

**Peter Davies**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 25 February 2025 22:36  
**To:** planninginfo  
**Subject:** DM/25/0014 and DM/25/0015

[REDACTED]

Dear Planning Team,

These comments follow review of the various documents associated with the planning application DM/25/0014 and DM/25/0015. Both numbers are noted as the same application site and so comments below apply to both numbers.

[REDACTED]

Overall the details of the proposal and supporting documents do not appear to deliver what is claimed when cross-referenced with the wider context of the local area and local residents' experience of or impact with the existing site.

#### **1. Local Doctors**

Though this may be walkable from the site for some proportion of the houses, the availability of doctors and doctors' appointments at the surgery now with the current residents is the issue. The surgery is part of a group of surgeries Modality Mid Sussex. Of two in-person appointments I have had, one was in Crawley Down, the other I had to travel to the Modality surgery in East Grinstead. Not the kind of journey to rely on a bus turning up/being on-time/delayed by traffic. This need for health services by residents at the proposed site will increase car journeys.

#### **2. Schools**

The local primary school is at 93% full (as of 25/02/25) and local secondary at 96% . With no short-term solution to this, car journeys will increase to schools outside the area.

Data source: <https://www.get-information-schools.service.gov.uk/Establishments/Establishment/Details/131001>

And <https://www.get-information-schools.service.gov.uk/Establishments/Establishment/Details/126088>

#### **3. Bus Services**

The bus service that largely runs , at best, one per hour to different destinations, isn't regular enough to stop car use for local journeys as outlined above with school and doctor surgery capacity.

In the Design and Access Statement, Section Connectivity Audit

Bus stops are said to be within a 5 minute walk of the site. This 5 minute estimate refers to the boundary of the site on Turners Hill Road. For a site 700m East to West, and 1000m North to South the bus stop is likely a 10 – 15 minute walk away from the houses on this site.

#### **4. Train Services – Constraints not listed, resulting in more car journeys**

The Transport Assessment and Framework Travel Plan do not take into account current constraints of using train services at Three Bridges. These constraints will result in more car journeys from the additional village residents.

### **Train Services - Parking challenge**

Three Bridges train station as a commuting point lacks adequate car parking for those needing to commute. If you arrive at the car park later than 7am on a Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday in term time, there are 0 empty spaces.

The main alternative is parking at least a 10 minute walk away on residential streets e.g. on Briarswood Close. This walk is not well lit and would therefore not be an option for some from October to March.

### **Train services - Cost of parking**

The cost of parking at Three Bridges is approximately £9 per day. For those travelling to work South of, but outside of London, a car journey is a more likely alternative.

## **5.Cycling**

The Functional Travel Plan references the uptake of cycling around the site. The B2028 that runs along the East side of the site may be 30mph, but as traffic study identified average is higher, and local speed watch regularly catch 60 motorists in an hour over the speed limit with top speeds in excess of 50+ or 60+ mph. As a regular competent cyclist, I am Not comfortable cycling on this road.

In the Design and Access Statement, section

Connectivity Audit Cycle Network references the Worth Way.

The Worth Way is too muddy from November to March for it to be a realistic route for cycling along to get to work and remain clean for work.

## **6.Traffic Assessment - Impact on Local Transport**

### **Key Junctions Not Surveyed - Local Road Users Queue On**

The assessment of junctions does not include two key routes locals drive

- i. To avoid Turners Hill junction at rush hour, locals often use Wallage Lane as an alternative route to reach the B2028. This naturally decreases any measurement figure for traffic queuing along Church Road to Turners Hill recorded
- ii. Using Turners Hill Road, driving North to South, approaching the Junction. This is a key route during rush hour. This photo taken at 8.15am on a Tuesday morning shows the traffic queuing back from the Turners Hill junction toward Crawley Down, the queuing starting just past Wallage Lane and B2028 intersection.





### **Junctions at Capacity 'Severe' impact**

The TA references a Leeds development where, at appeal, a +50% delay in junction queuing was not considered severe. This case is 9 years old, in West Yorkshire and involved a 97 second queue time increasing to 151 seconds. Evidence of local queue times being 15 minutes to travel 500m:

At 5.30pm on 24/02/25, , I queued in traffic on the approach to Turners Hill junction along Church Road. The queue began just before this map location of our car was taken in first screenshot below. Shown taken at 17.37 (time shown at top).

The second screenshot taken 15 minutes later we had just progressed to the side road before the village houses of Turners Hill start. Time shown as 17:52 to queue approximately





It is not realistic this junction is not considered over capacity, and that 100s of additional residents needing 000s of journeys to schools, doctors, work will not make this junction use 'severe'.

With the West Sussex Transport Strategy 'severe' criteria of +3% RFC, using the average car length of 5m, the 15min queue to cover 500m example I documented above on 24/03/25 and a reasonable proportion of new sites' residents to travel this route, the impact on this junction can only be classed as severe.

## 7. Lighting Impact Assessment

This report has various inconsistencies and incorrect information about the area (examples below). This, along with the statement in the report that the lighting design on the site used for the report's review is all assumptions, underlines this report is not a review of lighting impact that can be apply to the site as completed.

