

---

**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 06 April 2023 18:10  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application DC/23/0406

## Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 06/04/2023 6:11 PM.

### Application Summary

|               |                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Address:      | Land To The West of Ashington C of E School Park Lane Ashington West Sussex                                                                                                        |
| Proposal:     | Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 180 dwellings, sports pavilion, sport pitches and allotments; with associated access, landscaping, open space and infrastructure. |
| Case Officer: | Nicola Pettifer                                                                                                                                                                    |

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

|          |                                     |
|----------|-------------------------------------|
| Address: | 4 Church Close Ashington Pulborough |
|----------|-------------------------------------|

### Comments Details

|                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Commenter Type:      | Member of the Public                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| Stance:              | Customer objects to the Planning Application                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Reasons for comment: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Design</li><li>- Highway Access and Parking</li><li>- Other</li><li>- Overdevelopment</li></ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Comments:            | <p>DESIGN</p> <p>The proposal makes no provision for public open space nor does it address the flooding issues at Mill Lane identified in the Neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>The proposal makes no provision for commercial use (B1) as identified in the Neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>The proposal does make provision for a playing field (full size pitch and a floodlit MUGA but these facilities are dispersed and poorly sited within the development.</p> <p>The siting of an attenuation basin adjacent to the recreational facilities is considered dangerous and not well thought through</p> |

## WATER NEUTRALITY

In considering Water neutrality the applicant appears to be claiming existing commercial use on the site (A car valeting operation handling circa 30 vehicles per day). As a neighbour to the site such an operation should be very noticeable but isn't - it is suggested this claimed prior usage is fictitious. There are no registered car valeting businesses recorded as operating from this site.

## OVER DEVELOPMENT

The land identified in the Ashington Neighbourhood plan consisted of 18.5Ha and was allocated to deliver approximately 150 dwellings. The application seeks permission for 180 dwellings on a much smaller land parcel this is considered to be over-development and not in keeping with the adopted neighbourhood plan.

## HIGHWAY ACCESS AND PARKING

The Transport Assessment is highly misleading as throughout the plan it refers to the proximity of amenities e.g. bus stops etc and under states all of these by measuring the distance from the Site Entrance, which itself is some way from the nearest dwelling. Whereas the map at Para 3.16 indicates distances from the centre of the site (a more realistic measure).

## PARKING

The proposal to allocate parking spaces for 20 vehicles at the sports pavilion, which itself is located to the extreme west of the site, requiring visitors to transit through the development appears inadequate given that the facility provides changing room for 40 people. By their own calculations (Table 4.4) the provision is inadequate based on the modelling for '5 a side' football (NB the proposal is not for a 5 a side pitch).

Furthermore There is no parking provision for the second pitch which is likely to lead to congestion in the surrounding area. Provision at the pavilion site and its location is unsuited to supporting both pitches

- the statement 'Visitors to the Southern pitch are likely to travel by sustainable modes of transport' is ludicrous. Many users will by nature of the facility be travelling from outside the village and therefore adequate provision for parking is essential to avoid congestion in surrounding residential areas.

## VEHICLE MOVEMENTS

The calculation assumes that only 50% of person trips will be by vehicle and on this basis estimates over 711 vehicle movements from the site per day (350 on and 361 off). Given the lack of access to amenities within the village and the lack of alternative public transport this assumption would appear to be a gross underestimate.

The developers Census data indicated that 82% of the existing movements in the area were vehicular with only 18% by other means - this apportionment provides a more realistic view of Actual behaviours given the local conditions / amenities and if used would indicate over 1100 vehicle movements per day is more likely

## ACCESS

Census data indicates 97% of vehicle movements will transit Church Lane. This road is already partly obstructed, with inadequate walkways and parked cars making two way access difficult. The route also represents the major school walking route to the village, adding a further 1000 vehicle movements per day will be hazardous. Whilst this may have negligible 'driver delay' it has significant impact on local amenity and safety of the village school walking route.

## ACCESS JUNCTION WITH CHURCH CLOSE

Visibility assessments at the proposed site access do not appear to take account of the regular on street parking that takes place in the bay to the East of the Church, which will obscure visibility at the junction of Church Close / Church Lane making entry / egress dangerous.

The angle of approach from the site onto church lane presents a hazard to traffic approaching from Church Close who will naturally be in a bind spot to drivers emerging from the site and who's attention will be focussed on the Church lane junction ahead.

Pedestrian access to the footpath running to the rear of Church close is not well served by a footpath only to the northern side of the proposed access route. A southern footway that not only serves access to Church farm house but also provides a safe walkway to the south of the proposed access route across existing public open access land would be a more suitable provision.

It is unclear why the developer has rejected the relatively modest recommendations made in its own Road Safety Audit.

#### CONSULTATION.

The developer conducted a pre application consultation and several concerns were raised by local residents. In its response the developer has ignored all of these concerns.

---

Kind regards