

[REDACTED]

Sent: 18 February 2024 12:14
To: Planning
Subject: [REDACTED] OBJECTING TO SANDGATE NURSERY DEVELOPMENT DC/23/0189
Categories: Comments Received

Dear Planning,

I have been unable to voice my objections via your planning portal as it appears to have lengthy technical difficulties.

I understand from seasoned local planning people that HDC only takes note of objections made via the portal.

Given that it is/has been unuseable for some time, I feel that it is reasonable to accept email objections.

I would be most grateful if you would confirm receipt and assure me that my objections will be included as a valid objection.

My wife and I have previously written to the Planning Committee regarding this development. I trust that you will have our comments on record.

We have recently become aware that this application, which was refused by Horsham Planning Committee, is now shown in the Horsham District Plan as being part of the plan. It is also outside of the limits of the defined existing built up area. Given that this has been shown in the plan without any notification whatsoever, this is an affront to democracy and we object to being treated in such a cavalier undemocratic manner.

We have become aware that your actions are in contention with HDPF policies, namely:

HDPF Policy 1 - it is not a strategic site in the Local Plan.

HDPF Policy 2 - it is not a nominated site in the Neighbourhood Plan.

HDPF Policy 3 - the site is not within an existing built up area.

HDPF Policy 4 - the site is not allocated in neither the Local nor Neighbourhood Plan and it does not adjoin an existing settlement plan.

The above items should be enough for your committee on reconsideration to rescind your approval.

HDPF Policy 23 - as the site cannot be served by safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access; or cannot be supplied with essential services, such as water, power, sewage and drainage, and waste disposal; or provide adequate vehicle parking; or would have an unacceptable impact on the landscape

HDPF Policy 24.3 -as it does not maintain or improve quality of water courses and prevent run off to surface water sewers.

HDPF Policy 25 - as the site certainly does not protect, conserve or enhance the landscape or townscape of the district or does not protect, conserve or enhance the setting of South Downs National park.

HDPF Policy 26 - as the site lies outside built-up area boundaries and does not support the needs of agriculture or forestry; does not enable the extraction of minerals or disposal of waste; or provide for quiet informal recreational use or enable the sustainable development of a rural area.

HDPF Policy 30 as there will be an adverse impact to the natural beauty and public enjoyment of the landscapes of the High Weald AONB and the adjoining South Downs National Park

HDPF Policy 32 as it does not complement the distinctive characters and heritage of the area

HDPF Policy 33 as there is loss of amenity to the neighbouring property; or the design is not sensitive to surrounding buildings, as the proposal is out of keeping and unsympathetic with the built surroundings and in that it does not respect the character of the surrounding area.

HDPF Policy 33.2 as there is loss of amenity to the neighbouring property; or the design is not sensitive to surrounding buildings

HDPF Policy 33.3 as the scale and massing and appearance of the proposal is out of keeping and unsympathetic with the built surroundings.

HDPF Policy 33.4 in that it does not respect the character of the surrounding area and buildings.

HDPF Policy 39 as it does not demonstrate there being sufficient capacity in the existing infrastructure to meet their requirements; or as there is no assessment of the likely infrastructure requirement or its provision

HDPF Policy 40 as it does not maintain or improve the existing transport system; nor is located in an area where there is a choice of local transport; and there is no sustainable transport to the site.

Policy 41 as it does not demonstrate adequate safe and secure parking, and highway safety.

Your actions directly contravene the Planning Policies and indeed go against your previous application decisions for this site.

I have added my detailed comments from our objection filed on 30 May 2023:

General comment: Sandgate Nursery off West End Lane has been refused permission twice by HDC and on appeal. The current application has been made despite Sandgate Nursery not being included in the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan (May 2021).

Transport: Church Street which becomes Upper Station Road which then becomes West End Lane is already under great pressure due to both moving and parked vehicles both private and commercial. The nearest public transport is available in Henfield High Street. Cars are essential for most residents. A case in point is the Bishop Park (Barratts) development in West End Lane, where we live. The majority of households run two cars. This is a necessity for anyone who needs to get to/from work outside the public transport schedules.

This will be true for many of the households in West End Lane and adjacent roads that feed in. It is worth noting there is continuous traffic, commercial and private including heavy agricultural lorries and heavy duty farm equipment all year round.

Street parking in the entire length of the road from the High Street is commonplace and effectively frequently creates a single-lane road. Parking in Bishop Park is also limited. Recreational traffic vastly increases the load at weekends and during holidays when people come to use the South Downs link.

It is therefore inconceivable that anyone could contemplate adding to this load by permitting development of this site.

The proposed two metre wide footpath in West End Lane and the associated one-way system would compound what is already an area struggling to accommodate the existing traffic demands. The proposal that suggests east-bound traffic at this point should have priority over west-bound will not be workable. Traffic is already often backed up past the Old Railway Tavern due to giving way to the eastbound flow.

Lots of local traffic already routes via Broomfield Road (off Upper Station Road/West End Lane) to then turn left through residential Nep Town to avoid the already congested High Street. This is particularly acute at peak times at the junction of Church Street and the High Street. Any increase in traffic over this whole area, however it is managed, would simply overload an already creaking infrastructure.

Ecology: Being a nursery, the site had very little actual construction and has thus evolved into a wildlife haven. There are many species that theoretically will be present on this site. We know for a fact that there are currently nightingales on the site. Two days ago we stood and watched from West End Lane while a deer grazed on site. Under the auspices of Horsham District Council and Sussex Wildlife Trust, both West End Lane and Hollands Lane have been noted in Henfield's Neighbourhood Plan as wildlife corridors.

Any development of the Sandgate Nursery site flies in the face of the avowed intent to preserve the wildlife in the Sandgate area.

Flooding: The Sandgate Nursery site has a known water flow that causes flooding at both the Northern and Southern sides. On the Northern side (West End Lane) there are drainage channels that never flow freely and cause flooding in the Lane and at the Lawyers Lane

junction. The Southern side of the site flows downhill towards the Hollands Lane bridle path, which has no inherent drainage (clay!) and therefore floods the entire area. We are very familiar with the Southern drainage as we walk this area frequently and are very familiar with the footpaths and bridleways.

Construction of buildings and the associated access roads can only increase the water run-off and will serve to exacerbate the existing potential for flooding.

Thank you for your consideration of our objections. I fear that it will have little effect on any decisions the Planning Department will take.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]