
From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 16 April 2023 16:10
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/23/0406

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 16/04/2023 4:11 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land To The West of Ashington C of E School Park Lane Ashington West Sussex
Proposal:	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 180 dwellings, sports pavilion, sport pitches and allotments; with associated access, landscaping, open space and infrastructure.
Case Officer:	Nicola Pettifer

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	5 Church Close Ashington
----------	--------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	The suggested number of houses exceeds that set out and agreed in the Neighbourhood plan, ie 180 units as opposed to 150. This is in direct contravention of the Neighbourhood Plan and needs to be challenged. The amount of available space, if Bellway are to include all the amenities as set out in the Neighbourhood Plan, means the suggested units will need to be set closer together, restricted in size and with markedly restricted gardens/green space. The development needs to be sympathetic with the surrounding area which is rural in nature with a high quality of surrounding countryside. By increasing the number of units, there will need to be a compromise in the size and quality of the units or in the agreed amenities. By creating more units that originally agreed in the Neighbourhood Plan, the impact on privacy, light and noise for existing residents is indefensible.

The siting of the sports pitches are not as per the Neighbourhood Plan. There is insufficient parking and facilities for teams coming from outside the village. The design makes no sense.

The figures used to defend the neutrality statement are incorrect, therefore the whole premise of water neutrality for this proposed site is flawed. Horsham District Council's position on water neutrality states that the building of any development should not increase the rate of water abstraction for drinking water supplies above existing levels. Bellway have used figures from the wrong water company, so all their figures must be challenged. Bellway suggest that an 'existing car valeting' operation on the site uses 1500 litres per day, or 375,000 litres per annum. This is highly disingenuous as a small number of cars are 'valeted' only, not washed.

Bellway advise that at property handover they will issue a paper and electronic Home User guide advising residents about the water fittings and the maximum allowable water use of the property. They are trying to justify their position on water neutrality, however once the units have been purchased, the home owners will have autonomy to make whatever changes they see fit. Bellway states the Title Deeds will contact a covenant restricting the water use and this covenant will require home owners not to downgrade water efficient fittings as this would potentially increase the demand on water. This simply isn't enforceable and most likely not palatable to many potential home owners. This further challenges Bellway's already flawed water neutrality position.

There is no provision for the flood mitigation work in Mill Lane that was agreed in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Access to the site will be via Church Lane/Church Close. The Neighbourhood Plan was clear about the concerns around maintaining safety for pedestrians, particularly given the narrowness of these roads. A staggered junction was agreed within the Neighbourhood Plan, but Bellway have not only again contravened the Neighbourhood Plan, they have also ignored suggestions made by the Transport Consultant. The suggested route is right next to the church wall so pedestrian access by the church is effectively cut off. Moreover, with the way Bellway have set out the junction, when cars are parked by the church, views of drivers will be restricted, which is dangerous. I cannot see how people will be able to walk to and from school, church and other community facilities safely and there is extremely limited provision for parking.

I would challenge the statement that Church Lane and Church Road are both two-way single carriageway roads subject to a 30mph speed limit. Neither road can safely accommodate two cars driving in opposite directions as they are simply too narrow. Church Lane has limited off road parking and cars are constantly parked on the road, making it already difficult to navigate. I have never seen cars driving at 30mph as this would be dangerous in the extreme. Added to this the location of the Scout Hut and Youth Club, there is a significant number of cars/pedestrians using this route and I cannot see that any considerations have been made to mitigate the risk of accidents.

I cannot see any clear reference to safeguard land for an extension to the existing primary school. The need for this is clearly stated in the Neighbourhood Plan. Existing residents already struggle to ensure their children have a local school place. With a potentially significant increase in demand following a development, there is a very real risk that local children will lose out on school places as children coming from the development are likely to live closer.

Bellway have not been clear about protecting the Forest School, again the need for this is clearly stated in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Bellway's plan is in no way sympathetic with the Neighbourhood Plan, but the agenda, to maximise profit at the expense of quality of life is absolutely clear and must be challenged.

Lastly, I am disappointed and concerned that Horsham District Council only sent out very few letters to residents, considering how many are likely to be impacted by Bellway's planning application. I also note that the dates of the consultant period, ie 27.3.23 to 17.4.23 and would point out that within this period, there were 2 bank holidays, so according to HDC's letter, the

consultation period should have been extended by a further 2 days. Can anyone advise why this hasn't been done?

Kind regards