015-2031)

The HDPF is Horsham District Council's adopted Local Plan for Horsham District outside the South Downs National Park. It replaced the earlier Core Strategy and General Development Control Policies (2007) and sets out the Council's vision, objectives and spatial strategy for managing growth and change up to 2031, to meet the district's social, economic and environmental needs. It is intended to be read alongside national policy and guidance, and it provides the strategic policy foundation that neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with.

The HDPF contains both strategic policies and general planning policies and identifies development locations to meet future needs including housing, employment, retail and other uses, while also providing a framework for protecting and enhancing the natural and built environment. It includes a set of strategic allocations and explains that infrastructure requirements arising from development are supported through mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy and section 106 obligations, particularly on strategic sites.

HDPF Policies 2 and 3 seek to achieve a sustainable distribution of development in the district and to maintain the district's rural character, in part by focusing new development within defined Built Up Area Boundaries. The application site is located outside the Built Up Area Boundary of Barns Green and is not allocated for residential development. As a result, insofar as HDPF Policies 4 (Settlement Expansion) and 26 (Countryside Protection) set out criteria for consideration of development in such cases, the proposal would not be in accordance with these policies.

Compliance with Development Plan

It is clear that the adopted development plan does not advocate, allocate, or provide policy support for new housing development at this site. The proposal is contrary to the HDPF and, significantly, is contrary to the INP. The INP identifies where housing is intended to be accommodated up to 2031 and, by implication, where it is not, and it re-confirms the Built-Up Area Boundary for Barns Green. The proposed development would therefore represent a departure from a recently made - and by definition up to date – development plan.

In a plan-led system, a departure from the development plan can only be justified where there are material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise, and where the decision-maker can evidence a clear and transparent planning balance. In this case, the proposal runs directly counter to the settlement strategy and countryside protection approach embedded in the adopted development plan, including both the INP and the HDPF.

Material considerations

As set out above, development proposals are required by section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan *“unless material considerations indicate otherwise”*.

Such material conditions, in this case, may include HDC’s *“Shaping Development in Horsham District Planning Advice Note”* (SDHD), approved by HDC’s Cabinet on 17 Sept 2025, as a non-statutory planning guidance document, the purpose of which (as described by the officers report to HDC Cabinet) is to *“to provide advice on the determination of planning applications in the context of the Council being unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply (and thus subject to the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ also known as the ‘tilted balance’)”*.

As non-statutory planning guidance, the SDHD does not form part of the statutory development plan and is a material consideration only, with the weight afforded it dependent on the facts of the case and its consistency with national policy and the adopted development plan. The Advice Note itself reflects this hierarchy, noting that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise, and it frames the document as providing *“clarity”* and *“guidance”* about the Council’s approach for those engaging with the planning system.

There are, in our view, two sections of the SDHD that are particularly relevant in the context of Horsham Council’s consideration of planning application DC/25/2057.

Section 2 of the SDHD discusses the *“weight of the HDPF and other documents”*. Those ‘other documents’ include the emerging Horsham District Local Plan 2023-2040.

In respect of the adopted HDPF, paragraph 2.4 of the SDHD acknowledges that given HDC is unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, paragraph 11 of the NPPF *“indicates that policies that affect that supply of housing may be considered out-of-date”* and that *“This has the effect of reducing the weight that may be afforded to such policies and engages the ‘tilted balance’ where there is an expectation that planning applications for housing should be approved”* but that *“the HDPF policies nevertheless may still carry some weight in decision making”*.

In respect of the HDPF therefore, HDC recognise that the titled balance of NPPF paragraph 11 applies, and a balancing exercise needs to take place when determining any application. In respect of the emerging HDLP, the SDHD considers and provides guidance on the weight that can be given to the emerging Local Plan policies by reference to the considerations set out at NPPF paragraph 49. For each of the considerations, HDC conclude that there is no justification for applying great weight to the policies of the still emerging HDLP, and paragraph 2.21 of the SDHD concludes: *“Taking the above together, the general advice is therefore that although the policies of the emerging Local Plan are likely to be material considerations in relation to specific planning applications, the weight to be applied to such policies is, at the time of writing, likely to be limited in most cases. The weight may increase should the examination progress to further stages.”*

There has been no further material progress to the examination of the emerging Local Plan since the SDHD was issued in mid-September 2025.

Section 3 of the SDHD, relates specifically to Neighbourhood Plans, and provides advice in relation to the weight afforded Neighbourhood Plans in the context of NPPF paragraph 11d) and the application of the 'tilted balance'. In doing so, Paragraph 3.4 of the SDHD makes clear that even if a local authority is unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, NPPF paragraph 14 would apply providing the neighbourhood plan satisfied the criteria set out in paragraph 14.

