

Planning Application DC/25/2079

“Use of land for the stationing of 4no. static caravans for (Gypsy and Traveller) residential purposes and associated day rooms”

Address: Cotlands Paddock Horsham Road Cowfold West Sussex RH13 8AH

Objections to this Planning Application

Objection 1 Policy 23

- 1. a) “The Site is served by a safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access. The proposal should not result in significant hazard to other road users”**

The above statement is for the safety of current road users and for the protection of this proposal and its potential inhabitants. Anyone who knows this area, and as per crash data, will confirm this as a wholly unacceptable access for both vehicular and pedestrian usage. THREE DEATHS and multiple crashes with casualties legitimise just how dangerous this section of road already is. Therefore, this proposal will have a severe impact on the road network rendering the application undeliverable.

- e) “The development will not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and the amenity of neighbouring properties, and is sensitively designed to mitigate any impact on its surroundings”**

The application site sits within an area of character landscape value and will have an adverse and detrimental affect to both the area; residential properties, listed buildings of high heritage value including Grade ii star and the footpath will run alongside the site. The static caravans, day rooms, hardstanding, tow caravans, bike sheds, roadways created will all lead to unacceptable harm and cannot be mitigated.

Objection 2 Policy 24

Noise, odour and light pollution cannot be assessed with this current application and can neither be secured by applying planning conditions or controlled restrictions. Where necessary, contaminated land should be remediated, and the appropriate types and locations of lighting should be used, so as not to give rise to unnecessary light pollution, particularly in rural areas. The site location is rural and will lead to light pollution in a sensitive area and adjacent to a very dangerous road when considered in continuity with the carriageway. The application should therefore be refused.

Objection 3 Policy 25

The Cowfold Neighbourhood Development Plan illustrates that this site sits outside of the ‘Built Up Area Boundary’ and is not designated for any further development.

Policy 25 1. ***“Protects, conserves and enhances the landscape and townscape character, taking into account areas identified as being of landscape importance, the individual settlement characteristics.” And,***

2. ***“Maintains and enhances the existing network of geological sites and biodiversity, including safeguarding existing designated sites and species, and ensures no net loss of wider biodiversity and provides net gains in biodiversity where possible.”***

Read in context with Policy 25, this proposal does not accord and furthermore attracts conflict with biodiversity measures and the baseline for the site cannot be assessed due to the incorrect plans, and habitat definitions as listed within the NPPF.

Objection 4 Policy 26

Countryside Protection:

“Outside built-up area boundaries, the rural character and undeveloped nature of the countryside will be protected against inappropriate development”.

This area has unique characteristics of wooded character and natural beauty; this Policy seeks to protect and enhance such countryside landscapes and not to erode or extinguish that beauty and tranquillity, ensuring the continuation of the landform and its setting.

Objection 5 Policy 32

“High quality and inclusive design for all development in the district will be required based on a clear understanding of the local, physical, social, economic, environmental and policy context for development”.

The conflict of this proposal is such that Policy 32 is directly affected:

- 2- **“Complement locally distinctive characters and heritage of the district”.**

This Policy seeks to protect and complement the Heritage assets within the near vicinity. Cotland Cottage Grade ii listed building and Brook Place Grade ii star* listing will be severely affected by this proposal. The visual impact will have a high level of harm and the cumulative impact will have an even greater level of substantial harm when considered within the proximity and setting of the listed buildings.

- 3- **“Contribute a sense of place both in the buildings and spaces themselves and in the way they integrate with their surroundings and the historic landscape in which they sit”.**

The level of harm to be attributed to this conflict is at the highest end of the scale. The proposal is both a threat and does not in any way integrate with the sense of place afforded to the setting of the Listed buildings and their surroundings.

Objection 6 Policy 34

This Policy seeks to conserve and enhance the natural and built environment Heritage assets that are irreplaceable.

The aim of the historic environment policy is to sustain and where appropriate, enhance the significance of the district's heritage assets, including where those qualities which make the asset

special and historic. Significance is the sum of the architectural, historic, artistic, communal, social and archaeological qualities of a designated and undesignated heritage asset.

The Council recognises that the historic environment is an irreplaceable resource which should be conserved for future generations. It provides a backdrop to sustainable tourism and local economy by creating places and an environment which is unique to the district.

Ensure that it is designed to avoid unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupiers/users of nearby property and land, for example through overlooking or noise, whilst having regard to the sensitivities of surrounding development.

For all of the above reasons, the conflict caused by this proposal on the designated Heritage assets, their setting, visual receptors and cumulative impact, the application should be refused.

Conflict with NPPF December 2024

This application conflicts with the following national policies and framework the NPPF applies in the following areas directly to this planning application:

- Para 39, 40, 41, 42: Pre-app engagement encouraged
- Para 78, 79, 80 : Rural Housing
- Para 110: Consideration of Development Proposals
- Para 112: Highway Considerations
- Para 130: Design Beauty
- Para 135: Conserve and enhance local character
- Para 174: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment
- Para 179: Habitats and Biodiversity
- Para 200 a) and b): Considering Heritage Impacts

Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain

No ECIA or accompanying BNG offset mitigation matrix has been produced to highlight statutory requirement and legislation, currently DEFRA 4.0 Metric. It is utterly irrefutable that this application for development will not affect the species without scoping out, and then fully assessing the nature of the following species:

- Bats
- Breeding birds
- Dormice
- Gold Crested Newts
- 

The above five main species are protected and irrevocable Ecological factors, and are not hypothesising, merely stating, that their presence, or absence as the case may be, is not for debate but by interpreting Ecological surveys and its data, are conducted as per paragraph 179 of the NPPF.

Therefore, extensive surveying and assessing would need to be undertaken to support any Application for development. Those surveys, assessments and monitoring will need to be conducted through the winter and summer months, publishing full data sets of evidence gathered.

There is significant harm to the coherence of the Ecological network and multiple migrating species within the Application site and within the ancient hedgerow patterns that surround the site. Any development would undoubtedly disturb these Ecological communities and habitats and thus create noise and light pollution with devastating harm.

Landscape, Character Appearance of Area and Visual Impact

The Application site lies within open rolling agricultural rural countryside with native hedgerows, mature trees, tranquil setting, dark skies with minimal to no light pollution, no noise pollution, and a PROW contiguous to the boundary of the red line plan.

The PROW is enjoyed by the rambler's association and hundreds if not thousands of people wanting to exercise in the rural countryside and to enjoy the views and setting within This is a material consideration and falls onto the radar of being a receptor which would be harmed with significant magnitude on the higher scale to the visual effect and ZOI or Zones of Influence under GLVIA guidance for Landscape and Visual Impact, both visually and in sensitivity.

The mature tree belt and hedgerows will have a significant scale of harm by a single dwelling, and the proposal of four static caravans with day rooms, bike storage and tow caravan parking and provision, with associated paraphernalia, will not enhance this rural setting in terms of visual sense or place. The land is mature, agricultural 'Classification 2 very good value' as recorded on DEFRA maps and is cohesive to its surrounding field patterns and quality of soils.

View from South East of the application site and across the Public Right of Way (PROW) which is directly adjacent to the site



SUMMARY

For all reasons listed above, this planning application should be refused on Highways, Landscape, Heritage, Biodiversity and Ecology and on the very fact this is at the wrong location and will almost certainly cause additional and multiple vehicular crashes and casualties in future.

The severe impact on highways is a single reason for refusal in isolation on its own right.