

[REDACTED]

Sent: 07 February 2026 19:02
To: Planning
Subject: DC/26/0035

Categories: Comments Received

Good evening,

I am writing to object to the planning application for a house on the land off the A24 and Spring Gardens.

My concerns are as follows:

Construction Traffic

The application does not give details on the construction traffic that access the site. Large construction vehicles entering and leaving the area, or being parked up, as per previous constructions applications would increase the danger of reduced visibility and road users.

Grazing Land and Impact on Wildlife

The land is currently for grazing is part of the countryside. Further building on the land would result a reduce in character for the area as well as making a significant change for local wildlife/habitats.

Light and Impact on Spring Gardens

The size and scales of the proposed house would block natural light to the properties and road, and negatively affect the living conditions.

Further more the current stable that has bene build has electric lighting on 24 hours a day, which is dazzling at night to road users, and shines in to peoples homes, causing problems when trying to get young children to sleep, sleeping when doing shift work and also just affecting the standard of living for residents who live in spring gardens.

This proposed property would worsen this, with the movement of the stable block south to be opposite more houses.

Parking

There is limited parking available in the area. This is already made worse by traffic going to spring gardens nursery.

The application does not show how parking would be managed, again could lead to unsafe or obstructive parking on the road which is narrow as it is and the only way to and from spring gardens is to use this route.

Flooding

Since the spring and pond was filled in to allow the stable block to be build as per previous applications the flooding at the bottom of Spring Gardens and bus stop has worsened significantly. Having further construction would potentially increase this, but also having a residential building erected on a flooded area and on unstable land where the spring was also raises concerns to the proposed buildings strength, again considering the size of it.

Also as another application has now been proposed I would like to address the following, of previous three declined applications:

Erection of a stable & kennel building and laying of hardstanding.

Ref. No: DC/22/1023 | Status: Application Refused

Retention of existing entrance and stable block together with reduced area of hardstanding (permeable) and parking for a single works van / trailer.

Ref. No: DC/24/1327 | Status: Application Refused

Retention of existing entrance and stable block together with reduced area of hardstanding (permeable) and parking for a single works van / trailer (Retrospective)

Ref. No: DC/25/0183 | Status: Application Refused

All three refused applications have been ignored over the past years and have been built in any case.

Reports of dogs barking all hours of the day were reported and nothing was done, and the kennel building remains. There again have been horses, but for a while now, none reside, and the building is used for storage.

The hand standing/parking for a single works van has been ignored, multiple vehicles have been left on the land, as well as construction and timber materials, as well as the constant fires that been lit all years round to burn construction waste.

In regards to this application

Reference DC/25/1009

Alternative Reference PP-14109271

Retention of existing entrance and stable block together with reduced area of hardstanding (permeable). (Retrospective).

The existing entrance was never used, and instead a brick build entrance was built very close to No 1 Spring Gardens, the original entrance was on the corner opposite the post box of Spring Gardens.

Therefore for all the above reasons, as well as previous applications that have been ignored or made to suit, I have to object to this application.

Kind regards

Sent from my iPhone