Errors to note:

1.Site location is incorrect stating open farmland to the North and West of the site. Houses, with residents of Crawley Down are North of the site, and also on some of the lane on West of the site (ref Paragraph 3.1)

1. The description of the site boundary being hedgerows which will naturally exclude light is incorrect when referencing the developers' proposal to remove trees/and or hedgerows in these exact places. Shown below in light green from the Design and Access Statement.

Approx 25% of the measurement locations listed in the Lighting Impact Assessment are on parts of the boundary where these trees/hedgerows are outlined as could be removed.



Additionally, there is no reference to the effect of lighting created by the dwellings both inside and outside lighting inhabitants may choose, further making this review incomplete.

## **8. Latest plans - Baseline Plans CD-1.1 -CD-1.4 rev 02 (Part 2 of 5)**

### **Viewpoint locations**

This does not include all views from the public footpaths around the site.

E.g.1 View from Huntsland into field 5.

E.g. 2. Views all along the path between viewpoints marked 4 and 8.

## **9. Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment**

This states “minimum of 200m of species-rich native hedgerow will be provided at the built development boundary.” Overall boundaries that are shown as being removed in the Design and Access Statement total approximately 500m.

See below taken from Design and Access statement. Light green areas along various boundaries are trees and/or hedgerows marked as could be removed.

Has the Biodiversity Assessment been reviewed with the detail of the developers plans?



## 10. Design and Access statement

The report requests ‘Due consideration be given to the merits of permitting this development ahead of the local plan process’

So long as due consideration is given to the flaws of the development plan which are not fully responded to despite previous resident comment submissions.

Pg 25 summarises how the proposal is written against National Design Guidelines across 10 criteria. However, the proposal does not include all local information that is relevant within each criteria but a set of information which I assume presents the proposal most favourable for the development approval. For example paragraph Context – the site’s immediate surroundings, houses and relative density along Wallage lane South of the site is not included.

Ten priority themes from the Mid Sussex District Plans have been pulled out as relevant to this development. Included in them is ‘Protect valued landscapes for their visual, historical and biodiversity significance.’


As I outline later, including photos, lines of sight across this site will be significantly changed. This theme therefore can not have been a priority when creating this plan.

## Section Facilities

“East Grinstead is 20minutes by bus”

See time estimates from bus timetables, none of which are 20 minutes. Only 1 out of 5 could be rounded down to 20 minutes. M


This misinformation raises the question how much other misinformation in these documents.




## Design and Access statement

Page 13 Housing density around the area outlined as here

Include areas around the site: Huntsland north of the site, area in screenshot has housing density of approximately 1.4 houses per hectare.



Similarly, the area immediately West of the development has a housing density of less than 1 per hectare. Screenshot of relevant area shown below



The area South of the development site is mentioned later on page 58 Built Heritage, when various listed buildings are referred to. Screenshot of some of this area, Again housing density significantly less



Page 51 Ref Paragraph “Integration with the Landscape”.  
‘..ensuring views of the surrounding landscape are maintained. ‘

Note the public views across the existing site below would be lost with the current proposal. All images submitted as part of 2022 response to Site Selection process.

**Image of Views 1:** Current view of proposed Southern Entry



**Image of Views 2:** Southward from Huntsland footpath across farmyard . Showing fields 3 and 4.

Field 2 looking Northward from this same path is now shown as excluded from development as it is Visually sensitive (reference page 17 of this document).

What is the logic behind these two different outcomes for Field 3 and Field 2? The gradient is higher on fields field 3 and 4, and so any development more visible.



**Image of Views 3:** Northward from Worth Way. Showing field 6



Page 56 Ref section Landscape – Response  
 Quote ‘The appraisal demonstrates that most visual receptors currently have their views contained by the mature vegetation along the settlement edge and adjacent to public rights of way. ‘  
 I highlight again current views across field and countryside on the site today, that would turn to views of the proposed houses in the current plans submitted:

## Image 2 from previous comment



### Page 62 Section: Involvement

#### Regarding Paragraph: Feedback Forms

Document summarises 'Main issues' raised by the 100 people who submitted comments.

I received no response to my feedback, would like to see what criteria decided the 'main issues'.

Other flaws I consider 'main issue' raised from the 12 page Wates paper proposal shared via the Haven Centre, Crawley Down November 2024 and submitted via email in December 2024 to [contact@westofturnershillroad.co.uk](mailto:contact@westofturnershillroad.co.uk) were:

- The idea of the 20 minute neighbourhood is not met by the location of most of the proposed houses
- Impact on Landscape views from public rights of way around the site of the countryside

It is stated 100 forms were received. The Online Version of the Feedback Form had an error, and I was not able to submit it. Potentially reducing the number of commenters due to form not working. I therefore submitted comments via email to

[contact@westofturnershillroad.co.uk](mailto:contact@westofturnershillroad.co.uk)

I also emailed details about the form not working. I received no email in response.

To note, I tried to get the online form to work using different browsers, removing website links from my content in case these were the cause of the error.

Error message screenshot below that was sent to [contact@westofturnershillroad.co.uk](mailto:contact@westofturnershillroad.co.uk):



Comments to follow in later email relating to DM/25/0016 and DM/25/0017  
Regards,