Those criteria are that:

- a) *"the neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan five years or less before the date on which the decision is made;*
- b) *the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement (see paragraphs 69-70)"*

The INP satisfies these criteria.

In respect of Criterion a) the INP became part of the development plan on 8th October 2025, well within 5 years before the anticipated date of decision for planning application DC/25/2057.

In respect of Criterion b), Chapter 6 of the INP addresses housing provision within the INP area, and Policies 9, 10 and 11 provide the policies and allocations to meet the identified housing requirement. Paragraph 6.2.6 of the INP says that the housing requirement figure for the INP is derived from three key sources, in addition to a Housing Needs Assessment undertaken on behalf of the Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group in March 2018, and was ultimately determined by Horsham Council as the strategic policy-making authority in line with NPPF paragraphs 69 and 70. Additionally, the INP Examiner's Report in recommending the INP could proceed to referendum, did so with due acknowledgement that 'delivering a sufficient supply of homes' was a relevant consideration (see paragraph 6.5 of the Examiner's Report), and included a modification (subsequently incorporated into the 'made' version of the INP) to provide *"a clearer set of arrangements"* for the process of reviewing the INP *"to take account of any revised housing numbers for the Parish which emerge from the local plan process"*.

We are not aware of any provision within statute or guidance that disapplies or has the effect of disapplying NPPF paragraph 14 on the grounds that the strategic housing needs requirement of the strategic policy-making authority may have changed.

Nor are we aware of any statute or guidance that sets a definitive timescale for the adoption of a neighbourhood plan once the Examiner's Report has been received (and, in any event, it is the case here that criterion a) of NPPF Paragraph 14 would still be met even if the INP had proceeded to referendum immediately after receipt of the Examiner's Report).

It is also the case of course, that evidence will always pre-date policy.

We note the applicant here refers to a recent appeal at a site referred to as *"Land to the south of Alderholt"*, to support their case that INP policies should be afforded less weight. That appeal however, related to a site for which the applicable Neighbourhood Plan (the Alderholt Neighbourhood Plan) was not made. Accordingly, NPPF paragraph 14 was not applicable in that case, as criterion a) of NPPF paragraph 14 was not met. That appeal case therefore represents a fundamentally different position to the policy position applying here, and the Inspector's views and conclusion in that case are of no relevance to the consideration and correct application of policy in this case.

Given all of the above, it is our view there are no grounds for concluding that the INP is somehow out-of-date or that paragraph 14 of the NPPF should not apply.

Rather, it is demonstrably the case that NPPF paragraph 14 is firmly engaged; that the proposal conflicts with the Neighbourhood Plan and, accordingly that such conflict is *“likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits”*.

The applicant’s Planning Statement, also makes reference to Appeal APP/Z3825/W/24/3355546 relating to Horsham Golf Club, in its consideration of the weight to be afforded to Neighbourhood Plan policy, in the context of insufficient housing supply at the district level. It is notable in that appeal, that the Inspector concluded that *“any conflict with NPPF paragraph 14 and the SNP would be outweighed by ‘other considerations’ in the case of a s38 balance or the ‘benefits’ of the scheme in the tilted balance under NPPF paragraph 11d) and HDPF Policy 1.”*. The benefits of that scheme, identified by the Inspector, included:

- provision of much needed and improved sports facilities, including a new home for Horsham Hockey Club and the Golf College
- provision of a new home for Warren Clark Golfing Dreams, a charity focused on using golf to encourage disabled and disadvantaged groups
- comprehensive programme of walking and cycling improvements providing material betterment to local residents
- financial contribution to increase the frequency of local bus services to the betterment of existing residents of the district
- delivery of commercial floorspace and employment within a new local centre
- 18.52 hectares of publicly assessable open space including natural and semi natural greenspace, allotments and eleven play areas
- Highway capacity improvements

The Inspector deemed the benefits to be of *“such magnitude”* that they outweighed the ‘flat balance’ policy conflicts *“even on the flat balance under section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004”*.

There are no equivalent, or even near-equivalent, benefits associated with the Barns Green proposal.

In our view, the sole benefit of some 68 new dwellings, in itself, carries insufficient weight to outweigh the conflict with the INP, and it cannot be sufficient reason to approve the proposal given the role and status of the neighbourhood Plan and the purpose and expectation of NPPF paragraph 14.

There are also a range of other material considerations that must be considered, some of which we consider below:

Drainage & flood risk

The application site is affected by areas of low, medium and high surface water flood risk. The Parish Council is concerned that developing this field will exacerbate existing flooding experienced in the village, particularly in the locality of the site, and that the proposed drainage strategy (including any works to the watercourse) may introduce risks that are not yet evidenced as acceptable.

