

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

From: [REDACTED] Codmore Hill, RH20 1DZ

Ref Application DC/25/0317. Amended Plans

COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING APPLICATION

1. The American Barn. I have printed of the drawing A4 size and doubled it to the A3 size. Due to the lack of a clear scale, I have had to deduce the footprint is approx. 16 m x 11 m. The size of a substantial dwelling. This would be ripe for conversion at a later date. It is designed for four horses, but there does not appear to be sufficient pasture for that number. The manure waste also needs to be considered and must not drain/ seep into the stream downhill. There appears to be no storage for this on site prior to removal.
2. 3 Stable Unit. This appears to be an identical footprint to the 'day rooms'. Again, it looks like it can be readily converted to accommodation. The building has been erected and does not represent the drawing submitted. It appears to have cage like bars for dogs. A misrepresentation. Another three horses mean more pasture and more manure waste. Neither of which are planned for.
3. The Dayroom. This has grown considerably since the initial application; it is now the size of a lodge in a holiday park and is not needed as these facilities should be available in the static caravans.
4. Bin and Bike shed. This is an open sided shelter. It is far from secure as suggested. I suspect this is insufficient bin capacity for the 10 people on site suggested in the Water Survey.
5. Block Plan.
 - a. The scale does not appear accurate and is misleading. The dayroom has been built and appears larger than on the plan. (ratios when compared to the boundary fence).
 - b. There are now two sets of large ornate metal gates. One leads to the site in question and the other to the paddock behind. These are not 'paddock gates' but suggest more units will be put into the paddock behind.
6. General points.
 - a. Bat boxes. There are no trees 3-5 m high on the site depicted by the plan. This is a pointless token gesture.
 - b. Fences. Some of these are on top of two rows of concrete gravel boards, Making them very high. Higher than the permissible boundary fence.
7. The Water Report. This report appears to be the work of a Ben Kirk at Promethean. I have a few issues with this report. Many of the figures don't stack up.
 - a. Human Consumption. He claims the average daily use for an individual is 64.3 litres per person per day. Southern Waters website suggests 274 litres for two. My personal meter reading is nearer Southern Waters estimate.
 - b. He is working on 10 occupants, this means 643 litres per day, which means for 365 days (a year) a total of 234,695 litres per annum for human consumption. Southern Waters figures would suggest more like 1370 litres per day. 500,050 litres per annum.
 - c. Equine Consumption. The report has failed to factor in the seven stables which suggest 7 horses. The Blue Cross website suggests 25-55 litres a day per horse. That is an average of 40 litres per day per horse. 280 litres per day for 7 horses. 102,200 litres per annum.
 - d. Total Consumption. Combining these two totals means a total of 336,895 litres per annum. Which means a similar volume of waste generated.
 - e. Water Harvesting. Buildings are listed with their catchment area capacity calculated. I have no way of checking this. The total is 460 sq m. An efficiency coefficient of 0.7 (70%) is suggested. This makes the realistic figure 322 sq m at 100% rainfall.
 - f. The North Heath table supplied gives an average over nearly 30 years. This table can be found on the Met Office Website. The annual average is 858.7 mm. Over 322 sq m this would generate 276.5 cubic metres. This is 276,501.4 litres.

- g. Initial Shortfall. The total consumption in para 7d and the harvest estimate in para 7f suggest a shortfall of 60,393 litres, 17.8%.
 - h. Southern Water Shortfall. The Southern Water and Blue Cross figures suggest a total of 602,250 litres. This suggests a shortfall of 325,749 litres, A 54% shortfall.
 - i. Page 14. Water Demand. I believe the two figures have been calculated incorrectly. They should be 22505(9.6%) and 38580(16.4%) litres respectively. No mention of the horses.
 - j. 35 Day Reserve. The suggested 35-day reserve. (9.6% of annual total). On the report figures this would mean 32,342 litres. Approx 3 of the 10,000 litres tanks set aside for the reserve alone. No mention of water for the horses.
 - k. 60 Day Reserve. The suggested 60 day (16.4%of annual total). On the report figures this would mean 55,588 litres being held on reserve. No mention of water for the horses.
 - l. There is no indication on the plan where all these tanks would go. Are they off-site? If so, where?
 - m. Wastage. Much of the water used will be grey water and need to be properly processed. There is no mention of any processing plant. The report talks of not putting pressure on the Arun and its tributaries. So where is all this waste, potentially, 336,895 litres per annum from the Report figure up to Southern Water figure of 602,250 litres per annum, going to go?
8. Other Issues Concerning the Site. I see from other reports by Pulborough and Horsham Councils this has been repeatedly rejected before for the logical and rational reasons outlined. I am not aware of any changes in policy allowing this type of unsupported development. At present it is a blot on the landscape, ruining a tranquil piece of countryside. It is not providing accommodation for those working on the land. If this were to be permitted it could result in a free for all in the area. I am confident the various Councils will have the necessary experience and courage the decline this type of action as they have done in the past. I am aware it may take some time, looking at other issues the Councils Have had to deal with.