
From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 26 January 2024 19:17
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/23/0406
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 26/01/2024 7:18 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land To The West of Ashington C of E School Park Lane Ashington West Sussex
Proposal:	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 180 dwellings, all-weather sport pitch, sports pavilion and allotments; with associated access, landscaping, open space and infrastructure.
Case Officer:	Nicola Pettifer

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	13 FAIRFIELD ROAD ASHINGTON PULBOROUGH
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Other - Overdevelopment
Comments:	Below is a copy of my submission to Bellway. I would particularly draw attention to the overdevelopment varying from agreed Neighbourhood Plan as they are proposing to build more homes on a smaller area of land. Following attendance to a Parish Council meeting on 11th Jan 2024 my wife and I were left completely unconvinced as to the credibility and workability of your suggested plans. The lack of any communication with the Parish Council (appearing to ignore all contact by the council) was rude and inconsiderate. The main gripe is the proposed number of houses to be built by yourselves i.e. 180 this is a discrepancy from the agreed, and voted for, Neighbourhood Plan where it was agreed to

accept 150 houses.

You also propose to erect the houses on a smaller site than was originally outlined thus making everything more compact. It appears you decided not to purchase all the land that was available, instead selecting a smaller amount of land for a larger quantity of housing. Your suggestion of less than 100 car journeys (at peak times) also seems unrealistic as people are now being asked to return to their offices.

The allocation of parking spaces per household is also ridiculous. How does a fraction of a car parking space work? Unless you insist everyone owns a smart car you are effectively restricting 1 & 2 Bed properties to 1 car per household and 3 bed properties and above to 2 cars per household. This is entirely unrealistic.

The amount of available parking for use with the Sports Pavilion and adjoining allotments was very ambiguous as it seemed there was only provision for 10 to 12 parking spaces for both areas.

The flood risk you feel is minimal for the new estate, however what about the rest of the village. The run off will go somewhere and the village suffers with more than enough flooding as it is. More properties = more displacement.

Referring back to my first view (quantity of housing) you may have come across as more genuine and caring if you had asked just to build an additional 10 (affordable homes and using the original quantity of land) instead of a further additional 20 more. Just seems greedy.

Kind regards