

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 17 January 2025 17:07:09 UTC+00:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Consultee Comments for Planning Application
DM/24/3011

Consultee comments

Dear Sir/Madam,

A consultee has commented on a Planning Application. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 17/01/2025 5:07 PM from . Balcombe Parish Council on behalf of Parish Consultation.

Application Summary

Reference:	DM/24/3011
Address:	Land Adjacent To Balcombe House London Road Balcombe West Sussex
Proposal:	Proposed erection of ornamental entrance gates, fencing and pillars together with road name plaques.
Case Officer:	Joanne Fisher

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

Comments:

Balcombe Parish Council's objection highlights concern about the proposed 'ornamental' gates and their potential impact on the character and accessibility of the area. Their key points include:

1. Private Estate Feel: The gates are seen as replicating a private estate however, the development is not a private estate and the public should not be given the impression that it is. To give the impression of exclusivity conflicts with the principles of the Neighbourhood Plan. Private streets are not appropriate in this village setting and could create an undesirable distinction between the public and private areas.
The gates to Balcombe House to which this proposal is compared is some distance for the entrance and the two would not be visible together.
2. Public Access: The council emphasizes that access to the new development, particularly to the Village Car Park, should remain open to the public. The gates may hinder this, restricting free

movement and possibly reducing the accessibility of the car park that is intended to serve the community. A requirement of the Design Guide for Balcombe adopted with the Neighbourhood Plan requires all new developments to have a pedestrian route through them to avoid them becoming purely private domain. For this reason, a small cut through path is provided at the western end of the close allowing casual walkers to walk through the development and keep the area as free access to the general public. The gates would conflict from this. Furthermore, a right of way for public access through the site should be made in order to implement this guidance set out in the NP.

3. Street scene: While acknowledging the gates' aesthetic appeal in appropriate context, the Parish Council suggests that their presence in this instance would undermine the effectiveness or intended use of the Village Car Park, potentially detracting from the community-focused design of the development. Other roads, closes and cul-de-sacs in the village are not gated and it would be out of character with the rest of the village if this one was. Most closes are of similar sizes, Foxwells, Bramble Mead, Combers, Troy Mead.... None are gated.

4. Hedgerow: The hedgerow should be reinstated along the visibility spays at this junction in order to accord with the policy for the site of retention of hedgerow along the road boundary.

In summary, the objection suggests that the ornamental gates could negatively impact both the public access and the overall design objectives of the development, and thus should be reconsidered.

Kind regards