[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 31 January 2024 14:17
To: Planning
Subject: Fwd: FAO Hannah Darley, re: 23/1895 Committee Report

Categories: Comments Received

Please see my correspondence directly below, I am forwarding to this mailbox so it is logged through the formal channel as well.

Kind regards

[redacted]
Oaktree Lodge, Burnthouse Lane, Lower Beeding, Horsham, RH13 6NN

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

[redacted]
Date: 31 January 2024 at 14:13:03 GMT
To: hannah.darley@horsham.gov.uk
Cc: dennis.livingstone@horsham.gov.uk, emma.parkes@horsham.gov.uk
Subject: FAO Hannah Darley, re: 23/1895 Committee Report

Hello Hannah,

Firstly, I am very unhappy that comments I made in my objection to this planning application seem to have been ignored and as a result incorrect & misleading information is being provided in this report to the committee, namely:

Page 1, Description of the Application - '1.3 The proposal will also include the laying of permeable hardstanding to the south of the existing parking area to provide an additional 14no. parking spaces. This would include 2no. disabled bays and am EV charging station.'

This only discusses the parking between the two buildings and does not mention a) the parking to the west of the NEW building which is in fact **NEW** in this application. I raised that the current site plan should be the proposed site plan from application DC/22/1198 which clearly shows a) no parking to the west of the new building and that trees in that area would remain and b) that the parking between the buildings was extended. I would have expected this to have been investigated, the current & proposed site maps revised and your review & recommendation to be based on that as the true facts.

Secondly, there is a mistake in point 6.12 - 'The nearest neighbour is located to the south, which comprises of a number of stables, barn, mobile home and residence. The increase in height and the scale of the resulting building would not result in any unacceptable harm to amenity.'
The nearest property is NOT to the south but on the north and east boundaries, this needs to be corrected as they are fully exposed to the site and there is a significant visual impact for them. This needs to be corrected as it misleads the planning committee members.
Considering how close the building to be extended is to their residence (then barn approved for conversion) and that windows directly overlook the site I had expected conditions to be included for additional landscaping on the north and east to reduce their exposure. This has not been included.

Thirdly, I wish to draw your attention to the alleged breach of planning ref EN/23/0481 which covers two separate complaints:
1. Development is not in accordance with the plans approved under DC21/1050 & DC/22/1198
2. Work has commenced on the car park (i.e. the space to the WEST of the new building as discussed above) prior to permission being obtained (DC/23/1895)

The Committee report does not reference this in any way so the committee members are unaware and I strongly believe they should be aware. As the investigation is not yet complete and both complaints are intrinsically linked to this application it surely must be concluded before any decision is made on DC/23/1895.

Can I ask for an urgent reply from you on this as the committee meeting is next week and I am planning on attending & speaking. Please feel free to contact me on the number below as a two way discussion would be helpful.

Kind regards

[redacted]

Sent from my iPad