National policy requires a sequential, risk-based approach to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding and, where development is necessary, to ensure it is safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. These requirements are reflected locally in HDPF Policy 38 (Flooding), which requires appropriate drainage and mitigation measures to ensure development is safe and does not increase flood risk off site.

The Parish Council also notes an apparent error within the FRA which refers to drainage to the Arun and Western Courses rather than the Ouse and Adur. Even if this is later described as a typographical error, it undermines confidence in the robustness of the assessment and reinforces the need for Horsham District Council to ensure the evidence base is corrected and internally consistent before it is relied upon.

Given the flood risk context, and pending the formal response from West Sussex County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority, the proposal currently fails to demonstrate compliance with the NPPF and HDPF Policy 38. The Parish Council requests that the application is not determined until the LLFA response is received and fully addressed. If the LLFA identifies deficiencies, uncertainty or unacceptable risk, this would justify refusal.

Traffic & Travel

The Parish Council has significant concerns regarding traffic, parking and the position and design of the proposed site access. The Transport Statement refers to highway works on Chapel Road to facilitate two-way movement and parking, but those works are outside the red line of the application. Reliance on off-site works that are not clearly secured and deliverable risks leaving unacceptable residual impacts.

National policy confirms that development should only be refused on highways grounds where there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or where residual cumulative impacts would be severe. The development plan requires the proposal to be appropriate in scale to the transport network (HDPF Policy 40) and to provide adequate parking to avoid overspill and highway safety impacts (HDPF Policy 41), having regard to West Sussex County Council's guidance as Highway Authority.

In this context, the evidence must demonstrate that the access location, visibility splays, and on-street conditions operate safely at school peak times and weekend peaks, and that the proposals do not prejudice safe and convenient access to the village shop and pub, including for disabled users. Any mitigation works relied upon must be fully secured and deliverable as part of the permission. Reference to a future TRO to manage parking outside the shop is not a substitute for an acceptable access and parking solution at the point of determination.

Foul drainage, sewerage capacity and pollution risk

The Parish Council remains concerned that the proposal would place additional pressure on an already constrained foul drainage and sewerage system, with a real-world history of sewer overflows affecting the local water environment as evidenced in public domain documents from the Rivers Trust. Those documents show that in 2021 there were 40 spills for a total of 252 hours, in 2022 there were 43 spills for a total of 410 hours and in 2023 there were 63 spills for a total of 569 hours. The latest data from the Rivers Trust confirms that in 2024 there were 60 spills for a total of 503 hours into Parsons Brook. Whilst the applicant references correspondence suggesting there is capacity within the drainage network, this does not, in itself, address the wider question of whether the overall wastewater system (including treatment and overflow performance) can accommodate the development without adverse environmental outcomes.

This is directly relevant to the development plan because HDPF Policy 39 (Infrastructure Provision) is explicit that the release of land for development is dependent on there being sufficient capacity in existing infrastructure, or the delivery of suitable mitigation in time. It also anticipates that studies may be required to determine whether a proposal will overload existing infrastructure. In this case, the evidence base should go beyond a narrow statement about point-of-connection capacity and should robustly address the actual performance constraints experienced locally, including the risk of an increased number of pollution incidents arising from exceedance of system capacity.

In addition, any increased risk of pollution to watercourses is inconsistent with HDPF Policy 24 (Environmental Protection), which requires development to avoid unacceptable environmental impacts, including impacts arising from pollution. The NPPF similarly requires decision-making to ensure development is appropriate for its location having regard to environmental effects, and it is a core principle of the planning system that the environment and amenities of existing residents should not be adversely affected by infrastructure overload.

Accordingly, the Parish Council considers that Horsham District Council should apply Policy 39 rigorously and should not place weight on generic capacity statements if they are not supported by a transparent, locality-specific assessment of network and treatment performance. If adequate capacity and/or deliverable mitigation cannot be evidenced, this weighs materially against the proposal and should be treated as a reason to refuse permission.

Deliverability of essential utilities and infrastructure

The Parish Council notes the ongoing local concern that the Sumners Ponds development has reportedly not yet been connected to the mains electricity network. Whilst this may be described as site-specific, it raises a legitimate deliverability concern about whether essential utilities can be provided to new development in the locality in a timely way, and whether interim solutions risk unacceptable impacts on amenity and the environment.

