

Storrington,S & W. N.Plan 2018 - Response to Question 6 of Public Hearing

a) Impact on listed building -- The proposed development would be totally overbearing due to its siting and height. Appendix I shows the height differential between the ground levels of Chestnut Cottage and the proposed site. Taking account of the slope within my garden, the difference is 21.57 metres. The proposed houses would be 8 -10 metres tall, which would be in the region of 30 metres above the ground level of Chestnut Cottage. It would totally overwhelm the cottage and have an urbanising impact on its rural setting. It would materially and unacceptably harm the character and appearance and significance of this rural listed cottage. This harm would not be outweighed by any public benefits

The development would fly in the face of the previous Appeal decisions made on behalf of the SOS, regarding the character, appearance and significance of the cottage. (See appendix II for details). It would be perverse to refuse the previous more modest and less invasive proposal (To the side and some 3-6 metres lower than Chestnut Cottage), to then approve 6 large, elevated dwellings within the rural heathland setting and within the main outlook from the listed cottage.

b) Buffer to adjacent SSSI

Natural England have stated that 20 metres is the minimum buffer they would accept to protect wildlife. How can the site promoters justify a reduction when there are numerous protected species within the Warren and on the proposed housing site. For example, various birds of prey and owls, starlings, slow worms, grass snakes, stag beetles, small tortoiseshell butterflies, bats, badgers and hedgehogs to name a few are on the site. The site has become an undisturbed area of heathland and the level of wildlife is increasing each year, as was promised as part of the restoration scheme.

c) Land Contamination issues

- The land fronting Washington Road was specially compacted to facilitate the Angel Sands development. Even then concern was raised about contamination towards the rear of that site. The proposed site is loose filled and I understand that Methane levels have been unacceptably high. The existing vent pipes would have to remain and if in private gardens I am sure they would be forgotten and not monitored. The pipe in my garden is never checked, despite being part of the restoration programme. (see Appendices III & IV for highlighted relevant comments).

Flooding

This is a major issue for us. When the land was first filled and before the planting was established water run-off from the site flooded us, our neighbours 200 yards along Water Lane and the Water ran all the way to the north end of Water Lane. It was an ongoing problem for months and months, with the developer disinclined to do anything or make good the damage. (See appendices V, VI, VII & VIII for relevant correspondence, photos and residents' petition.) The proposal would massively accentuate this problem, with the necessary large expanses of hard surfacing and grubbing up of planting. I am confident that we would be flooded again, but on a greater scale.

d) Acceptable access

- Heather Way may not be feasible. If entered through Angel Sands, the access would overwhelm Chestnut Cottage due to its elevated position some 5 metres above the cottage. It would have an urbanizing impact on the setting of the cottage.

e) Appropriate location for housing

- The scheme would irreparably damage the setting of the Warren (the SSSI), which includes an historic Hill fort and environs. It would obstruct views of the Warren from SDNP to the south, including Sullington Conservation Area.

- Permission for Angel Sands was given on basis that rest of sandpit would be restored to heathland and provide a natural and appropriate buffer to the SSSI. (see Appendix IV, point 3 and Appendix IX.

f) Built up area Boundary

- We oppose the entire development and hence the extension of the built-up boundary.
- However, if the boundary were to be extended it would be arbitrary and perverse to include the Angel Sands development at the front as well as a large area of infill land but to exclude the adjoining properties, which predate the proposed development by several centuries!