

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 November 2024 15:01:09 UTC+00:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/24/1538
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 09/11/2024 3:01 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land To The South of Furners Lane Henfield West Sussex
Proposal:	Erection of 29 dwellings with associated landscaping, open space, parking and creation of new vehicular access
Case Officer:	Stephanie Bryant

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	20 FURNERS LANE HENFIELD
----------	--------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design- Highway Access and Parking- Other- Overdevelopment- Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	I object to the current plan. Layout, design and scale of housing is inappropriate for the preservation of such a heritage site.
<hr/>	

The Henfield Neighbourhood Plan Policy 2.3 c. seems to have been totally disregarded.

Where are the single story dwellings suitable for older and downsizing households to meet local needs? I can only see chalet bungalows disguised as these, with dormer windows, heights of which appear to be similar to that of the two story houses proposed . What good is a room upstairs if you become immobile?

This land is the ONLY and LAST chance for the village to build single story bungalows within a short and safe walking distance to the village amenities. The hall in particular, hosts many clubs and activities which provide an important lifeline for many elderly residents within our community.

Keeping independence and enabling elderly/disabled people to stay in their homes should be a PRIORITY for the council.

I also note that only 28% of these properties will be built to M4 (2) or M4 (3) regulations for future adaptability and wheelchair access . WHY NOT ALL ??? None of us know when this requirement may be needed, but surely the developers and councils can commit to future proofing our homes . Otherwise where are these people to go if they can't stay in their own homes ? Moved into the already overburdened care system.

HNP: 2.3.d

The proposal has' regard to the amenities of adjoining residential properties.'

HNP : Policy 12: DESIGN STANDARDS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

it states:

12.a. The design respects the amenities of occupiers/ users of nearby property and land.

12 c The scale ,density, massing, height ,landscape design, layout and materials of ALL development proposals, including alterations to existing buildings are of high quality and reflect the architectural and historic character and the scale of surrounding buildings and street scene landscape.

As an owner of one of the bungalows on the western boundary of this plan I do not see that the developers have acknowledged our potential view at all. We are at the 'pinch point' corner with visitor parking spaces and flats 19/20 looking straight onto our gardens. The height of the 'affordable housing' block is totally unacceptable in relation to bungalows as well as the proposed red brick and tiling. Where is the sympathetic use of materials connecting to such an agricultural/heritage site? MUTED shades of grey /green and flintwork would be much more in keeping, blending into the countryside. The grey and taupe weatherboarding with the slate tiles would also work well and would be more reminiscent of agricultural buildings.

Look at the bungalows at the top of Furners Mead and Croudace estate for ideas to compliment the surroundings, also the bricks

used in the bungalows in the lower part of FURNERS MEAD.

On the landscaping plan there are trees proposed near the back boundary of bungalows 19 and 20 FURNERS MEAD. I presume the developers think that these will suffice in blocking out our view of the two story builds? I can only see deciduous trees on the plan which I am concerned that, as they grow, their canopy will block the light from our properties and kill off the existing hedge.

It is of note that the next door bungalow no.21 is owned by the charity/developer therefore no objections will arise from this site.

BACKSETTOWN:

Where is any consideration to the view of this heritage house from the village centre? As you walk through the footpath looking east towards the house along the existing drive, the proposal would mean that you would be met with housing totally out of scale and built in a bright brick and roof tiles, surely the more red/brown mix brick could be a compromise? This should be a considered view with potential homeowners and visitors to the village using this pathway regularly.

TRAFFIC :

If the whole of the estate was single story bungalows like FURNERS MEAD there would be far less traffic travelling to the proposed site. A high majority of residents living in bungalows around the village have only ONE car or don't drive at all... no more than 30 cars.

With the proposed development which includes 9 four bedroom houses you would be looking at more than 70 cars trying to get out of the already congested junction from Furners Lane onto the High Street daily .

INFRASTRUCTURE:

Is the developer contributing in any way to amenities in the village ? Poor infrastructure plagues the village and needs to be rectified before further developments are allowed.

Please may careful consideration be taken on this development, it has the potential to be an asset to the village if bungalows are built with the community in mind, NOT expensive 4 bedroom houses (which we have a plentiful supply of in the village) which can be sited in alternative locations earmarked in the village.

Regards

Kind regards