

**From:** Parish Clerk <clerk@lindfieldrural-pc.org.uk>  
**Sent:** 28 January 2025 15:37:49 UTC+00:00  
**To:** "Joanne Fisher" <Joanne.Fisher@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** LRPC Response to DM/24/2922 Hollyrood House

Dear Joanne,

Please find below the LRPC response to DM/24/2922 and once again many thanks for allowing the extra time.

Our councillors are not against this development, but feel the below work is required for safety and other matters.

### **LRPC Response to:**

#### **DM 24/2922 - Hollyrood house Linfield RH 16 2RA**

#### **Principle of development**

This "grey" disused site is already developed and hosts several disparate, untidy buildings and therefore the principle of development/POD is well established and therefore acceptable. To support a consistent decision-making process, we are primarily considering density, design, sustainability/pricing and safe access.

#### **Access**

LRPC do not feel that access and egress are neither safe nor acceptable. There is a known RTC issue in the area. Including a recent fatal RTC that has not been taken into consideration. We fully agree with the eleven points made by WSCC in relation to Highways and safety matters. It should be considered to reduce the number of accesses or introduce a one-way system, to reduce vehicle / pedestrian conflict. We also request the introduction of a reduced speed limit for Ardingly Road and Park Lane, which is supported by the speed information provided in the transport assessment. In addition, in relation to the bus stops and access to the bus stops there should be wheelchair accessible routes to and from both bus stops, with dedicated waiting areas, in accordance with LTN 1/24. To emphasise this, we would like to provide this commentary from the near Buxshalls development and inadequate bus stop infrastructure provided. One resident quoted "It affects the quality of life of residents living on the road in other ways – through the noise caused by higher speed driving, through the anxiety that many of us feel turning in and out of our driveways, and through severance: there is quite a large community on our stretch of road including other families with similar aged children and we would like more contact with our neighbours but frankly crossing the road between my house and Grange Farm on the other side can feel like crossing the Amazon and the idea of my children doing it keeps me awake at night, so effectively the road in its current state cuts us off from our immediate neighbours as well as from Lindfield village proper", these proposals would replicate this issue. The Buxshalls issue is now having to be resolved at the public's expense, due to the initial oversight by MSDC and WSCC.

#### **Flood Risk & Drainage.**

We agree with WSCC that there should be an acceptable FRA & Drainage Strategy because not in accordance with the NPPF, PPG Flood risk and coastal change or local policies. This

means that flood risk could increase elsewhere. Reason To prevent flooding in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 167, 169 and 174 by ensuring the satisfactory management of local flood risk, surface water flow paths, storage and disposal of surface water from the site in a range of rainfall events and ensuring the SuDS proposed operates as designed for the lifetime of the development.

### **EVC -Electric Vehicle Charging**

Charging provision should be at least 49% of the 37 spaces which equates to 18/19 spaces. This requirement should be attached as a planning condition, with future proofing for with appropriate supply trunking without the need to excavate.

### **Affordable housing**

Requirement for a mandatory six units. The draft officer report by Helen Blackith accepting payment in lieu does not support council affordable housing objectives robustly enough. Developer consultant numbers are exceptionally low and lack credibility as they do not correlate with real achieved pricing in the local market. An overage excess clause for should be inserted to protect what the wider public interest in terms of provision of affordable housing space, as the achieved pricing for this completed development will undoubtedly exceed the consultants overly pessimist calculations. This is directly relevant as the site is nearer to Lindfield Village, therefore the recent development of the Buxshalls Estate nearby on the Ardingly Road is a directly relevant and tangible price benchmark indicator. The demand for housing in and around Lindfield consistently outstrips supply and is directly relevant in terms of rural location and demand for housing. This emphasises the reality that the S106 Management report deliberately undervalues this development. Specifically, the Crick May rental references on page 39 of the report are significantly lower than local rental rates achieved and therefore grossly misleading by a factor of at least 50%. Likewise baseline costs for the conversion of all dwellings appears to be inflated by the consultant as they represent new build costs- not conversion metrics.

### **Design**

The removal of the flat roofs on the application is however welcome.

### **Dark Skies**

External lighting across this site in a rural location is very important; it needs to meet not only the requirements of LRPC Dark Skies policy, but also those set out in MSDC a Dark Sky policy as part of their 2021 – 2039 District Plan under section DPN8 – “Lighting Impact & Dark Skies” (page 68).

LRPC notes the general statement in paragraph 23 of the Planning Statement in relation to “Dark Skies” which is a very important issue in relation this rural development. However, it refers to, only in general terms, to the use of motion sensors and dimming technologies to minimise light dispersion and pollution but fails to provide any real information on how this will be achieved across the site, especially in relation to car parking and other open areas.

This means providing more details to comply with the main aim of our Dark Sky policy, which is to control outdoor lighting to ensure it is “*designed to direct light to the ground, not up into the sky where it can contribute to light pollution*”. Which means the night sky is without artificial lighting, thereby not interfering with the “*vital (to the) proper functioning of natural ecosystems*”, as artificial lighting adversely affects different species migration patterns, predator-prey relationships, and disorients the circadian rhythms of many creatures in relation to their night/day behavior.

## **Summary**

In principle, LRPC supports this application if the following discrepancies are addressed via amendments or planning conditions,

- Closure/stopping up of vehicular exiting onto Ardingly Road
- EVC- Minimum 18 spaces to provide charging for electric vehicles.
- Bus-Stop upgrade to support sustainable transport to LTM124 standard.
- S106 Overage clause based upon final achieved pricing for development to increase allocation for sustainable/Affordable Housing contribution. If these metrics are met/exceeded, the provision of affordable housing should be on-site.

If these requirements are not fully addressed, for the absence of doubt, LRPC objects to this application.

Kind regards

Santi

Santi Gil

Clerk to the Council  
Lindfield Rural Parish Council

Walstead Chapel  
East Mascalls Lane  
Lindfield  
West Sussex  
RH16 2QJ

Tel: 01444 831499

Email: [clerk@lindfieldrural-pc.org.uk](mailto:clerk@lindfieldrural-pc.org.uk)

Website: <http://www.lindfieldrural-pc.org.uk>