From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 September 2024 15:44:52 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application S106/24/0016
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 11/09/2024 3:44 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Duckmoor Farm Wooddale Lane Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 9DZ
Proposal:	Discharge of planning obligation (DC/20/2607) pursuant to Schedule 1, Paragraph 5.1 relating to water neutrality, and to amend the Water Neutrality Statement secured pursuant to the definition of Water Neutrality Scheme
Case Officer:	Matthew Porter

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	Dadswell Drive Billingshurst

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Other
Comments:	I strongly object to this application. Having read the two commissioned reports by The Diary Group and GWP Consultants it is clear that the Water Neutrality Statement is not reliable, definitive or precise. Far from it. It is apparent Horsham District Council should never have given

assurances to NE and the Planning Inspector that the scheme was Water Neutral nor could it be secured as Water Neutral given the conclusions of these reports. Horsham District Council should have refused the Water Neutrality Statement based on the information presented to it.

The Authors with their great many number of years of experience and technical expertise between them, state in no uncertain terms that based on the information provided the Water Neutrality Statement lacks proper rigour and credibility and is not reliable. Collectively these reports show the Water Neutrality Statement cannot be relied upon as a sound document based on their conclusions.

It is evident from both reports that a number of technical points have been completely overlooked or not even considered; fundamental industry protocols have been confused and conflated in the Water Neutrality Statement. Why did HDC not seek professional advice and proper technical opinion at the time of the original application to derive their conclusion and this latest application?

These two professional technical reports raise so many questions about the feasibility and validity of the Water Neutrality of this scheme it poses serious questions about process and the validity of decisions made.

Furthermore, it also seems wholly inadequate that a member of the public had to pay privately for these reports in order to unveil the technical inadequacies of the Water Neutrality Statement and Horsham District Council's inability to properly analyse the Water Neutrality of the scheme.

Based on previous representations, and these commissioned reports there is now a substantial base of evidence that the scheme is not Water Neutral, nor can it be proven that the scheme is Water Neutral in practise, let alone being precise, definitive and beyond reasonable scientific doubt. It also confirms that the Water Neutrality cannot be secured reliably or scientifically.

To accept this scheme as Water Neutral would be simply wrong and HDC should reject the application accordingly.

Kind regards