
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 April 2025 19:23
To: Planning
Subject: Application DC/25/0317

Categories: Comments Received

To: Kate Turner, planning@horsham.gov.uk

From: [REDACTED] Codmore Hill, RH20 1DZ

Ref Application DC/25/0317

COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING APPLICATION

1. I have read a number of the objections to the above application and endorse them.
2. General Point.
 - a. Over the years there has been a steady development by stealth in the general area.
 - b. South of the Toat Garage there is an area of block-built constructions that have been left abandoned with a number of scruffy caravans on site.
 - c. At the corner of Hill Farm Lane, Stane Street, Rose View(?) has been developed on an old car park.
 - d. In Blackhurst Lane there are a number of static sites that have also appeared, masquerading as a nursery.
 - e. Another site in Pickhurst Lane appears to have been halted, after the council instructed the removal of a bank that was clearly put there to stop passers-by seeing what was going on.
 - f. In Pickhurst Lane, next to the site in question there are another group of 'static' sites.
 - g. I am also aware of unauthorised sites on Harbelots Lane
 - h. Comment: There seems to be a general disregard for the conventional planning rules and regulations. Utilities and drainage seem to be poorly thought through. This application is another disregard for the conventions of society, and another example of 'land grabs' for the wrong purposes.
3. Comments on the Application
 - a. The comments from Batchelor Monkhouse deal with the technical issues, about which I am not qualified or experienced. I will stick to what I can see as I pass the site.

b. The 'drain'. The plan refers to a drain to the south of the property. It is not a drain. Drains are manmade, design to move excess rain/water from a site, such as a country road. In town the drains tend to flow into the water waste system for treatment. This is a natural stream that has been carved out of the contours over hundreds of years. It is a natural feature and is fed by a number of seasonal springs that emerge below Hill Farm Lane when the water table is high. It is also fed by streams from the other side of Pickhurst Lane from the area of the Toat Monument. It has its own eco system and I have seen ducks and other wildlife in that area and further downstream, it eventually flows into the Arun. It is a stream and not a 'drain' as suggested in the application.

c. 'Static' Caravan. It is clear by the name the term used there is no intention of moving the caravan, which in essence makes it a permanent structure. It is not a caravan as it is not designed to travel on the road towed behind a tractor/prime mover. There is no image to suggest the 'rain harvesting' as suggested in the application. No sign of septic tanks or drainage management

d. 'Day' Rooms. This definition is open to abuse. In a hotel environment, it is a room designed for a short stay, but not overnight. In the prison/hospital sense it is an area to sit out for recreational purposes. It is very unlikely to have bathing and cooking facilities as specified in the application as the host institution would supply them. There should be no need for this, as these facilities would be available in the static home. These are the sort of facilities I would expect to see on a campsite, which would have the necessary planning permission. This appears to be an attempt to build 'half a house' with the intention of increasing it later. The footprint is similar to a 1970's 3 bedroom semi. This is not needed when you have the static home. This is 'mission creep' and suggests that other units will be packed onto the site. Again, more stress on the drainage system. There is no indication of 'rain harvesting' as mentioned in the application. This implies another 'family unit' would be on site.

e. Caravan Plot. A caravan is pictured parked on the driveway. In my deeds I am not allowed to park a caravan on my driveway. The fact the applicants have drawn one in indicates a degree of permanence. This indicates another (third) family unit could be on site.

f. Block Plan. I have not been on site to measure, but I feel that the plan bears little resemblance what is happening on site.

- i. The southern boundary appears to be a lot further south than drawn.
- ii. The drawing has a gate. I have not spotted a gate.
- iii. The height of the fence is higher than the standard domestic boundary height. It has two concrete base blocks, obstructing surface drainage. The style is not in keeping with the area.
- iv. The day rooms are drawn 5 m square, contrary to the detailed drawing.
- v. The cars appear to be very small. Again, I suspect to make the space look bigger. Probably not big enough to pull the caravan that has been drawn.
- vi. The caravan appears to be very narrow also.

vii. The access is new and there is very little turning area. I have seen councils turn down barn conversions because the road access does not meet the modern safety requirements. I suspect this may apply here.

viii. There has been a strip left along by Pickhurst Lane. There is no need for this as there was access to the field from the east before the new gateway was put in. This strip suggests two things to me. It may be later cleared to be used for parking. Or will be used as access to a similar project to 'infill' the space behind the static units.

ix. At present there is a mystery 'barn/shed' in the middle of the plot. There is no mention of it on the plan.

x. Amenity Areas. At present it appears to be a paddock for a horse.

xi. Summary: The block plan does not resemble the site. It is a very economical depiction.

4. Additional Comments. I suspect this application is outside any settlement boundary, and it is not within a garden boundary making it permissible. I have had an initial enquiry turned down to develop my late mothers garden because it was outside the settlement area. (Tandridge District Council) I see this as a permanent development. It is not sanctioned by the Council or the State. If it was, they would be insisting on considerably more units on such a site. I suspect it is also not in the Local Plan.

5. I would urge the council to dismiss this application and have the site returned to its original state. Like the sites in Harbelots Lane, it is unauthorised, and in breach of planning regulations.

6. I would also like to suggest that firms that deal in hardcore and concrete footings should insist on seeing planning permission before they agree to deliver to such a site. If there is no planning permission, they should also be held liable. This would cut down this type of abuse.

I am also aware of unauthorised sites on Harbelots Lane