
Sent: 11 February 2026 10:50
To: Planning
Subject: DC/25/2114 + attachment
Categories: Comments Received

Good morning

I set out below a number of concerns arising from the submitted reports within application DC/25/2114

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

*What is evident from looking at the wider area of Upper Beeding is that there is **no particular** architectural or **historic style** that is prevalent in the local housing stock.* ‘

While parts of Upper Beeding may contain a mix of housing styles, this is not relevant to the immediate context of the application site, which lies adjacent to Sele Priory Grade II listed and within the setting of the Grade I listed Church of St Peter. These heritage assets clearly establish a strong historic and architectural character, and their setting is afforded the highest level of protection. The applicant’s assertion therefore fails to reflect the site’s true context and understates the potential harm arising from the proposed development.

Transport Statement

*‘Upper Beeding has a number of retail facilities in the High Street area and Hyde Square. These include a NISA supermarket, a pharmacy and associated shop, a **Post Office**, newsagent and takeaway food outlets.’*

Upper Beeding has not had a Post Office for at least 8 years

‘*The proposed development can be **safely** accessed and serviced from the existing highway network via Church Farm Walk. **A network of footpaths links the local area.***

Upper Beeding High Street and the local supermarket are within a 10 minute walk from the site. The local road network is considered suitable for cycling and National Cycle Network Route 223 provides an off-road link to Shoreham-by-Sea. The site can therefore be accessed by means other than the private car with public transport provision within walking distance of the site.'

The Transport Statement states that the site can be "safely accessed and serviced" via Church Farm Walk. However, Church Farm Walk has no footpaths, requiring pedestrians to share the carriageway with vehicles. In the absence of pedestrian infrastructure, the report provides no evidence to support its claim that access would be 'safe'. This omission undermines the credibility of the assessment and the conclusion that the highway network is suitable for the proposed development.

It is also highly misleading to report that there 'a network of footpaths' as there is no footpath within Church Farm Walk or Church Lane....I live in Church Farm Walkshould I wish to walk with my dog down through Church Farm Walk...then down the full length of Church Lane I wouldn't come across a footpath until I arrived at the very end....Church Farm Walk and Church Lane ARE the footpaths.
See diagram below.

*'The western section of Church Lane has sections of **grass verges**, front gardens and driveways adjoining the carriageway. Footways are present on Deacons Way and the route connecting the High Street via Church Lane, Priory Field and Saltings Way. The southern section of Church Lane does not have a formal footway but has a section demarcated by a white line for pedestrians.'*

The grass verges mentioned are in actuality....steep slippery grass banks.

Please note that it is misleading to mention.....

'The southern section of Church Lane does not have a formal footway but has a section demarcated by a white line for pedestrians'

The southern section of Church Lane which is approximately 1/2 a mile from the proposed site is not relevant to the proposed site which is also called Church Lane that has no such white lines and neither is this section 'one way'....that is

the narrow width of one car than can drive up and down at the same time with one driver needing to reverse and doubles up as a footpath.

The Transport Statement fails to clearly identify where construction traffic would enter the site or how such traffic would be managed. It states that 'access would be at the north end of Church Farm Walk'

I am concerned that this creates the impression that all **construction** traffic will enter the site at the stated access point, when in reality construction traffic may instead enter via Riverside Park. If that were to occur, the objections raised regarding Church Lane would not have been properly assessed.

This represents a significant omission and the application should not be determined until this information is provided.

The Transport Statement contains multiple inaccuracies. I have identified at least six errors, which calls into question the reliability of the document and means it cannot be trusted as a sound basis for decision-making

Thank you


Oxcroft
Church Farm Walk
Upper Beeding
BN44 3HD



Sent from my iPad