From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 28 February 2024 14:38
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/23/2076

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 28/02/2024 2:38 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land North of Stonepit Lane Henfield West Sussex BN5 9QT
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey detached workshop / woodland management / forestry building. Installation of 6No. rooflights, new access and track.
Case Officer:	Hannah Darley

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	Lashmars Hall Stonepit Lane HENFIELD

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	I object most strongly to this ill-conceived and speculative application which is in itself intrinsically the same as the previous application for this site namely DC/22/1874. This new application should be refused for the same reasons. It will be an unnecessary (to its countryside location) intrusive and disturbing development. Privacy, light and noise: As a neighbour we will be disturbed by the noise from this site which purports to process timber products including the import of timber and the export of products. The noise from this equipment and who knows what else (from its B1 light industrial classification) will be very intrusive in what is an extremely quiet and open countryside area. Not just for the neighbours but also for the wildlife. Because of the nature of the environment

noise travels easily for significant distances, in the days when the local boarding kennels were in operation it was often easy to hear the dogs barking and they were over twice the distance away from us. This application should it be allowed will add light pollution via the roof lights and also outside lighting which will presumably be needed. This will negatively impact the nocturnal wildlife including the many bats and owls that hunt this area of open countryside. Highway access and parking: The whole of stonepit Lane is a popular Public, footpath. Mostly unmetalled and very narrow, It is a Trees and Landscaping: At 7.5 metres height or 24.5 feet in old money, this building would tower over the hedgerow and be clearly visible from all the footpaths that surround it. Being as it is on a raised slope within the open country side landscape. I have noticed that the application has some errors, which I will draw your attention to. - Page 6 states that there are already 2 parking spaces but there are none, it's a green field so this statement is incorrect. - On page 8 the applicant has answered No to the questions "Does the proposal involve the need to dispose of trade effluents or trade waste?" (no). "Do the plans incorporate areas to store and aid the collection of waste?" (no). "Have arrangements been made for the separate storage and collection of recyclable waste?" (no). It cannot be correct that an industrial workshop will not create any waste from the processes, products or workforce. Access to the site is via Stonepit Lane which is in the ownership of the Diocese of Chichester and Church Commissioners, not the owners of land either side who have been served notice by the applicant's Agent. The statutory requirements needed to make the application valid have therefore not been satisfied. Either Certificate B should be re-issued, or Certificates C or D should be used, and I would expect the local planning authority to request a re-submission or re-advertise the application. This application is contrary to at least the following 11 off HDPF policies: - Policy 2, It is not a nominated site in the Neighbourhood Plan. - Policy 4, The site is not allocated in the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan and does not adjoin an existing settlement edge. - Policy 1, It is not a strategic site in the Local Plan. - Policy 10, It does not maintain the quality and character of the area; does not contribute to diverse and sustainable farming enterprises or promote recreation. - Policy 23, The site cannot be served by safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access; or cannot be supplied with some essential services, such as water, power, sewage and drainage, and waste disposal, or provide adequate vehicle parking. - Policy 25, It does not protect, conserve or enhance the landscape or townscape character of the district. - Policy 40, It does not maintain or improve the existing transport system, nor is it located in an area where there is a choice of local transport and there is no sustainable transport to the site. This is a very rural location with limited access via a private road. - Policy 3, It is not within an existing built-up area. - Policy 26, 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. - Policy 33.2, There is loss of amenity to the neighbouring property, or the design is not sensitive to surrounding buildings. - Policy 33.4, It does not respect the character of the surrounding area and buildings. I support the Parish council and my friends and Neighbours in their objections to this application. I urge The Planning department at Horsham to again refuse permission on the basis of all the Valid points raised.

If the applicant truly wished to improve the ecology of the site and keep his costs down, then a much lower level structure hidden in a corner of the site closer to the entrance with the lane would be the obvious approach. The structure is not hidden away in a corner of the site it is prominently placed in the middle of the plot which also requires a long driveway to it from the lane. It is quite obvious from the size, height and positioning within the site, that the intention here is to put up a house size structure in a prime location which once it has been a 'workshop' for a short while will be converted into a dwelling thus attempting to bypass planning legislation and achieve, in due 2 course, a dwelling in the countryside that would not be permitted if it were submitted openly. The applicant makes many statements about his intentions, the intended use, frequency of use, current intentions for the future, limiting noise etc. But none of these can be enforced and they can all change easily once the site is active. Finaly, He argues that by their nature rural businesses need to be located rurally. However, the purposes that he states the building is required for are industrial and not rural. They are certainly not specific to the area or located next to a material source as every item will have to be bought in. Further why is the site needed at all if it is to be used so infrequently for such light use? It certainly would not offer much employment or benefit for the damage it will do.

Kind regards