Rec'd 2/12/24

22 Warren Croft
Cootham, Pulborough
W.Sussex, RH20 4BE

The Planning Inspectorate
Room 3/C Eagle
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

28th November 2024

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: P.I. ref: APP/Z3825/W/24/3354517
Horsham D.C. ref: DC/24/1102
Applicant: Mrs Shona Partington
Change of use of existing property (in garden) from a Holiday Let to a Permanent C3 Dwelling house, 1 Cootham Brow, New Town Road, Storrington, West Sussex, RH20 4JP

Having been given the opportunity to make comments on the above Appeal, on the grounds that I live opposite no 1 Cootham Brow and would be affected by an increase in population and vehicular movements, I am writing as follows:

Original Planning Application?

As I understand it, the application pertains to a building in the back garden of no. 1 Cootham Brow and not the main house.

Have you checked - was there ever an original Planning Application made and Consent given for the substantial "Holiday Let" in the back garden at No. 1 Cootham Brow? We have lived here for almost 20 years and I have never been aware of such an arrangement. The previous residents appeared to be "away a lot" so I don't see how they could have operated a holiday rental. If there was no permission given for the existing substantial building, surely it should be demolished.

Setting a Precedent

By granting Consent for Change of Use to a permanent dwelling would set a dangerous precedent. Having lived in this area all my life, I have seen many many gardens disappear under bricks, in some cases by demolishing the original property and building many properties on tiny plots. This always turns what was once a reasonable, desirable, or indeed a "posh" area, into "rural suburbia" as they used to say when I worked in an Estate Agents years ago.

This particular example reminds me of a story on the television which I saw some years ago whereby non-white immigrants in this country were building multiple occupation buildings at the end of their gardens which appeared to be "sheds" in order to provide "housing" for their fellow patriots. People will always try to bend and stretch the law.

Density

As you are aware, once Permission is granted for one house to have another property in their garden, more will follow suit and life becomes unbearable for everyone in the vicinity who chose to live there because of its "character".

Having worked for many years for an architectural practice I recall there once was a time that "changing the character of the area" (or words to that effect) was a justifiable reason for Planning Consent to be refused on the grounds of "density". I understand that this, sadly, has gone by the board.

Vehicle Parking

As far as I can see, there is a lay by for parking in front of the building in question. It would appear that in order to enter or exit this area, any vehicles using this building would need to use the area in front of the row of houses a little further up the narrow lane in order to turn round. I am sure the residents there will also have made representation to you on this problem.

If it has been used as a holiday let, I assume this would have been an intermittent problem. However, should it become a permanent residence, then this would be a permanent problem. Obviously people have visitors and there would be friction between them and the people who already have to use the tarmacked area which obviously belongs to the properties further up the lane.

Parking Problems continued....

This leads me on to say – due to the limited vehicle parking in front of nos. 1 – 6 Cootham Brow in New Town Road, there is often overspill into my road – Warren Croft. Human nature dictates that people want to park as close to their home as possible, which means that the Cootham Brow residents, their visitors, tradesmen etc often park at the "top end" of Warren Croft where I live. This creates a problem as drivers turning into Warren Croft are in serious danger of crashing into vehicles parked just round the turning. Due to high fences, walls, and hedging, they can't see them until they are "on top of them".

In addition, these overspill vehicles sometimes obscure my vision when I am reversing out of my drive as I do not drive a large 4 x 4 vehicle like so many people these days and my car is somewhat "low down". I do not feel I should be pressurised to change my vehicle due to other people's actions.

There is already a shortage of parking for Cootham Brow as modern family lifestyles necessitate multiple car ownership. This means that cars are parked up as far as the main road – the A283 – which again means it is hazardous turning off that road into New Town Road because the Cootham Brow residents park up as far as the junction with the A283 and New Town Road and there is limited visibility when exiting the A283 to return home.

Therefore to grant Permission for yet more potential vehicle owners would add to the problem.

There is only one small lay-by for visitors to Warren Croft but again, this is sometimes used by Cootham Brow personnel due to lack of sufficient parking at their properties.

Although Warren Croft is not a Private Road, it has to be said that through a lifetime of hard work, the residents on this estate have been able to enjoy living in detached properties and therefore pay more Council Tax. To be blunt about it, we do not want any more locals being forced to park in our road and detracting from our Quality of Life.

I hope the foregoing is sufficient to add weight to Horsham District Council's reasons for Refusing this application. Thank you.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]