From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 24 May 2024 13:43
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/24/0660

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 24/05/2024 1:43 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	April Cottage Sunset Lane West Chiltington West Sussex RH20 2PB
Proposal:	Demolition of existing detached garage and erection of a two-storey detached dwelling.
Case Officer:	Alice Johnson

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	Meadow Cottage, Sunset Lane, West Chiltington Pulborough

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	We object strongly to this planning application. The proposed building, whilst different from that in application DC/22/2302, is not in keeping with a "Wells" building style - failing as it does to meet many of the Character Assessments highlighted in the West Chiltington Lanes Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan. For example, there are no quirky windows, plain timber windows, decorative dentil brickwork, an enclosed brick porch or an intricate chimney. The plans show the proposed development being built close to both April Cottage and Well Cottage and so are not 'sympathetic to its context in terms of its siting, scale ... materials and details' as required by the West Chiltington Lanes Conservation Area Management Plan. To permit such a development would be to allow the ruin of the street view and defeat entirely the purpose of introducing the Conservation Area. We believe the conclusion of the applicant's water neutrality report - that water neutrality will be achieved - is wrong. In its calculation for rainwater harvesting, Clause 5.1.4 uses a collection area of 177m². However, the proposed plans show the building footprint to be (13.17m x 9.18m) 121m² and, even allowing for the roof overhang and the porch, this is some way short of the 177m². The report also fails to address the fact that when, in time, April Cottage has new owners they could choose different water fittings and/or remove the rainwater harvesting system on that property. On the subject of rainwater harvesting at the existing property, how will that work given there is a thatch roof? If all the water is to be captured, the gutter would need to be extremely wide, would not be in keeping with any other property in the Lanes, and would surely fail to receive planning permission within the new West Chiltington Lanes Conservation Area Management Plan. We therefore believe the water neutrality report should not be relied upon, as there is simply no way its findings/recommendations can be implemented. The applicant states that this property would fulfil a housing demand in the area. Given there are currently 66 four bedroomed homes on the market within a three mile radius, there appears no shortage of property. We further comment on the lack of an ecology report. As a footnote, it is interesting to read that the applicant wishes to obtain planning permission for a development almost identical to one they so strongly objected to less than 10 years previously.

Kind regards