For official use only (date received): 04/09/2025 16:16:17

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/Z3825/W/25/3369821

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference	APP/Z3825/W/25/3369821
Appeal By	MR SIMON BISHOP
Site Address	Development Site Lot 3 Kent Street Cowfold West Sussex RH13 8BB

SENDER DETAILS

Name	[redacted]
Address	46 Puttock Way BILLINGSHURST RH14 9ZJ

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- ☐ Appellant
- ☐ Agent
- ☑ Interested Party / Person
- ☐ Land Owner
- ☐ Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- ☐ Final Comments
- ☐ Proof of Evidence
- ☐ Statement
- ☐ Statement of Common Ground
- ☑ Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- ☐ Other

COMMENT DOCUMENTS

The documents listed below were uploaded with this form:

Relates to Section: REPRESENTATION
Document Description: Your comments on the appeal.
File name: Case APP,Z3825,W,25,3369821.pdf

PLEASE ENSURE THAT A COPY OF THIS SHEET IS ENCLOSED WHEN POSTING THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS TO US

Dear Mr Devereux,

I am writing to lodge a formal objection to appeal application APP-Z3825-W-25-3369821 concerning the commercial development along the rural lane serving my parents' property.

This location is entirely unsuitable for the scale of activity proposed. The lane is a single-track road with no passing places, and the volume of traffic generated by the development has already resulted in regular congestion, obstruction, and delays. These conditions pose a direct risk to both residents and livestock, while also creating a serious hazard for emergency vehicle access. The absence of a fire hydrant in the area is particularly alarming, as it represents a fundamental breach of fire safety expectations. National fire service strategy, Building Regulations, and statutory guidance all require adequate access and water supply for firefighting. Without this provision, the development risks being non-compliant from the outset and leaves the emergency services unable to fulfil their duties effectively. This is not only a planning issue but a matter of life safety.

In addition to the risks to safety, my parents' home has suffered a profound and sustained loss of amenity. What was once a quiet and rural setting is now subject to noise and light pollution, loss of privacy, repeated boundary damage, and, on occasion, aggressive behaviour from visitors to the site. These impacts are demonstrably harmful and are contrary to Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998, which protects the right to peaceful enjoyment of one's home and property.

Taken together, the combination of inadequate infrastructure, absence of essential fire safety measures, and the significant loss of residential amenity demonstrate that this proposal is wholly incompatible with its rural setting. It conflicts with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, which places a duty on planning authorities to ensure safe access, to protect rural communities, and to avoid unacceptable harm to residents.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Planning Inspectorate to refuse this application on the basis that it is unsafe, unsustainable, and incompatible with the character and needs of the local area.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]