

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 January 2020 18:19
To: Planning
Subject: Re: Planning Application Reference Number DC/19/2464
Attachments: Comments on DC.19.2464.pdf

For the attention of Matthew Porter

Please see attached letter containing comments on Planning Application Reference Number DC/19/2464 -
Erection of 80 Dwellings ... at Land West of Worthing Road, Southwater (Phase 5)

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Oakwood
Shaws Lane
Southwater
Horsham
RH13 9BX**

1 January 2020

Sent by e-mail to: planning@horsham.gov.uk

For the attention of Matthew Porter

Re: Planning Application Reference Number DC/19/2464

Erection of 80 Dwellings ... at Land West of Worthing Road, Southwater (Phase 5)

Dear Sirs

I wish to raise three concerns with the above planning application as follows.

Additional footpath route with access onto Shaws Lane

My first concern is the inclusion of a second footpath access point on to Shaws Lane in addition to the existing Public Right of Way (PROW 1652). This is described on page 34 of the Proposals Document as "Retention of informal existing footpath route" (key feature 9 on the proposed site layout on that page of the document). It is incorrect to describe this as an existing footpath route. The only footpath route from Shaws Lane across the field on which this development is planned is via the Public Right of Way 1652 (key feature 3 on the aforementioned site layout).

It appears that Berkeley Homes, at their own admission (see page 47 of the Proposals Document – 5.9 Movement and Access – Pedestrian and Cycle (pp06)) showed the existing Public Right of Way in the incorrect location in their previous application but now, having corrected their error and reintroduced the existing Public Right of Way access point onto Shaws Lane, want also to retain the incorrect footpath access to Shaws Lane. I note that the footpath was also shown in the incorrect position, and not in the correct position, on a number of the historic maps (those from 2000, 2006 and 2017) in the Ground Investigation Reports Plan document. Having lived in Shaws Lane for 26 years and used the footpath throughout that period, I can verify that the actual line of the footpath has always been where it is currently. Indeed it was shown in this correct position on the 1912/13 and 1961/62 maps in the document referred to above.

Shaws Lane is a bridleway and private track leading to various properties in the Lane which, with the exception of the length prior to the entrance to Chase Farm, has been privately maintained by the residents. It is a rural setting with ancient hedgerow along the length of its border with the proposed development (other than at one point where it has already been destroyed to put in place an emergency access to the proposed development). There is currently no gap and dense hedgerow at the proposed point of access by this second footpath to Shaws Lane. Given that the existing footpath is only a very short walk away, there is, in my view, no case for including this second access point onto Shaws Lane, which would spoil the rural ambience of the Lane. I therefore request that the inclusion of this feature is removed.

Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP)

My second concern is the inclusion of the Local Equipped Area of Play (key feature 8 on the aforementioned site layout) within the ecological mitigation area adjacent to Shaws Lane. In my view, the inclusion of the play area here is inconsistent with what the ecological zone is intended to be. Furthermore, even if the proposed additional footpath referred to above is removed from the plans, I am concerned that visitors to the play area will choose to drive there and, given that there is no provision for

parking near the play area on the development itself, try to park in Shaws Lane, a single track private drive with no space for parking. Should visitors park here, there is a risk of damage to the hedgerow as visitors seek to access the play area from Shaws Lane. In any case, it would seem to me to make much more sense to position the play area more centrally in the development where it would be more easily accessed by a greater number of residents with children on foot and less likely to become a potential meeting point for older youths intent on unsocial behaviour. I therefore request that the position of this play area is reconsidered or, given that there is already a play area nearby in Phase 4 of the development, that it is removed altogether.

Proposed removal of trees on boundary of development

Finally, I was surprised to see a significant number of mature trees with a recommendation for removal in the Tree Report. I do not believe that it is justified to remove these trees just because, for example, they have signs of damage to their trunks. Trees can survive for very many tens of years with such damage. Removal of them is not only, in my view, unnecessary but will also be significantly detrimental to the rural ambience of Shaws Lane. I therefore suggest that these recommendations to remove trees are revisited with a view to retaining as many as possible.

Yours faithfully

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.