From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 28 April 2024 18:57
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/24/0086

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 28/04/2024 6:56 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	The Grain Store Stonepit Lane Henfield West Sussex BN5 9QT
Proposal:	Change of use of part of the building and land for industrial purposes.
Case Officer:	Hannah Darley

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	Lashmars Hall Stonepit lane Henfield

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment
Comments:	I am writing further, in addition to previous comments I have made on this and other applications and appeals for developments relevant to Stonepit Lane and the wider conservation area of Henfield specific to the High street and to the West of the Highstreet. I am reiterating my concerns and those of other locals and the Parrish council regarding the unsuitability of Stonepit lane for additional development. The lane is an ancient farm track, narrow, twisting and mostly un-mettled. It is also a designated public footpath, heavily used and more so since the recent major development of 170 off homes at Bishop Park off Westend Lane. In 2000, the Planning inspector at appeal APP /238251C199 1103L864 relating to application HF/13/99 had two main reasons for rejecting the appeal and upholding the refusal for permission.

His conclusion on the 2nd point was:
"Inspectors in four previous appeals spread over the last 17 years concerning proposed commercial or residential development of land served by Stonepit Lane have reached similar conclusions about the unsuitability and inadequacies of the private road and its junction with West End Lane. My objections in the terms of the second main issue are of sufficient strength to outweigh my favourable consideration of the development in terms of the first main issue."
He had quite a lot to say which you can refer to by referencing the appeal mentioned above but in particular:
"In my opinion that the limited widths of much of Stonepit Lane, shared with users of the public footpath, the poor visibility at the right-angled bends and at junctions renders the road network unsuitable and inadequate to accommodate the traffic generated by the scale of the manufacturing and structure of the appeal building' Such further demands on Stonepit Lane would give rise to additional highway dangers, materially worsening conditions for highway users, contrary to policies of the development plan and emerging Structure Plan."
Whilst I appreciate that guidance and regulations have changed since the year 2000, I would point out that, not only did the inspector in 2000 uphold and refer to previous judgements on the same grounds (making a total of five) but the application fails within current regulation namely National Planning Policy 2023 which states:
115. Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

116. Within this context, applications for development should:
a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second - so far as possible - to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;
b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;
c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive - which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards;
d) allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and
e) be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations
This and the other applications fail current policy on points A, C & D.
I would seriously hope that a consistent approach to planning decisions would be retained and that this appeal and the other applications referred to below would be refused on the same basis. Not just for their additional cumulative impact on Stonepit Lane but also for their cumulative additional impact on drawing ever increasing traffic through the, narrow, winding, unclassified roads of the Henfield conservation area West of Henfield Highstreet.
Just some of the recent and current applications in Stonepit Lane and the immediate area for new developments:
DC/24/0265
DC/24/0086
DC/23/2180
DC/23/0424
DC/23/2076
DC/23/1072
DC/22/1874
DC/19/0133
DC/24/0367
DC/23/2100
DC/23/0189

It should be noted that the Highway authority usually make "no comment" or "no concern" with regard to applications like these, particularly when they are sited off un-adopted access (tracks, lanes, roads). Primarily because they do not have any responsibility (therefore no comeback on them).

Please consider the cumulative negative impacts
Thankyou for hearing me out.

Kind regards