This is relevant to decision-making because HDPF Policy 39 (Infrastructure Provision) requires that where extra infrastructure capacity is needed, it must be provided in time to serve the development (or the relevant phase), so that the environment and amenities of existing or new residents are not adversely affected. It also confirms that infrastructure delivery can be secured by planning obligation, CIL, or conditions. The Parish Council therefore requests that Horsham District Council requires robust confirmation of deliverability for key utilities (including electricity) as part of the evidence base, including any required network reinforcement, programme for delivery, and phasing arrangements.

Design, height, character and “suburbanising” impacts

The Parish Council is concerned that the submitted design approach appears tall, suburban in form, and out of keeping with Barns Green’s established character and edge-of-settlement setting. In a village context, the scale, massing, roof forms, plot patterns, boundary treatments and materials are not a secondary matter. They are central to whether the proposal conserves local distinctiveness and avoids harm to the rural character and townscape.

This is a clear development plan issue. HDPF Policy 33 (Development Principles) requires development to be of a high standard of design and layout, with scale, massing and appearance that relates sympathetically to its surroundings and avoids unacceptable harm to amenity, including impacts on skyline and important views, and it requires development to be locally distinctive and to respect the character of the surrounding area.

National policy also places substantial weight on achieving well-designed places. The NPPF (paragraphs 132 to 137) emphasises that design policies should reflect local aspirations grounded in an understanding of each area’s defining characteristics, and that applicants should demonstrate how proposals meet design expectations, including through effective engagement. It also recognises the importance of retaining existing trees wherever possible and incorporating trees as part of development design.

The Parish Council considers that the scheme, as currently presented, fails to demonstrate a sufficiently contextual response to Barns Green’s character, and this weighs against the application when assessed against the development plan and national policy.

Loss of ancient hedgerow, impacts on ancient woodland and biodiversity

The Parish Council objects to the proposed loss of the hedgerow at the front of the site and is concerned about potential impacts on ancient woodland and the wider ecological network. Hedgerows and woodland features are part of the district's landscape structure and rural character, and their removal can represent irreversible harm.

The development plan contains strong policy protection in this regard. HDPF Policy 31 (Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity) supports development only where there are no significant adverse impacts on biodiversity, including ancient woodland, and it requires appropriate avoidance, mitigation and compensation where impacts arise. The countryside strategy also recognises the importance of landscape features such as field patterns and boundaries, including hedgerows, as part of rural character.

National policy is particularly clear on irreplaceable habitats. The NPPF (paragraph 193c) states that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees, should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists.

Given this policy context, the Parish Council considers that any proposal involving loss of an ancient hedgerow and risks to ancient woodland should be treated as a matter of substantial weight against the scheme, unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate avoidance, and where that is not possible, a compelling case that satisfies the relevant development plan tests and the very high national policy bar for irreplaceable habitats.

Impact on local businesses

There are considerable concerns over the potential impact on local businesses both during the build out phase of development and in the longer term. The very real potential loss of the local shop/post office and pub would have a significant negative effect on the local community. These facilities provide a critical role in maintaining a vibrant local community and in providing valuable local services.

Conclusion

To conclude, the proposed development is contrary to the adopted development plan in principle. The site lies outside the defined Built Up Area Boundary, is not allocated for housing, and the proposal conflicts with the settlement strategy and countryside protection approach in the Horsham District Planning Framework. Most significantly, it conflicts with the Itchingfield Neighbourhood Plan, which was made on 8 October 2025 and is therefore the most up to date expression of the development plan for the parish. The Neighbourhood Plan has been examined, endorsed through referendum, and made by Horsham District Council. It identifies how and where housing growth should be accommodated to 2031, and the application site is not supported by that strategy.

There is no basis for treating the Neighbourhood Plan as out of date, and the protections for made neighbourhood plans in NPPF paragraph 14 are engaged. The clear direction of national policy, in those circumstances, is that permission should not be granted for development that conflicts with the Neighbourhood Plan, because the adverse impacts of doing so are likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

The Parish Council does not consider that direction is displaced on the facts of this case. The principal benefit advanced is the delivery of 68 dwellings. In the Parish Council's view, that benefit alone, without more, is not of such magnitude that it can reasonably outweigh the direct conflict with the recently made Neighbourhood Plan and the spatial strategy of the adopted Local Plan. There are no

equivalent wider public benefits of the type sometimes relied upon in other cases to justify setting aside neighbourhood plan policy. Further, there are numerous harmful impacts, some of which are set out in this letter, which weigh against the grant of permission.

For these reasons, and having regard to the additional concerns raised in this letter, Itchingfield Parish Council unequivocally requests that Horsham District Council refuses planning permission.

Kind regards,

Itchingfield Parish Council

Itchingfield Parish Council

Submission by Locum Clerk (Justin Tyler) on behalf of Itchingfield Parish Council following IPC Meeting of 4th February 2026