

[REDACTED]

Sent: 27 July 2026 17:09
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to Planning Application DC/26/1048
Attachments: Objection S73.pdf
Categories: Comments Received

Dear Sirs

Objection to Planning Application DC/26/1048

A S73 application is designed to be used for minor to moderate design alterations to a consented scheme.

The plans submitted under this application cannot be considered to be minor or moderate. Nothing remains of the original consented scheme. Here are some of the immediate areas that demonstrate that it cannot be considered to be a minor/moderate change:

1. The original plan was for modular off-site construction. This is no longer the case. A completely different form of structure is now being proposed which does not fit with a S73 application.
2. The original colour scheme was approved on the grounds of its natural colour palette - this is clearly no longer the case. It will be a black and overbearing structure that does not blend into the landscape or even match the local housing which is brick. The documents show photographs of the local residential housing stock and there has been no attempt to match this.
3. The design has increased in size in all dimensions and most importantly the height. The industrial chimney on the top of the building is completely unacceptable. This is a residential neighbourhood - not an industrial estate. The original plans did not include this chimney or anything like it. It is note worthy that pages 19 and 24 of the Design Report do not show the industrial chimney as part of the building. The Design Report states "the building is no higher than the original consented scheme" but does this include the items that are being put on the roof that were not included in the original consented scheme?
4. The original plans showed that the classrooms constructed in 2017 were an integral part of the new school - it seems this is no longer the case. If they are not needed anymore why can the building not be moved further away from the houses in Merryfield Drive. As has been stated many times the planned location is intrusive and a breach of human rights. If these classrooms are no longer required why can't the new building be single storey and therefore minimise the impact on residents?
5. The revised scheme clearly states that the building has been extended approximately 10-15m to the north. Where is the accuracy in this statement. The architects need to clearly outline how much bigger the new building will be and demonstrate the impact on residents.

Other points:

1. The whole process has been rushed and the consultation has not been meaningful. Yet again residents have not been listened to.

2. What action is being taken to mitigate the flooding experienced by the residents of Merryfield Drive?
3. The restriction on parking for contractors in Greenway is ridiculous - it will merely move the problem into Merryfield Drive.
4. The use of the school as a community asset will only exacerbate the intrusion into the lives of residents.
5. The proposals state on page 6 "Point 7 *The need to stay within the spirit of the existing planning permission is now a constraint*". How do these revised plans demonstrate that they are staying within the spirit of the granted planning permission?
6. Where is the Management Plan that will minimise the disruption to residents out of hours?

I understand the residents [REDACTED] have submitted [REDACTED] objection and I agree completely with all the points [REDACTED]. It is important that careful consideration is given to all points raised by residents.

Thank you

[REDACTED]
90 Merryfield Drive
Horsham
RH12 2AX