[redacted]
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2024 2:27 PM
To: NEW West 2 <west2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Fwd: dc/23/1762 Appeal reference APP/Z3825/W24/3342546

[redacted]

Heathcote,North Heath
West Sussex RH20 2HR

I wish to object strongly to the proposed development:

Erection of 5No. two storey dwellings at Gennetts Farm, Gay Street Lane, North Heath, Pulborough, West Sussex RH20 2HN
Site reference: DC/23/1762
Appeal reference: APP/Z3825/W/24/3342546

North Heath, Pulborough comprises a small collection of dwellings, located along a rural road, and while there are some scattered residential dwellings along and adjoining the A29, there is no connectivity or direct relationship between these homes. There is therefore an appearance of scattered rural dwellings rather than a distinct community or settlement.

The site remains outside of the built-up area, within a countryside location in policy terms, and does not adjoin an identified and classified settlement. On this basis, Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF remain of significant weight in the determination of the application, with the proposed development not considered to comply with the overarching spatial strategy.

The proposed development would result in a suburban form of development which does not reflect its rural location, or have an appreciation of the setting of the listed building. Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that "In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses." It is considered that the current proposal would not preserve the setting of the listed building and could be considered to result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage.

Due to the proposed scale, form and layout of the development the level of harm within the setting of the listed buildings would be towards the higher end of the scale of less than substantial.

HDC Environmental Health: During a site visit by an Environmental Health Officer from HDC, a number of potential sources of contamination were noted. Given this and the historic agricultural use of the site, a land use which Environmental Health considers potentially contaminating, HDC is of the view that the ground on the site has the potential to be contaminated.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES WSCC Highways: The site is located off Gay Street Lane, this is a D class rural road with a speed limit of 60mph, although given the local rural nature of Gay Street Lane such speeds are not expected in this location. Gay street lane is also width

restricted (6'.6" except for access). The site has an existing access onto Gay Street Lane some 40m from the fork in the road with Gay Street Lane and Nutbourne Lane.

Highways Impacts: Policies 40 and 41 of the HDPF promote development that provides safe and adequate access, suitable for all users The proposed development would include the construction of a new access to the south of the driveway serving Glebe Farm, with the access road extending parallel to this driveway. HDC stated - It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the proposed development would not result in harm to the safety and function of the highway network, as required by Policies 40 and 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and paragraph 109 of the NPPF.

Southern Water: There are no public foul and surface water sewers in the area to serve this development.

Parish Comments: Objected previously on the grounds of overdevelopment in a rural setting and concerns regarding access issues.

The proposed dwellings would remain distanced from day to day services and facilities, where occupants would be overtly reliant on private vehicles to access all of their needs. The provision of market housing in this location, not linked to a rural use, would be contrary to Policy 26 of the HDPF, and the development would not be in accordance with the overarching spatial strategy for development as set out in Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF.

The site has been previously used for agriculture, with the buildings remaining in place. The site is therefore considered to be excluded from the definition of Previously Developed Land, and the development would not therefore comprise the redevelopment of a brownfield site. It is not therefore considered that there are any material considerations that would outweigh the harm to the countryside location or reduce the conflict with the overarching spatial strategy as outlined above.

The proposed development is considered by HDC to result in the encroachment of the countryside location, and would be of a quantum, scale and extent that would result in an intrusive and alien addition that would detract from the informal character and ambience of the countryside location.

Furthermore, there are concerns regarding the individual design of the dwellings and how these would relate not only to each other, but also to the built character of the nearby dwellings.

The proposed development would encompass dwellings of various scale, height and design, with no discernible features or design references shared between the dwellings. The proposed development is not therefore considered to be of a scale, massing or appearance that would relate sympathetically to the built surroundings and landscape, and would not be locally distinctive in character, nor provide an attractive environment, contribute to a sense of place nor integrate with the surroundings. For these reasons, the proposed development is considered to be of a quantum, scale, design and form that would result in an inappropriate and intrusive addition that would be unreflective of the settlement pattern and build characteristics of the locality. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies 52, 26, 32, and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Furthermore, the proposed development has made no design reference to the architectural features and characteristics of the Listed Building. For these reasons, there are concerns that the proposal would detract from the special character and significance of the Listed Building and its setting, and would not preserve the setting of the Listed Building.

Ecology: Policy 31 of the HDPF states that development will be supported where it demonstrates that it maintains or enhances the existing network of green infrastructure. Development proposals will be required to contribute to the enhancement of existing biodiversity, and should create and manage new habitats where appropriate. Circular 06/2005 identifies that the presence of protected species is a material consideration when considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat.

This area is considered to be remote from day to day services, and remains as an unclassified settlement.

The proposed dwellings would be distanced from day to day services, where the provision of market housing in this location, not linked to a rural use, would be contrary to Policy 26 of the HDPF, and would not be in accordance with the overarching spatial strategy for development as set out in Policies 3 and 4 of the HDPF.

The proposal is considered to result in a poor-quality design that would sit as an incoherent and irrational built form, and would fail to create a sense of place nor integrate with its surroundings. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies 52, 26, 32, and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Additional points:

Impact on Local Infrastructure:

1. Potential strain on local infrastructure, such as the narrow lanes. Additionally, lack of sewage systems and drainage.
2. There is a network of public footpaths running next to/through the site.

Environmental Impact:

2. Potential environmental impact of increased human activity, including waste disposal, noise pollution and disruption to local ecosystems.
3. The site is near the railway. The train horn noise is extremely loud.

Inadequate Access to Services:

1. The proposed site will put an increasing burden on the already overstretched essential services such as schools, healthcare facilities and public transportation, which could negatively impact the well-being of the community.

Traffic increase/safety:

- There would be a significant increase in traffic. It is suggested that there would be 4 cars per dwelling. So 20 extra cars using the narrow lanes. Additionally, the entrance is likely to be sited on the already hazardous junction of Gay Street Lane and Nutbourne Lane.

Historical Significance:

1. The site would be near a Roman road which is of historical significance. The proposed development would compromise its value and integrity.

Precedent Setting:

2. By approving this application it could set a precedent for similar developments in the future, potentially altering the character of the area and the intended, predominantly rural and agricultural, land use.

Countryside

- Open, rural countryside being destroyed. (Fails to accord with Policies 25, 32 and 33 of the Council's Planning Framework)

Listed Properties

3. Gennetts Farm is a listed property. Additionally, there are a number of other listed properties close by. These are of historic significance and may be affected.

Wildlife

4. The site is home to a variety of wildlife, including protected species such as bats, barn owls and nightingales.

Water Neutrality

- This site would increase the rate of water abstraction necessary in the area. This would adversely affect local water neutrality requirements.
- Further, in relation to the water neutrality, whereby the hydrogeological report was based on the incorrect location. Rudgwick is on the northern edge of the Sussex North Water Reserve Zone rather than North Heath which is right in the centre of the zone, therefore arguments that the water to be extracted via a borehole would not be sourced from water within the SNWRZ area is not valid. Also, the application confirms that current water usage is 0 (zero) litres per day at the site, so any water use would need to be offset, for which no provision has been made in the application.
- Additionally, the report was based on one (we) 3 bedroom house and four 4 bedroom houses, when the application is actually for one (we) 3 bedroom house, three 4 bedroom houses and one 5 bedroom house, so will in fact use even more water than the report suggests.

[redacted]

Heathcote,North Heath
West Sussex RH20 2HR