From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 September 2024 13:52:21 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/22/2058
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 10/09/2024 1:52 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Richmond Farm Stables Rye Farm Lane Barns Green Horsham West Sussex RH13 0QB
Proposal:	Retrospective application for the erection of a lean-to structure for use as a store only, ancillary to the approved mixed use of the site comprising residential and the keeping of dogs.
Case Officer:	Alice Johnson

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	Richmond Farm Rye Farm Lane Horsham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment
Comments:	Dear Sirs, Once again, I am having to object to another retrospective planning application for Richmond Farm Stables. 1.Highway Access and Parking and Noise

Numerous photographic evidences have been provided to your department illustrating the parking hazards caused by the visitors to Richmond Farm Stables, parking along Rye Farm Lane.

Under Planning permit DC/29/95 - at 06 it clearly states 'parking INSIDE the premises' this has never been altered and stands today yet the applicant ignores this and parks opposite her premises on the grass verge (an area she has taken possession of, has gravelled over and refers to it as 'her layby') she also parks right up the lane on a grass verge opposite my house, and her dog walking volunteers frequently block the lane with their inconsiderate parking.

The permitted parking for Richmond Farm Stables is within the applicant's property.

A letter sent to your environmental health dept from Acoustic Associates Sussex Limited (Client : SD Consulting Limited)
Dated 3/09/2021
Project J3246

Entitled - Noise Management Plan

States :-

'Dog barking will not be tolerated the behaviour will be investigated and remedied at source where practical.

Dog barking is not acceptable to Sarah with a zero tolerance policy in place as neighbours do reside in close proximity'

This is not done, dogs are allowed to bark, this is a work of fiction, there have been numerous complaints to your council regarding dog barking at all times of the day and night, people in the village have complained on the local Facebook page, and there is much evidence of dog barking.

In this letter it also states that the volunteers will park in the village and drive to the premises in one car - this is never done.

2. Overdevelopment

This 'storage leanto' has been erected when the applicant has been advised that any other development outside the plan attached to the CLUED must be done once planning permission has been applied for and given.

So, once again, the neighbours are having to object to another retrospective application, when development has been done, in the full knowledge planning permission should first have been sought.

It really makes me wonder why any restrictions are applied to planning permits as, clearly, no attention is taken of them and this applicant continues to develop, regardless.

My concern is the applicant has developed outside the plan submitted with the CLUED application and permit

.....this plan, outlining the area used 'for the keeping of dogs' is another example of creeping development i.e. applying for one thing, then changing/expanding the use to suit the latest enterprise

one stable used in connection with 'the keeping of dogs' was granted permission for use as '5 stables, 2 foaling boxes and tack/feed room' (I/8/01) - no mention of dogs

History at this site shows a string of retrospective applications and if this is granted it will open the way for more and more development, with or without planning permission

HOWEVER, I will say and I have previously said, I am not unsympathetic to the plight of these greyhounds but up to 22 dogs shoe horned next to residential properties up a single track lane, footpath and bridlepath, with no parking (apart from INSIDE) the premises, is not the place for it.

Thank you for once again reading what has previously been written on this, yet another, retrospective and reworded, retrospective application.

Kind regards