[redacted]

Sent: 21 October 2025 17:36
To: Planning
Subject: DC/24/1855 DC/24/1856 FAO Alice Johnson

Categories: Comments Received

[redacted]

FAO Alice Johnson

Dear Alice,

I am providing the below updated comments after reviewing along with my family the plethora of additional documentation added to both planning applications, ref DC/24/1856 and DC/24/1855 since February 2025 when the consultation period initially ended.

Proposed Access Location

The HDC environmental protection team leader (Lee Money) stated concerns with the car park access running adjacent to the boundary with Westlands in March 2024 and mentioned it again in his email of 3rd October 2025 in response to AJW's recent Alternative Access Review (2nd October 2025).

The use of the Old House garden as a car park was also cautioned in HDC's conservation response (28th Feb 2025).

WSCC highways authority response (March 2025) provided no objection to the planned change in access and described it as "providing the best available visibility", but does not go on to explain why.

The reasons given in AJW's Alternative Access Review (2nd October 2025) to prefer the new access location over the existing Hornshill Lane entrance lacks any substance.

Section 2.1.2 which discusses the existing Hornshill Lane access mentions "landscaping on the eastern/southern boundary" which has no association with the Hornshill Lane entrance.

Visibility from the existing entrance on Hornshill Lane can be improved by removing overgrown vegetation. This is the existing site access and therefore deemed suitable for customer traffic and delivery lorries when the pub was still operating in 2023.

The new proposed location is a domestic entrance, partly shared with the neighbouring domestic property and therefore completely unsuitable for the anticipated business traffic.

Visibility splays in the Transport Statement (7th August 2025 - Drawing ITS19914-GA-004) do not account for the retained T3 Lime tree which affects the visibility to the South. To the North, it assumes that the hedge and neighbouring front garden are maintained in their

current state, which is not in control of the applicant and will be reconsidered if this plan is approved.

Old House Garage

According to the Ecology Impact Assessment (March 2025), the bat surveys are now more than one year old and should be repeated before proceeding to needlessly demolish a beautiful building attached to a listed building which currently houses multiple protected species.

The garage is double height and currently provides a vision and sound barrier to the neighbouring property. It is incorrectly referred to as single storey in multiple documents. The garage is the same height as the Old House and is attached by way of a gated wall, so within the curtilage and thus should be protected by the Old House listing.

Boundary Wall

The Arboricultural Impact Assessment section 5.2.1 mentions that the boundary wall is being sought at the neighbours request.

It must be made clear that the comment was made before the public consultation, with no advance knowledge of the planned change to the access route, as a condition to any change of use to the Old House.

No agreement has been made between the applicant and the neighbour, but the planned introduction of a 20mph driveway and car park next door to a domestic garden requires serious consideration and if approved, will certainly require enhanced protections and retention of the current established hedges.

In the biodiversity impact calculation dated 16th September 2025, figure 2 does not show that the proposed wall will replace the existing hedgerow and so the calculation is flawed.

If the new access route and car park is approved, which would be hugely detrimental to the neighbouring property, then the hedgerow must be retained to maintain the biodiversity and amenity with the proposed brick wall built inside it to reduce the noise but hidden from the neighbour's view.

The planned wall only reaches part way down the neighbouring garden, if the wall is to be used as a noise and vision barrier then it should be extended around the whole boundary with the neighbouring property which runs right around to Loxwood Road.

The suggested 2m freestanding wall, with bridging over root protection zones, has been questioned by the Place Services Landscape Team who have requested review from a structural engineer. Any issue with this structure could potentially be fatal if falling either into the car park or into the neighbouring garden where grandchildren are often at play.

Noise Impact

In Figure 5.3 of the Noise Impact Assessment (29th November 2024), noise propagation shows zero noise to the Westlands garden despite proposed introduction of a driveway and car park next door. The assessment is clearly flawed and should be repeated and independently reviewed.

Landscape surface finishes (drawing 10574-LA-04) shows a number of the proposed parking spaces in gravel, which will increase noise pollution. Bound gravel should be used throughout as recommended by HDC Environmental Protection.

Shared Sewer

HDC Drainage note on 13th June 2025 requested more information as to who will undertake responsibility for the replacement and maintenance in perpetuity of the drainage. Since this is currently shared with the neighbouring property, agreement should be made before planning permission is granted. No contact has been made to date.

The sewer runs under the neighbouring private land and HDC have suggested it be diverted as part of the remedial works.

French engineering response 15th July does not seem to address this point and we await further clarification.

Other

The Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan (May 2025) section 2.1.1 mentions "users of the Primary School". It is not clear from the proposed plan which building the school will occupy!?

Summary

As previously stated, we support in principle the regeneration of the Mucky Duck and there are aspects to the plan which would certainly be beneficial to the site and the Old House. However, the planned demolition of the Old House garage, widening of the entry gate and addition of a new access route down the side of our property is completely unacceptable and perfectly avoidable by using the existing Hornshill Lane entrance.

The new car park in the Old House garden is not a welcome addition and seems unsuitable for the anticipated hotel capacity, but if approved must include measures to reduce noise and pollution impact to the neighbouring properties.

All necessary steps must be taken to avoid parking on the Hornshill Lane verges as this will not only lead to dangerous impact to local pedestrians, horses and cyclists competing for space with passing vehicles, but also could lead to critical emergency services being delayed.

I would welcome direct contact from the planning department to discuss my inevitable unique position considering my boundary with the proposed access road and car park.

Kind Regards,

[redacted]
Westlands

[redacted]